

terrorist group." So how should we expect a national government to treat its terrorists?

Likewise, our Secretary of State in 1991 gave a signal to Milosevic by saying, "All Yugoslavia should remain a monolithic state." What followed was to be expected: Serb oppression of the Croats and the Muslims.

All our wise counsel so freely given to so many in this region fails to recognize that the country of Yugoslavia was an artificial country created by the Soviet masters, just as the borders of most Middle Eastern countries were concocted by the British and U.N. resolutions.

The centuries old ethnic rivalries inherent in this region, and aggravated by persistent Western influence as far back as the Crusades, will never be resolved by arbitrary threats and use of force from the United States or the United Nations. All that is being accomplished is to further alienate the factions, festering hate and pushing the region into a war of which we need no part.

Planning any military involvement in Kosova is senseless. Our security is not threatened, and no one has the foggiest notion of whether Kofi Annan or Bill Clinton is in charge of our foreign policy. The two certainly do not speak in unison on Iraq.

But we cannot maintain two loyalties, one to a world government under the United Nations and the other to U.S. sovereignty protected by an American Congress. If we try, only chaos can result and we are moving rapidly in that direction.

Instead of bringing our troops home from Bosnia, as many Members of Congress have expressed an interest in doing, over the President's objection, we are rapidly preparing for sending more troops into Kosova. This obsession with worldwide military occupation by U.S. troops is occurring at the very time our troops lack adequate training and preparation.

□ 1830

This is not a result of too little money by a misdirected role for our military, a role that contradicts the policy of neutrality, friendship, trade and nonintervention in the affairs of other nations. The question we should ask is: are we entitled to, wealthy enough, or even wise enough to assume the role of world policemen and protector of the world's natural resources?

Under the Constitution, there is no such authority. Under rules of morality, we have no authority to force others to behave as we believe they should, and force American citizens to pay for it not only with dollars, but with life and limb as well. And by the rules of common sense, the role of world policemen is a dangerous game and not worth playing.

Acting as an honest broker, the U.S. may help bring warring factions to the peace table, but never with threats of war or bribes paid for by the American

taxpayers. We should stop sending money and weapons to all factions. Too often our support finds its way into the hands of both warring factions and we never know how long it will be for our friends and allies of today to become our enemy and targets of tomorrow.

Concern for American security is a proper and necessary function of the U.S. Congress. The current policy, and one pursued for decades, threatens our security, drains our wallets, and worst of all, threatens the lives of young Americans to stand tall for Americans' defense, but not for Kofi Annan and the United Nations.

PLANNING THE 2000 CENSUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, earlier today one of my colleagues came to the floor of the House and complained about the Census Bureau and the Department of Commerce not providing information about the 2000 Census.

I am here to put the facts of the matter before the Members of the House so that they can make up their own minds about the openness of the planning for the 2000 Census.

First, let me remind my colleagues that the process of planning the 2000 Census has been the most open planning process of any census in history. The only thing that is closed in this process is the minds of those who are opposed to sampling.

First, a few of the facts. As I have pointed out before, the planning for the 2000 Census has involved an Advisory Committee of over 50 organizations, including House and Senate members who sit on the authorizing and appropriations committees and subcommittees.

In the 102nd and 103rd Congresses, there were several hearings on the 2000 Census. Unfortunately, there have been very few since then. The Census Bureau Director and the Secretary of Commerce have held dozens of town hall meetings to involve the public in the planning of the 2000 Census. There have been no secrets in the past about planning the census and there are no secrets today.

Last week, there was much ado about the plans for a nonsampling census and some Members have complained because one has not been produced. Mr. Speaker, there is a plan for the 2000 Census and it is a good one. Here it is: The Congress has asked for yet a second plan to be developed and that is being done. But there was no staff at the Census Bureau to develop a second plan for a census when that request was made. Every available staff member of the Census Bureau was hard at work trying to get the 2000 dress rehearsal under way, or working on the Economic Census, or working on one of the many current population programs

the Census Bureau is responsible for. To develop a second plan for the 2000 Census means that they have to hire new staff. That takes time.

Once that staff has been hired, they have to be trained before they can be turned loose to design a census. If Members think that plan should be ready today, they either badly misunderstand the complexity of the task, or do not care about the quality of the product. I for one, want to make sure that the next census is the best possible. I fear that some of my colleagues will settle for a census that leaves out millions of Americans, as long as it suits their own political purposes.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest that there is inappropriate and appropriate oversight. The opponents of sampling have repeatedly claimed that the use of sampling left the census open to political manipulation by the political officials at the Commerce Department. Now, it is my understanding that the Census Subcommittee staff has requested to interrogate the staff at the Census Bureau doing some of the most sensitive statistical work, before that work is completed.

Why I ask? The Census Bureau offered to give the subcommittee staff full access to any documents or individuals once the research was completed. Why is the subcommittee insisting that they must have access during the research process?

Congressional staff has no more reason to interfere with this statistical process than do officials at the Department of Commerce. If the political officials at Commerce asked for the kind of access requested by the subcommittee's staff, they would be turned down. That is as it should be. The subcommittee staff needs to learn the difference between oversight and interference.

The Census Bureau is an agency of impeccable integrity. I, for one, stand here ready to defend their integrity against any who attack it, be they Congresspersons, Congressional staff, or officials in the administration. The subcommittee staff are not being stonewalled, they are being told that there should be no political interference with the statistics of the census. That is correct, and I will defend it to the end.

CONGRESSIONAL CHILDREN'S CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I come today on the floor of the House for two issues that I think are extremely important. First of all, I would like to thank all of the participants who joined the Congressional Children's Caucus today in a hearing on emotional disorders of children.

