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Thank you for the invitation to speak. I really wanted to be here today because I care deeply about the future of Montana, as do all of you.

And I think the future of Montana, like that of our country, is bright -- if, and only if we work together to meet significant challenges facing us.

We are, in my opinion, at a crucial juncture in our history -- both here at home, and across the land.

There is good news on the home front. Montana's resource industries are showing renewed strength.

Beef prices are at the highest levels of the decade; beef producers are more profitable than ever before.
Copper is over $1 per pound, a price many thought they would never see again.

Montana had a record wheat harvest this year; and the Soviets have just made a significant purchase of Montana wheat.

And oil prices, while not at the levels we would like, are showing signs of underlying strength.

But let's not kid ourselves. How many of us here tonight can actually say we are responsible for this good news?

The answer is "none" -- none of us.

Economic forces miles from the mountains and plains of our state control Montana's economic fate.

Decisions that directly affect our lives are being made not only in New York and Washington, but in Tokyo, Bonn, Seoul, and Moscow as well.
It is a sad fact that currently Montana's future does not rest in the hands of you and me, our families and friends; it's controlled by the whims and plans of people we do not know, and some governments for which we do not vote.

It is time for Montana to do something about its economic sovereignty.

It is time for Montanans to take back the reins of our economic future.

It is time we Montanans decide whose vision we want to follow -- our own, or some European or Oriental minister's.

How do we do this? By diversifying Montana's economy with new business -- high technology, value added production, expanded tourism, manufacturing.

Montana must tap America's entrepreneurial resources. We must make a strong, aggressive effort to attract new and different types of business into our state.
And we must look for new, innovative ways to strengthen our traditional resource based industries. We must never forget the trails we have forged in the past, but we cannot ignore the call for a new mission for Montana.

The best and most recent example of the kind of effort we have made -- and must continue to make -- is our effort to attract U.S. West to Bozeman.

Montanans have never done a better job of working together.

Cities across the state united in their support of Bozeman and the Advanced Technology Park.

Educators, legislators, businessmen, and civil servants pulled together as never before.

Local, state, and federal officials coordinated their efforts.
And Democrats and Republicans set their differences aside to do what was best for Montana.

No, we didn't get the project.

But I'll tell you something. From my talks with Jack McAllister and others at U.S. West, we came close. We made a very good impression. And we laid the groundwork for attracting one of the spinoffs that are likely to result at some point in the future.

Now, we must extend the constructive spirit of the U.S. West campaign into other critical areas.

We have to fight for better air service to Montana -- a crucial ingredient for attracting new business to the state.

I wrote legislation that will extend the Essential Air Service program for another 10 years, and which will maintain vital economic lifelines to seven rural Montana communities.
And I have introduced legislation calling for a blue ribbon Presidential commission to examine the effects of airline deregulation and propose some remedies.

In Montana and other interior states, deregulation has been a bust. We suffer frequent delays, cancellations, fewer flights on smaller planes, and reduced safety.

We are going to have to fight for good air service, both here and in Washington. Without it, we'll be left in the dust.

We must put aside flowery rhetoric about education and put our money where our mouth is: our state education system must be our number one priority if we are serious about attracting new business to Montana. The U.S. West experience made that very clear.

President Tietz may get into this issue in greater detail, but just let me say that education is clearly a subject everyone in this room must be concerned with, and be willing to support.
For starters, CI-27, son of CI-27, or whatever you want to call it, should be soundly defeated. This narrow, short-sighted, selfish measure would cripple Montana. It is a bad idea whose time should never come.

Montana's tax system should be overhauled, with an eye toward making this state more attractive to investment and our basic industries more competitive.

I was criticized for calling for the elimination of the unitary tax. Now it has been substantially modified and that is good. We must send signals to out-of-state business that the welcome mat is out in Montana.

Real, solid solutions to Montana's liability crisis must be found, and quickly. Economic opportunities appear for only an instant; they will not wait for Montana to get its house in order. The liability problem is indeed a significant liability for the state.
And we must be more aggressive in bringing Montana to the world. We should not just open a state economic development office in Japan, we must assure it sustained support from the state and our business community. A long term commitment will yield dividends.

Much as the economic engine of America developed those countries, now our partners in the Pacific can help Montana's economy grow the next century. For example, if we get Japan to lower its beef quotas, Montana beef exports to Japan should expand significantly.

Montana must expand its reach across our region as well as across the Pacific. Recently, five states took an important step toward developing a regional approach to economic development.

