United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 145 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MAY 20, 1999 No. 74

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. QUINN).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 20, 1999.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JACK QUINN to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Reverend Father James Nock, Senate Chaplain, State of Connecticut, Hartford, Connecticut, offered the following prayer:

Almighty Father, we ask Your blessing on this august body, as we come together this morning to do the work of our Nation.

Let us never forget the potential we share together, to accomplish anything we choose. For with our combined talents, abilities, and experiences, there is no limit to what we can accomplish, only the limit of our own imaginations.

And we ask this of You, who lives and reigns, forever and ever.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WICKER led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

WELCOME TO FATHER JAMES J. NOCK

(Mr. LARSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LARSON. Mr. Speaker, I would first like to extend a heartfelt thanks to Chaplain Ford for providing an opportunity for a dear friend and a pastor of mine in East Hartford, a person who has brought home and shepherds the flock on a regular basis, Dr. James Nock from East Hartford.

Father Nock was born in Hartford, Connecticut, of Italian and Irish decent. He is a graduate of Saint Bonaventure University, and he also took his graduate studies at Sulpice in Paris, France; ordained in the Cathedral of Notre Dame in Paris on June 26, 1964, and currently the pastor of Our Lady of Peace in East Hartford, Connecticut.

Father also has served as the Chaplain of the Connecticut State Senate, and he has always brought not only great wisdom in his remarks but a great sense of humor and a sense about the people he serves here on Earth. I want to thank Chaplain Ford so much for providing Father Nock, the parish and the community of East Hartford with this wonderful opportunity.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain 10 one-minutes on each side.

CLINTON-GORE ADMINISTRATION SHORTCHANGING MEDICARE

(Mr. WICKER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Speaker, the message is beginning to get through that the Clinton-Gore administration is shortchanging Medicare. Ill-advised regulations are threatening the quality of health care for our Nation's retired citizens by cutting Medicare $20 billion below the level set by Congress in the Balanced Budget Act.

In a letter this month to HHS Secretary Shalala, 20 Democratic Senators joined 21 Republican Senators in urging this administration to reverse its decision, warning that harm could come to elderly patients. This bipartisan letter warns that if regulations are not revised, we may see closings of facilities, layoffs of dedicated caregivers, reductions in access to skilled nursing services and erosion of quality of care.

I say to our President, your cuts in Medicare are unacceptable and they are not in compliance with the Balanced Budget Act. It is time for this administration to provide the resources our senior citizens require.

BIPARTISAN EFFORT FOR CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

(Mr. DOGGETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, last year we forced a vote on reform to clean up the way congressional campaigns are conducted. In the words of the respected commentator, Mary McGrory: ''To get the bill to the floor reformers had to pry it out of the clenched jaws of Speaker Newt Gingrich by gathering signatures on a discharge petition.''

When that vote for reform finally and belatedly occurred, we found out why.

Printed on recycled paper.

Every single Republican leader voted against the bipartisan reform, supported by good government groups, and every Democratic leader voted for it. Nevertheless, Republican delay wrote the obituary for this proposal in the Senate.

This year we face the same problem. Here in this House, 196 Democrats have signed a petition to force debate on all proposals, Democratic and Republican, now. Speaker HASTERT and Mr. DELAY say wait until some time in the fall. Every Republican member who refuses to sign this petition for timely action is complicit in killing reform. Join us in a bipartisan effort. Sign now and act now.

HMO REFORM

(Mr. GANSKE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Speaker, I want to correct the record. The other night I gave a special order on HMO reform and inadvertently mentioned the NFIB. In fact, the results I mentioned were from the National Survey of Small Business Executives on Health Care by the Kaiser-Harvard Program on Public Health and Social Policy. I was correct, however, in citing the numbers.

When this group of 300 small business executives was asked if HMO reform were passed into law and would increase premiums by up to $5 a month, only 1 percent said they would drop coverage and 5 percent did not know; 94 percent would continue coverage.

This cost is in the range of what I think my legislation would affect premiums. This is borne out by the CEO of Iowa Blue Cross/Blue Shield telling me that his plan is implementing the President's commission recommendations on quality and they do not expect to see an increase in premiums from that.

Mr. Speaker, the opponents of HMO reform are trying to scare people about the effects of cost on access to care. I will be happy to share this survey of small business executives with anyone who wants to see some real data.

VOTE ON SHAYS-MEEHAN BEFORE MEMORIAL DAY

(Mr. PASCRELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, with all civility, Congress is still divided between those who believe there is too much money in our campaigns and those who believe there is never enough. We sell democracy short if we think the voters are not watching our electoral behavior. They are becoming very interested in how we handle campaign financing.