Shockingly, one after another witness presented to our Congressional committee the fact that the services and funding for treating children with emotional disorders was at the lowest end of any sort of health care service in this country. In fact, we were told by the administration, that two-thirds of America's children needing assistance with emotional disorders are without treatment and care. We are also told of the complicated process of HMOs that does not cover care for emotional disorders and mental illness in children.

In fact, running between two hearings, one of the remarks that I made in coming to the Congressional Children's Caucus hearing on this matter is that we might even call the system bankrupt; the fact that our children are so very important and when, in the greatest need of their time, when they are young, when they may be suffering from attention deficit disorder or they may be suffering from depression, we in this very powerful nation do not have the wherewithal or funding to fix these broken lives.

Parents came and presented to us tragic instances of suicide and what could have been done or what should be done to prevent this. But more importantly, what they did say to us is this is something that could be remedied. A child aged 7 or 4 or 5, 8, 10, 12 or a teenager suffering from depression can be helped. That family can be helped.

Why, in this powerful country, do we spend so much money on so many different things; do we argue and debate on the floor of the House on so many different things, and yet we cannot find the funding or any of the resources to truly help those children who are in need?

With that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that I will be looking to offer legislation to increase the amount of funding that we have to implement centers around the country, some centers, that we now have only 31 centers in 22 States, 22 out of 50 States, where we have the resources to help our children suffering from emotional disorders. And clearly, I will be looking to question HMOs as to how they treat the reimbursement to families for coverage of this whole question of mental or emotional disorders of our children and hope to support House Resolution 212 sponsored by John Lewis that emphasizes the importance of this question.

TRIBUTE TO WOMEN-OWNED BUSINESSES

Let me complete my remarks, Mr. Speaker, by saying that I do want to pay tribute to women-owned businesses. Certainly, one would ask the connection. But I thought these were two important issues that I needed to mention this evening.

My tribute to women-owned businesses is simply this: These represent the backbone of America's economy. How many women do I meet who are moved out of the workforce without any opportunity for employment and have found economic independence

through the idea of women-owned businesses. I am a major supporter of the Small Business Administration's effort in helping cottage-owned industries owned by women.

In fact, there was a pilot program in Houston, Texas, spearheaded by Milton Wilson of our SBA, that helped to fund what we call cottage-owned agencies, such as Mary Kay, which has been expanded by the one-stop capital store. The U.S. general store allows small businesses to go in and access contracts in the Federal Government all over the country. The one-stop capital store allows small businesses and women-owned business to access capital.

If I ever heard anything from our women-owned businesses, it is that it is so difficult for them to prove themselves as a worthy credit risk. How shameful in 1998 that we still have the problems of saying the little lady can't handle it.

Well, let me salute all the women-owned businesses who have turned into the big ladies who are doing quite well. Let me encourage them to continue to be the pioneers that they are. And let me say to them that I, for one, will give to them my full commitment for ensuring that they are treated with the dignity and equality for capital, for investment, for access to opportunities, and for access to opportunity in this government.

I close by simply saying that women-owned businesses have benefitted from affirmative action. And for all my colleagues who might be listening, that is why I think it is extremely important to turn back anyone who attempts to undermine what affirmative action stands for, providing an equal opportunity, acting affirmatively to open the doors of opportunity for all.

WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mrs. TAUSCHER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Women's History Month and in particular to pay special recognition to the millions of women business owners in the United States today. I think that it is particularly significant and important that we honor the nearly 8 million women-owned businesses that exist in the United States, because the right of a woman to legally own or run a business has been won only very recently in the course of United States history.

Women were historically denied the right to legally run a business or hold assets in their name, which prevented them from ever achieving financial self-sufficiency. This is not to say that women did not run businesses or make financial decisions every day. They not only ran shops and mercantiles, but farms and other businesses on a regular basis. But this was done in the name of a husband, a father, a brother, or a son.

The economic contributions women have made to this country have been tremendous, but they remain largely unrecognized. We need to acknowledge this not only during Women's History Month but every month.

As a former businesswoman, I know how difficult it is to break into business, period, and how particularly difficult it is if you are a woman. Every business needs capital to succeed. In our business-friendly environment, one where we value hard work and entrepreneurship, one would think that all talented, educated individuals would have access to capital.

Despite the tremendous advances women have made in every field, access to capital is still a significant problem for many women. There are still banks that deny business loans to qualified women entrepreneurs.

The Congressional Caucus for Women's issues last year heard testimony from a number of businesswomen owners who stated that they were forced to use credit cards to finance their first business ventures. But despite the barriers that women business owners have had to face, they have continually proven themselves to be a success.

The nearly 8 million women-owned firms in the United States provide jobs for 15.5 million people and generate nearly \$1.4 trillion in sales. The number of women-owned companies increased at twice the rate of male-owned businesses from 1987 to 1992.

Businesses owned by women are extremely stable. For example, nearly three-quarters of the commercially women-owned firms that existed in 1991 are still successfully operating today. However, in comparison, only two-thirds of all commercially active firms in 1999 are successfully operating today.

□ 1845

I am especially proud of the fact that my home State of California leads the country in the number of women-owned business firms. There are nearly 1.1 million women-owned businesses in California, which employ approximately 2.3 million people and generate \$314 million in sales.

Women-owned businesses make a difference in the economic health of not only the State of California but the entire United States. In return, we must do more for them.

Encouraging women to start their own businesses, for example, is an excellent way to move them off the welfare rolls. Microcredit programs across the country provide low-income women with marketable skills; many of them are moving from welfare to work with small loans to start their own businesses. These women might set up something as small as a stall in a flea market or as challenging as a catering service. Whatever business they choose to start, the fact is that they are working to make themselves and their families self-sufficient.