Business leaders from Montana, Washington, Oregon, Alaska, Oregon, and Idaho gathered in Spokane to kick off the creation of the Northwest Business Coalition. Several of my northwestern
Senate colleagues and I spoke with the group via a satellite tele-conference.

Jim Scott was in Spokane and can tell you how the meetings went. It's clear that our region has many attributes that can work to Montana's advantage.

(stats on trade volume, other regional advantages -- to be provided by seattle chamber/nm biz coalition and the Northwest Policy Center)

In short, working together as a region, as well as a state, is essential to our future prosperity.

The same axiom applies to Washington, where now more than ever we need to work together.

We are facing staggering economic challenges -- the greatest test of this nation's leadership and people since World War II.
The budget and trade deficits will sap the strength and resolve of this nation if left unchecked.

Unfortunately, the stock market crash has not resulted in a crash course in deficit reduction. The signal from Wall Street has not been translated into political will to make tough decisions.

The automatic deficit cuts mandated by the Gramm Rudman law is not the best way to get the job done, but it may be the only way right now.

I think there will be a minimal response to this crisis until the next Administration assumes office in January 1988.

I don't like that scenario. I think everything should be on the table now -- everything!

And I stated on the floor of the Senate on Tuesday -- as I have though Montana -- that we should freeze ALL federal spending for one year.
A straight, across-the-board, fair freeze of spending.

Democrats and Republicans must bury the hatchet on the deficit issue, because if we don't it will surely bury us.

And if we don't come to grips with this problem soon America's destiny will soon be in the hands of our creditors.

The crisis is very real. Payments on the federal debt -- $136 billion in 1986 -- are now equivalent to the total taxpayer savings originally projected from the 1981 income-tax cut.

Entitlements have grown from $200 billion in 1979 to $400 billion in 1986. They totaled $46 billion in 1968.

And we Americans are consuming more than we produce, much more. And the difference is being funded by foreigners -- a bill that will come due painfully and soon.
U.S. consumption per worker has risen by $3,100 over the current decade. Only $950 of that has been paid for by growth in what each of us produces; the rest has been funded by cuts in domestic investment and a river of foreign debt.

These figures come from a sobering article in October's Atlantic Monthly by Pete Peterson, chairman of The Blackstone Group, a New York investment-banking firm. I urge you all to read it.

In six years the United States has burned up more than $500 billion, net, by liquidating our foreign assets and by borrowing from abroad. That is an immense flow of capital, even in global terms.

I don't want America to end up like Great Britain. We won't if people stop trying to place the blame on someone and get to work on the problem.

And work on the problem together -- as a state, as a region, as a country, as a people.
people. Prosperity is not going to happen overnight -- or during the next commercial break. Japan didn't become an economic power in a day, a week or a year. It took a long-term commitment to prudent economic goals -- goals such as an increased savings rate, and more investment in infrastructure, R&D and education.

It took working together for Japan to succeed. I know we can do the same here in Montana. I've seen such spirit first hand.

About once a month I try to schedule a day where I work a shift at a Montana business. This year I've worked in a flour mill, the ASARCO plant in Helena, a talc plant, a hospital, a livestock show, and at the Columbia Falls aluminum plant.

My work experiences in these places convince me that our people have the wherewithall to get the job done. Together -- as business, community and political leaders -- we have to provide the kind of guidance that will inspire the spirit of Montana's people.
And that is really our "Mission for Montana:"
working together.
Sen. Daniel Inouye: Closing Remarks

Associated Press

Following is a transcript of remarks by Sen. Daniel K. Inouye (D-Hawaii), at the close of Lt. Col. Oliver L. North's session before the congressional Iran-contra committees.

From the beginning of the history of mankind, organized societies, whether they be tribes or clans or nations, have nurtured and created heroes, because heroes are necessary. They serve as a cement to unite people, to bring unity in that nation. It provides glory to their history, it provides legends.

We have many heroes. This hearing is being held in Washington, the city of heroes, the city of monuments. We have hundreds of monuments in this city, in the Capitol, in Statuary Hall, each state has honored two of their heroes or heroines. The State of Hawaii honors King Kamehameha, the warrio...
IIT, Ito, eek of Testimony

Hearing of Testimony

to [CIA Director William J. Casey's] office

r, and he would tell me to 'put away ber it, I didn't belong in the business.'

LT. COL. OLIVER L. NORTH

disobey unlawful orders. This principle was consid-
ered so important, that we—the government of the United States—proposed that it be internationally applied, in the Nuremberg trials. And in the Nu-
remberg trials, we said that the fact that the defen-
dant—

Brendan V. Sullivan, Jr., North's attorney, inter-
rupted.