Last year, the freshman campaign finance bill was used as interference in getting Shays-Meehan to the floor. With the discharge petition from both sides, we accomplished a vote. We do not need any obstructions now. Let us get on with it. Let us restore credibility to the electoral process now, not later.

Shays-Meehan needs to be voted on before Memorial Day. We can do this in a bipartisan way. I appeal to my colleagues, let us conclude this debate in a civil tone. I think it is the best for America.

BREAST CANCER COALITION

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, did my colleagues know this year alone one in eight women will be diagnosed with breast cancer and did they know that of those positively diagnosed women 75 percent will have had no family history of breast cancer?

It continues to be the leading cause of cancer deaths for all women ages 35 to 54. My home State of Florida has the third highest rate of breast cancer. These numbers have caused champions like Jane Torres, President of the Florida Breast Cancer Coalition, to dedicate their lives on heightening awareness.

Due to the work of groups like the Florida Breast Cancer Coalition, Federal funds for research have now increased by as much as sixfold. Eager advocates like Jane, Jill Lawrence, Shelly Greenberg, Midge Blumberg-Krams, Teresa Menendez, Claudia Dobelstein and all of the members of the Florida Breast Cancer Coalition will continue to fight until this treacherous disease is eradicated. Congratulations to them.

A NATION THAT BANS GOD IS A NATION THAT OPENS THE DOOR TO THE DEVIL

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, another school shooting; this time in Georgia. Everyone is desperately searching for answers. I say the search should stop right here. Congress must look in the mirror, because in America today our students can study cults, devil worship, Hitler, but God is banned, banned from our schools. I say a nation that bans God is a nation that opens the door to the devil and to the problems that we are facing as a nation.

Congress, it is time to allow God back into our schools, and I further recommend after all the technicalities we allow God back into our Nation.

RETURN ''THE HUMAN RIGHTS'' TO THE DEMOCRACY MOVEMENT

(Mr. DIAZ-BALART asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to protest a violation of the U.S. Constitution's Bill of Rights by the Clinton administration. The Fourth Amendment to the Constitution guarantees that the right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers and effects against unreasonable searches and seizures shall not be violated.

Mr. Ramon Saul Sanchez, the President of the Democracy Movement, has been on a hunger strike in Miami for 16 days. He began this protest on May 5 to protest the illegal confiscation of the boat, The Human Rights, by the Coast Guard, acting on orders from the Clinton-Gore White House. The small boat was confiscated for the crime of carrying copies of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights on the high seas the same day that dissidents within Cuba had announced that they would peacefully be commemorating the 50th anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

That apparently seditious document for the Clinton administration reads, everyone has the right to freedom of movement and residence.

Mr. President, today is Cuban Independence Day. Bring an end to the hunger strike. Return The Human Rights to the Democracy Movement.

NINE OUT OF TEN AMERICANS SUPPORT CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

(Mr. CROWLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, referring to the Democratic campaign finance reform discharge petition, which has 196 Democratic signatures, a Republican recently remarked in Roll Call and I quote, ''People who sign the discharge petition are committing treason against the party. That is how strongly I feel about that. That is a dangerous position to take and we need to end that talk.''

It is no surprise the Republican Party, which outspends Democrats two-to-one, has proclaimed that supporting campaign finance reform should be a felony offense.

Mr. Speaker, our political system needs and our constituents demand campaign finance reform now. Nine out of 10 Americans support campaign finance reform. I repeat, 9 out of 10 Americans. Last year, 196 Members signed the discharge petition that led to bringing the Shays-Meehan bipartisan campaign finance reform bill to the House floor.

□ 1015

Without that petition process, the House Republican leadership would never have let that debate occur. Time is running out. In order to have enough time for the Senate to pass campaign finance reform, moderate Republicans must sign this discharge petition immediately.

Mr. Speaker, the House must act now on campaign finance reform, and pass it before Memorial Day.

THE COLD WAR IS OVER, BUT DANGEROUS ENEMIES STILL EXIST

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, the Cold War is over. These words we have heard repeated thousands of times since the end of Communist tyranny in Berlin in 1989, especially by leftists whose eagerness to gut our military forces was similarly obvious, even at the height of the Cold War.

But though the Cold War is temporarily over, all of human history argues that it would be foolish to let our defenses down. Dangerous enemies still exist. They do not care what treaties we sign, how much good will Americans have, and they do not care how prosperous we become.

They wish to do us harm because they resent our wealth, reject our democratic values, despise our religious traditions, and cannot maintain their tyrannies at home knowing that freedom exists in a bastion we call America. The very existence of our Nation threatens their existence.

