States cities and Japan is more competitive and more preferable than additional service from cities that already have service to Japan.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I thank the gentleman from Texas, particularly for his effort. I simply want to join in his remarks and acknowledge as a representative for the downtown business community one of the strains on expanding business and expanding trade is a lack of a direct route from Houston to Tokyo. I would encourage the negotiators to seriously look at the importance of the fourth largest city in the Nation having a direct route from Houston to Tokyo, and particularly with respect to Continental Airlines and other airlines that are looking at that issue.

Mr. GREEN. In reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, and I know it is a bipartisan effort by both Republicans and Democrats, because I am honored to represent the Intercontinental Airport now that the Federal court saw fit last year to give it to me from district 18, having lived there for many years. It is important to the whole business community and all of Houston because of the port and the trade we already do with Japan to have that nonstop service. I hope those negotiators understand that.

MONTANA MINING DISPUTE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. HILL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to tell a story to my colleagues about a place called Cooke City, MT. Cooke City, MT, is an isolated community in south central Montana. It is located about 3 miles northeast of Yellowstone Park. It is surrounded by a historical mining district where there has been active mining for well over 100 years. It also happens to be the home of a place called the New World Mine.

Some of my colleagues might recognize the name the New World Mine. On October 12, 1996, a little over a year ago, President Clinton announced that he had entered into an agreement with a foreign mining company and an environmental community to stop the process of proceeding with the development of a new gold mine at the site of the New World Mine. He did so based upon concerns that had been raised by members of the environmental community that mining at that site might pose some risk to Yellowstone Park. However, in the process of interrupting the process of the mine, the President also interrupted the environmental impact statement that would have given us for certain an understanding of what the real risks would have been. So in secret the President, a foreign mining company and an environmental community agreed to give away 65 million dollars' worth of public land in Montana in exchange for this mine.

Mr. Speaker, that created outrage in Montana. Sportsmens' groups and environmentalists expressed outrage because Montanans feel great attachment to the public land. They hunt, they fish, they hike, they pick berries, they camp. Mr. Speaker, many of them actually make their living on public lands.

Sensing that outrage, the President changed his mind, and he decided instead of 65 million dollars' worth of public land, he would take $100 million out of the Conservation Reserve Program from Montana and give that to this mining company instead. That created outrage, Mr. Speaker. Farmers, environmentalists and sportsmen, all of whom believe greatly in the Conservation Reserve Program, expressed their outrage.

So then the President said no, he wanted $65 million from the Congress. And Congress said, whoa, wait a minute.

There are three big problems, Mr. Speaker, with the President's plan. First, the White House forgot about Montana. The General Accounting Office just issued a report that said that Montana is going to lose 466 jobs, $45 million in revenues. In fact, local Park County will lose $1.2 million in revenues in the first 5 years.

The second problem is that we have discovered the mine was not an asset, but rather a liability. There are serious water quality problems arising out of previous mining activities, and the President has proposed that the taxpayers assume those liabilities.

But, Mr. Speaker, the really big problem with this deal was that we found out that the mining company did not own the ore. There is a lady by the name of Margaret Reeb, who lives in Livingston, MT, whose mother was the first woman in the Cooke City mining camp, who over the years has acquired those mining claims, and she owns the ore. The problem was she was not consulted, she was not asked, she never signed. Margaret owns the asset.

Mr. Speaker, when the White House was asked about this, what will happen if Margaret Reeb does not want to sell her ore, which she said she does not, the White House said, ''Well, there's more than one way to skin a cat.'' Mr. Speaker, we do not call it cat skinning in Montana, we call it claim jumping. It is wrong in Washington, and it is wrong in Montana.

Now the President has said that if we do not give him a blank check in the Interior appropriations bill, he is going to veto the Interior appropriations bill. What do we do? Some people say we should just walk away from this deal. Others say that we should just give the President the $65 million and forget about it.

I think both of those options are wrong. I think that we have an obligation, Mr. Speaker, to pay a mining company for what its real interest and the real value of its assets are. I think we have an obligation, Mr. Speaker, to protect Margaret Reeb and her private property rights. I think we have an obligation, Mr. Speaker, to make whole the State of Montana by replacing the minerals that will be withdrawn with other minerals that might be developed. And so I have offered a fair proposal, a proposal that will protect those property rights, that will reimburse the State of Montana, and will help that local community that is isolated and needs those jobs and that economic impact.

I would hope that my colleagues will help me in trying to convince the President that there is a fairer plan than stealing Margaret Reeb's property rights. There is a fairer plan than denying Montana the jobs and the economic opportunities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTINEZ] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. MARTINEZ addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extension of Remarks.]

THE DEFICIT AND THE DEBT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN] is recognized for half the time until midnight, 40 minutes, as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to talk about the good news that we can bring from Washington, D.C., for a change and how much things have changed from the past to where we stand today.

I think to start this discussion, it would make sense that we talk about the difference between debt and deficit, much like folks in their own home understand the difference between a checkbook and borrowing a mortgage on a home. When we talk about the deficit in this Nation, what we are talking about is the amount of money that our Federal Government borrows each year more than what it takes in. That is how much it spends out of its checkbook each year more than what it takes in. That is the deficit. So the amount they overdraw their checkbook, it is not a lot different than in our own home. If you overdraw your checkbook, that is called a deficit.

What our Government does each year after they overdraw their checkbook is they go out and borrow money to make their checks good. When they borrow money, of course, each year, that amount that they have borrowed keeps adding up and up and up.

This chart I have brought with me tonight shows how the debt has been growing facing this Nation. As a matter of fact, in 1995 when I took office