Sullivan: Mr. Chairman, May I please register an objection?

Inouye: May I continue my statement?

Sullivan: I find this offensive. I find you engaging in a personal attack on Col. North, and you're far re-
noved from the issues of this case. To make refer-
ence to the Nuremberg trials, I find personally and professionally distasteful, and I can no longer sit here and listen to this.

Inouye: You will have to sit there, if you want to lis-
ten.

Sullivan: Mr. Chairman, please don't conclude these hearings on this unfair note. I have strong ob-
jections to many things in the hearings, and you up there speak about listening to the American people. Why don't you listen to the American people and what they've said as a result [Inouye bangs the gavel of the last week. There are 20,000 telegrams in our room outside the corridor here that came in this morning. The American people—

Inouye: I'm sure that there are.

Sullivan: The American people have spoken, and please stop this personal attack against Col. North.

Inouye: I have sat here, listened to the colonel, without interrupting. I hope you will accord me the courtesy of saying my piece.

Sullivan: Sir, you may give speeches on the issues, it seems to me. You may ask questions, but you may not attack him personally. This has gone too far, in my opinion, with all due respect.

Inouye: I'm not attacking him personally.

Sullivan: That's the way I hear it, sir.

Inouye: Col. North, I'm certain it must have been painful for you, as you stated, to testify that you lied to senior officials of our government, that you lied and misled our Congress. And believe me, it was painful for all of us to sit here and listen to that testimony. It was painful. It was equally painful to learn from your testimony that you lied and misled because of what you believed to be a just cause—support of Nicara-
gua's freedom fighters, the contras.

You have eloquently articulated your opposition to Marxism and communism, and I believe that all of us on this panel are equally opposed to Marxism and communism. But should we, in the defense of democracy, adopt and embrace one of the most important tenets of communism and Marxism: the ends justify the means?

This is not one of the commandments of demo-
cracy. Our government is not a government of men. It is still a government of laws. And finally, to those thousands upon thousands of citizens who have called, sent telegrams, written letters, I wish to thank all of you most sincerely and commend you for your demonstrated interest in the well-being of our government, of our freedoms and our democracy. Your support or opposition of what is happening in this room is impor-
tant, important because it dramatically demonstrates the strength of this democracy.

We Americans are confident in our strength to openly and without fear put into action one of the im-
portant teachings of our greatest Founding Fathers, Thomas Jefferson, who spoke of the right to dissent, the right to criticize the leaders of this government, and he said, "The spirit of resistance to government is so valuable on certain occasions that I wish it to be al-
ways kept alive. It will often be exercised when wrong, but better so than not be exercised at all."

Unlike communism, in a democracy such as ours, we are not afraid to wash our dirty linen in public. We're not afraid to let the world know that we do have failures and we do have shortcomings.

We permit all to film and record our space flights. Unlike communism, in a democracy such as ours, we're not afraid to let the world know that we do have failures and we do have shortcomings.

I'd like to make one make more closing remark. Throughout the past 10 days, many of my colleagues on this panel, in opening their questions to the colo-
nel, prefaced their remarks by saying, "Colonel, I'm cer-
tain you know that I voted for aid to the contras."

Ladies and gentlemen and Col. North, I voted against aid to the contras. I did so not as a communist. I did so as a citizen of the United States. I did so not as an agent of the KGB. I did so upon information that I gathered as a member of the bipartisan com-
mision on Central America, based upon information that I gathered as chairman of the Foreign Operations Committee, based upon information that I gathered as a senior member of the defense subcommittee, and based upon information that I gathered as chairman and member of the Senate intelligence committee.

I voted against aid to the contras. It wasn't easy to vote against your commander in chief. It's not easy to stand before my colleagues and find [myself] in dis-
agreement, but that is the nature of democracy. I did so because I was firmly convinced that to follow the path or the course that was laid down by the Reagan proposal . . . would certainly and inevitably lead to a point where young men and women of the United States would have to be sent into the conflict.

And, colonel, I am certain, having experienced war-
fare, that is not what we want our young people to go through again. You have lost many friends, and their names now are engraved on the black marble. I have lost many friends who are buried throughout this land.

I know that the path of diplomacy is frustrating, at times angering. But I would think that we should give it a chance, if it means that, with some patience, we could save even one life. So that is why I wish my col-
leagues to know that I voted against aid to the Ni-
caraguan freedom fighters.

