But there are certain things in American history we have said that are criteria for when we get involved in these type of conflicts. One is generally that it has to cross international boundaries. This question is complicated here because it is inside a nation, albeit an autonomous subsection of that nation or at least an area we believe should be autonomous.

We have also historically argued that there has to be a clear national interest. And the only clear national interest here is the instability of Europe; and, quite frankly, what we have seen is that every week this war goes on, Europe is becoming less stable and the agreement will be less good. In other words, our peak in American interest agreement was before we started bombing. Every week the bombing has continued, the agreement in the end will be worse.

The agreements that are now on the table we could have had several weeks ago. In truth, the Kosovars are less willing and the Serbians less willing to live together in peace in the future because of the conflict escalating. The more we bomb, the more we destabilize Montenegro.

Now we have accidentally hit the Chinese embassy, and China has used this at least as an occasion to stir up their people. Russia is concerned as to whether we will be coming in there, and they have reactivated and are concerned about their nuclear defenses because they do not want us coming in if it is Chechnya.

Other nations around the world are concerned about what our international policy is. Israel is concerned, justly, that if we recognize an independent Kosovo, what does that mean for the Palestinians? Turkey is concerned about what this means for the Kurds. The settlement we are looking towards is worse than we would have had early on while there was still a possibility to put this thing back together.

Furthermore, it does not appear to be winnable. Historically, wars or efforts that have worked have been winnable or had an exit strategy. But that does not and still begs the fundamental moral question: How then do we deal with a Milosevic or a Serbian population? Or, for that matter, in Croatia, where many people were killed and moved out? The ethnic cleansing being the moved out; the killed being the genocide without a trial.

Now Sandy Berger, the National Security Adviser to our Republican conference, suggested that the goal of this administration, and he said this pointblank, was to teach the world how to live together in peace. This shows some of the divisions that we have in this country and in the world regarding, quite frankly, the perfectibility of man. Can we, in fact, especially through bombs, teach the world how to live in peace? Or even without bombs, is that a realistic goal?

In my opinion, that is more a humanist perfectibility of man argument and not one rooted in the Judeo-Christian beliefs that this country was founded on.

Mr. Speaker, I will extend my comments with written remarks, because I am very concerned the premises of this war are unachievable and the goals are false and, therefore, because of a kind heart, we have plunged ourselves in an unwinnable conflict that is contrary to our own moral traditions.

TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNITY SYSTEMS PRESERVATION PROGRAM

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, this last week at the Conference on Sustainable Development in Detroit, Michigan, the administration announced the winners of the Transportation and Community Systems Preservation Program. The TCSP was a little noticed title in TEA–21, which really did not get the attention and recognition it deserved.

□ 1845

There are a number of programs that spend far more than the $13 million involved, but there are few that will have more long-term impact.

The program had its origin in the experience in my State of Oregon in the early 1990s, where citizen activists successfully petitioned the State Department of Transportation to consider an alternative to a traditional beltway that included careful land use planning, connecting the transportation links, and grouping uses in a way that might be able to achieve the transportation and congestion and air quality objectives without as much concrete. And the fact is that the alternative that they developed was more cost effective than simply building a traditional road.

This LUTRAC program, helping communities design local initiatives to maximize their infrastructure investment, has found its way into ISTEA.

Yesterday morning, I visited with Federal, State and local officials and local business people in my community dealing with FEMA's Project Impact. And here we found that Oregon's requirement of careful land use planning with local governments actually has made a significant impact in lowering the losses to flood damage. It has resulted in saving Oregon's homeowners and businesses millions of dollars as a result of disaster mitigation.

The TCSP is designed to extend these principles beyond natural disasters to potential manmade disasters of needless loss of farmland, forests, unnecessary traffic congestion, and conflicts between residential, commercial, and industrial uses.

Recently we had a presentation from the director of our State watchdog agency, the Land Conservation and Development Commission, which was set up to enforce and regulate the land use requirements that our Oregon voters have repeatedly supported. He presented the data that I found rather compelling that, in the 20 years that we have had our system, we actually protected an increase of 4 percent more agriculture land in the Willamette Valley in Oregon.

The metropolitan Portland area, although it has increased in population 42 percent, the urbanized area has only increased 20 percent. Unlike what has happened in New York City, where the urbanized area increased eight times more rapidly than the population increase, in Chicago it was 11 times more rapidly urbanization in the population increase, Detroit 13 times.

An even more interesting comparison is we have two fast growing counties in the Portland metropolitan area, one, Washington County, just to the west of the City of Portland, and one to the north in the State of Washington, Clark County. Both have been the fastest growing counties in their States.

Clark County, in Washington, lost 6,000 more acres of farmland than Washington County, even though in Washington County we have increased more than 40,000 more residents than Clark County. Not only that, but the per-farm income actually dropped by 10 percent in Clark County, while in Washington County, with the land use and transportation protections, farm income rose by 30 percent, farm income rising in a county that is the home of Oregon's high-tech industry.

The TCSP program is going to make a difference in localities that do not have the Oregon land use planning framework and it is going to make a huge difference in our community building on that system.

There have been over 500 applications submitted around the country. This week, in Denver, there are people studying at a conference right now how to use the program.

I strongly urge that each Member of Congress look at the applications from their district, understand how they work. These concepts of smart growth can include a number of programs that simply are not going to be funded without having the adequate support from our Congressional representatives. It will in the long run save far more tax dollars than the modest investment in planning; and, most important, it will include our citizens in helping shape impacts on their destiny.

WHITE HOUSE YOUTH VIOLENCE SUMMIT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRADY of Texas). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I have taken out this time to make some comments about the horrendous tragedy