This has been a long day. I know that all of us are de-
sirous of a rest. Col. North, with all sincerity, I thank you for your assistance these past six days. You have been most cordial, and your presence should make your fellow officers very proud of the way you have presented yourself. And to your lady, I wish her the best. She has sat there throughout these days with patience and grace. You have a fine lady.
Rep. Hamilton: Closing Remarks

Following is a transcript of remarks by Representative Hamilton (D-Ohio), of the House Select Committee investigating the Iran-Contra affair.

Mr. Chairman, I may I express to you my personal appreciation for the manner in which you have presided over these committees these several days. You've had a difficult time with other difficult moments. I think you have been firm and fair, and you have kept these proceedings moving along, and all of us are most grateful to you. Now Col. North, let me join with others in expressing my appreciation to you for your testimony. And as the chairman has indicated, I will use my time just to give you some comments.

I recognize that a president and those carrying out his policies sometimes face agonizing choices, and you've had more than your share of them. I've never for a moment, over the years that I have known you, doubted your good intentions to free hostages, to seek democracy in Nicaragua, to fight communism and to advance the best interests of the nation. And for many in this country, I think the pursuit of such goals is one of the main reasons you are in that seat in themselves, and encourage you and any others from all nations. Yet we who represent the people, I think we can understand to some degree, the dangers and the enormity of those crises of his presidency, despite the Congress of the United States to launch an attack on the policy, and that policy, which is probably not to change the course, the or the causes that you sought to promote. It is not my task, and it is the task of those committees to judge you. As others have said, we here to learn what went wrong, what caused the mistakes, what we can do to correct them. And the陷阱for which these committees is whether we understand the facts better because of your testimony, and I think we are, and we are grateful to you.

In your opening statement you said that those hearings have caused serious damage to our national interests. I wonder whether the damage has caused by the hearings or by the acts which prompted those hearings, I wonder whether you would have the Congress do nothing after it has been lied to and misled and ignored. Would we in the Congress then be true to our constitutional responsibilities to the American people or to the Constitution if we chose the latter course.

These committees, of course, hold the power of impeachment, and I think that would be part of our constitutional system of checks and balances. There are many parts of your testimony that I agree with. I agree with you that these committees must be careful not to cripple the president. I agree with you that the president needs the capability to carry out covert actions.

During my six years on the Intelligence Committee, over 90 percent of the covert actions that were recommended to us by the president were supported and approved. And only the large-scale paramilitary operations, which really could not be kept secret, were challenged. I agree with you, when you said in your opening statement, that you're caught in a struggle between the Congress and the president over the direction of American foreign policy, and that most certainly is not your fault. And I agree with you, that the Congress, whose record in all of this is certainly not unblemished, also must be accountable for its actions.

Now let me tell you what bothers me. I want to talk about two things, first policy, and then process. Chairman Rouvey has correctly said that the business of these Select Committees is not policy, and I agree with him, but you made such an eloquent and impassioned statement about policy, that I wanted to comment. I am very troubled by your defense of secret arms sales to Iran. There's no disagreement about the strategic importance of Iran or the desirability of an opening to Iran. My concern is with the means employed to achieve those objectives.

The president has acknowledged that his policy, as implemented, was an arm's-length policy. And selling arms to Iran in secret was, to put it simply, bad policy. The policy contradicted and undermined long-held, often articulated, widely supported public policies in United States. It repudiated U.S. policy to make no concessions to terrorists, to remain in the [Persian] Gulf war, and to stop arms sales to Iran. We sold arms in a nation officially designated by our government as a terrorist state. This secret policy of selling arms to Iran damaged U.S. credibility.

A great power cannot base its policy on an untruth without a loss of credibility. Friendly governments were deceived about what we were doing. You speak about the credibility of U.S. policy in Central America. You were right about that, but in the Middle East, mutual trust with some friends was damaged, even shattered.

The policy of arms for hostages sent a clear message to the states of the Persian Gulf, and that message was that the United States is helping Iran in its war effort, and making an accommodation with the fanatical revolution, and Iran's neighbors should do the same. The policy provided the Soviets an opportunity they have now grabbed, with which we are struggling to deal. The policy achieved none of the goals it sought. The ayatollah [Ruhollah Khomeini] got his arms, more Americans are held hostage today than when this policy began, subversion of U.S. interests throughout the region by Iran continues. Moderate in Iran, if any there were, did not come forward. Today, those moderate are showing fidelity to the Iranian revolution, I don't think there's a better cause than the United States in the Persian Gulf. In brief, the policy of selling arms to Iran, in my view at least, simply cannot be defended as in the interest of the United States. There were there are other means to achieve that opening which should have been used.

Now let me comment on process as well, first with regard to covert actions. You and I agree that covert actions pose very special problems for a democracy. It is, as you said, a dangerous world, and we must be able to conduct covert actions, as
and you don't recall whether they were destroyed, as I recall your testimony.

There's no accountability for an $80 million account stated by the U.S. government property. There is no accountability for a quarter of a million dollars available to you. You say you never took a penny. I believe you, but we have no records to support or to contradict what you say, indeed, most of the important records concerning these events have been destroyed.

Your testimony points up confusion throughout the foreign policymaking process. You've testified that [the late CIA] Director [William J.] Casey sought to create a no-shelf, self-sustaining, stand-alone entity to carry out covert actions—an apparent act without the knowledge of other officials in government. You've testified there was an unclear commitment to Israel concerning replenishment of missiles. You've testified that it has been U.S. policy not to negotiate with terrorists. Yet the president has said the opposite—that we will never negotiate with terrorists. You have testified that a lot of us were willing to go along with what we were doing, hoping against hope that it would succeed and willing to walk away when it failed. Now my guess is, that's a pretty accurate description of what happened. But it's not the way to run a government. Secret operations should pass a sufficient test of accountability. And these covert operations did not pass that test. There was a lack of accountability for funds and for policy, and responsibility rests with the president, if he did not know of your significant activities done in his name, then he should have, and we should all have asked [former national security adviser] Adm. [John M.] Poindexter some questions.

Now the next point with regard to process relates to your attitude toward the Congress. As you would expect, I'm bothered by your comments about the Congress. You show very little appreciation of its role in the foreign policy process. You acknowledge that you were "erroneous, misleading, evasive and wrong" in your testimony to the Congress, I appreciate, sir, that honesty can be hard in the context of government. But I am impressed that policy was driven by a series of lies—lies to the Iranians, lies to the Congress, lies to the intelligence agencies, lies to the attorney general, lies to our friends and allies, lies to the Congress, and lies to the American people. So often during these hearings—not just during your testimony, but others' as well, I have been reminded of President Thomas Jefferson's statement: "The whole art of government consists in the art of being honest."

Your experience has been in the executive branch, and mine has been in the Congress. Undoubtedly our perspectives will differ ... You said on the first day of your testimony, and I quote, "I didn't want to show Congress a single word on this whole thing." I do not see how your attitude can be reconciled with the Constitution of the United States. I often find in the executive branch, in this administration as well as in others, a view that the Congress is not a partner, but an adversary. The Constitution grants foreign policy-making powers to both the president and the Congress, and our foreign policy cannot succeed unless they work together. You blame the Congress if the restrictions it approved were the cause of mistakes by the administration, yet congressional restrictions in the case of Nicaragua, if the polls are accurate, reflected the majority of the American people. In any case, I think you and I would agree that there is insufficient consensus on policy in Nicaragua. Public opinion is deeply divided. And the task of leadership, it seems to me, is to build public support for policy. If that burden of leadership is not met, secret policies cannot succeed over the long term.

The fourth point with regard to process relates to means and ends. As I understand your testimony, you did what you did because those were your orders and because you knew it was the only way to run a government. Secret operations were devoted to a particular objective, but a form of government which specifies means and methods of achieving objectives. Methods and means are what this country are all about. We subvert our democratic process to bring about a desired end, no matter how strongly we may believe in that end. We've weakened our country and we have not strengthened it. A few do not know what is better for Americans than Americans know themselves. If I understand our government correctly, no small group of people, no matter how important, no matter how well-intentioned they may be, should be trusted to determine policy. As President [Jimmy] Carter said, "Trusting should be placed not in a few, but in a number of hands."

Let me conclude. Your opening statement made the analogy to a baseball game. You said the playing field here was uneven and the Congress would declare itself the winner. I understand your sentiments, but may I suggest that we are not engaged in a game with winners and losers. That approach, if I may say so, is self-serving and ultimately self-defeating. We all lost. The interests of the United States have been damaged by what happened. This country cannot be run effectively [when] ... major foreign policies are formulated by only a few and are made and carried out in secret. And when public officials lie to other nations and to each other. One purpose of these hearings is to change that. The self-cleansing process, the Tower commission and these joint hearings and the report which will follow, see it all, we hope, of a process to reinvigorate and restore our system of government.

I don't have any doubt at all, Col. North, that you are a patriot. There are many patriots, fortunately, and many forms of patriotism. For you, perhaps, patriotism revolved in the conduct of deeds, some requiring great personal courage, to free hostages and fight communism. And those of us who pursue public service with less risk to our physical well-being admire such courage. But there's another form of patriotism, which is unique to democracy, it resides in those who have a deep respect for the rule of law and faith in America's democratic traditions. To uphold our Constitution requires not the exceptional efforts of the few, but the confidence and the trust and the work of the many. Democracy has its frustrations. You've experienced some of them, but we, you and I, know of no better system of government. And when that democratic process is subverted, we risk all that we cherish. I thank you, sir, for your testimony, and I wish you and I wish your family well.
Billings Chamber of Commerce (Nov. 18, 1987)

I came tonight and missed rest tonight because I believe it's critical that we in Billings, in our entire state, and in America finally begin to get serious, stop talking and start acting to solve our economic problems.

We all know the crash happened here at home. I won't belabor the obvious.

We also all know that these problems exist not only Montana + neighboring states but for we live in a universal economy with bright spots on the East and West coasts, but holes in the interior - natural resources, states such as ours.
add in soft decision of other countries, Barn, Toky, etc.

We also know that our country has been living on borrowed time. We've doubled our national debt in 6 years. The accumulated deficit in the last 6 years equall the total of all of our yearly accumulated deficit from the birth of our country to 1981. That's right debt doubled from $1.1T to $2.3T in the last six years.

We are staggering net debtor, trying more to foreclose then do the so called biggest cases of third world debt countries combined. We have become debtor nations. The annual deficit fix
has we so addicted to to debt that
outside - foreign creditors who hold our debt,
are begining to call in the loan unless we get our act
together & begin to get on the wagon.
Worse yet, this generation is leaving a
legacy of debt so great its becoming
certain that we will be leaving our
children with a standard of living that
is lower than ours.

The economic problems of Billings,
of neighboring Montana, of neighboring states,
and of the nation are
trivial. They also all are
very similar in their solution - they will be solved only with hard
work, persistence, good faith and above all cooperation. We are in this
boat together. As Benjamin Franklin said, "we either keep together,
or we hang separately."

What can we do together?

First, it's important to recognize the good news. (Add good news
we heard/copied/...) 

Second, it's critical to remember our strengths. Let us leverage our
of the best, most highly educated workforce in America.

(Our beauty, our lifestyle, etc.)

We've also learned a lot. We didn't win U.S. West's Advanced Tech Center (whatever it's called). But we learned a few lessons.

We learned that corporate statewide cooperation is critical. US West CEO Jack MacAllister personally told me how impressed he was that Montana settled on one site.
We learned that our state's enthusiasm was very cutesy. In certain that they came close to coming to Russia.

We also learned that it went to Colorado primarily because the graduate program better fit the state's needs. Translation: it was more effective.

The obvious lesson: the quality of our state's higher education counts.

And we learned that our service or lack of it makes a difference. Make no mistake, keep up, and it.
Well what do we do?

I believe that businesses and public servants must further develop efforts we are already undertaking.

We're regarded (understood) our and our unity, too. That's good.

In the Congress we're beginning to strengthen our service. Will EIS a consensus. I've also introduced a bill.

It's now for Come to study all efforts of our businesses (have needs states).
We're working on strengthening our end system (mention Tier 2, who will be present at)

We're also hiring techies. Sure it we haven't completed task. But we're making progress.

We're shipping Mentone beef to Japan - because there's a vast potential there.

Several of us at Net are organizing

with other NW Corp. (expand and mention impact of NE/Midwest coalition)
What else must we do?

We must go out and learn now — see how other states are doing it — test our ideas. Just as Japanese leaders controlled the world after WWII, adopting the best ideas and discarding the worst, we, too, have to learn more. Both business and elected officials, public servants.

I've spent many hours talking with Senators, who as former governors of their states, explained how they got out to listen for their states — much as that
they spent so much time on the road as in at home. Sen Fritz Hollings is the best example.

We also must get more aggressive. I'm still very intrigued how Gov. Jackhov of S.D. would reportedly get on the phone, not wait to be called on the phone to see how she is doing. It is pretty obvious to me, whether he is going to come to or remain in S.D. It is that easy to see who is at the bottom.

Our compassion delegation can work more closely with each other to help the governor as well. If we worked together, set priorities, and
All five of us made that telephone call. Not just once or twice, but however many times it takes. I guarantee it'll make a difference.