This chart dramatically shows what happens when a Nation ignores the lessons of history. We do so at our peril.

THE BOMBING IN YUGOSLAVIA MUST STOP AND DIPLOMATIC MEASURES TOWARDS PEACE MUST BE ACCELERATED

(Mr. KUCINICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, last night three innocent people died and scores were injured in the bombing of a Belgrade hospital by NATO air forces.

This tragedy, taken with the NATO bombing of the Swedish Ambassador's residence, the recent NATO bombing of the Chinese Embassy in Belgrade, the NATO bombing of refugee convoys, the NATO bombing of passenger buses and trains and other civilian infrastructure, raises grave questions about the strategy and the morality of NATO's actions.

It is no longer acceptable for NATO to blithely declare that the mass of civilian casualties resulting from the bombings are unintentional and therefore simply accidental. When such accidents keep repeating themselves and result in the countless deaths of innocent people, it is time to say this must stop.

The continued bombing and the consequent catastrophic parade of innocent human carnage, and NATO's arrogant willingness to endanger innocent civilians, even to mothers giving birth in hospitals, forfeits NATO's claim to the moral high ground. The bombing must stop, and diplomatic measures towards peace must be accelerated.

URGING MEMBERS TO JOIN IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 883, THE AMERICAN LAND SOVEREIGNTY PROTECTION ACT

(Mr. GIBBONS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), chairman of the Committee on Resources, and the 183 Members who are cosponsors of H.R. 883, the American Land Sovereignty Protection Act.

It is time that the Congress reclaim its authority granted under the Constitution to make decisions over lands belonging to the United States.

The United Nations has absolutely no right to make land designations for America's liberty bell, our Independence Hall, or the Statue of Liberty, or for that matter, any land management decisions for our national parks like the Grand Canyon or Yosemite.

Former Ambassador Jeanne Kirkpatrick said it best: ''What recourse does an American voter have when U.N. bureaucrats from Connecticut or Iraq or Libya have made decisions that unjustly damage his or her property rights that lie near a national park?''

It is time that this Congress reclaim its constitutional authority and it is time that America reclaims her lands. I encourage Members to join me in supporting H.R. 883, the American Land Sovereignty Protection Act.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back any constitutional authority we may have left.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

(Mrs. CAPPS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, today I am speaking from the other side of the aisle to reach out to our Republican friends. Many of them have been leaders in the effort to reform our campaign finance system. I applaud them for this. Today we need their courage more than ever.

It now appears we will not be debating this issue until September, if at all. It is difficult to go against leadership. No one likes to do this. I do not, either. But some issues require us to take a stand, and this is one of those times.

Today I am asking Members to stand for what they and I and the American people believe by signing the Blue Dog discharge petition. Let us bring campaign finance reform to the floor for a debate. We need to do it now.

THE ADMINISTRATION IS AGAIN PLAYING POLITICS WITH MEDICARE

(Mr. HEFLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, whom should Americans trust more to protect the Medicare program for seniors? Let us look at the facts.

Democrats sat idly by while Medicare was on the verge of bankruptcy during the period of time that they controlled both the White House and the Congress. Then Republicans won the majority of the Congress, and almost immediately reformed and strengthened Medicare for the first time ever. Democrats then attacked Republicans for reforming a program that should have been reformed a long time ago. That is fact number one.

Now consider this. We find out that this administration is spending $20 billion less on Medicare than the law allows. Let me repeat that. This administration is spending $20 billion less on Medicare than Congress intended and as authorized by law.

Hospitals are feeling the pinch. Seniors are not getting the care they need as quickly as they need it. Why is this administration playing politics once again with Medicare? Again, I ask the question, whom should seniors trust more to protect Medicare?

TRANSPORTATION BUREAUCRATS SEEK TO PENALIZE WORKING AMERICANS

(Mr. CHABOT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, the same Federal government that wants to see our medical records, monitor our banking transactions, register our private post office box, and if the Vice President has his way, tell us where to live, now wants to tax our drive to work every day.

Transportation officials in Maryland, with the apparent support of the Federal Highway Administration, are cooking up a silly idea that will allow those who can afford it to skirt rush hour traffic by paying to drive in a special HOT or high-occupancy toll lane. Those who cannot afford or do not want to pay an additional tax on a highway their tax dollars are already paying for are welcome to sit in rush hour traffic while those in the so-called Lexus lanes speed by.

Mr. Speaker, the reason there is a rush hour is that people have to go to work. They have to go to work to support their families and to pay their taxes, which help to pay the salaries of transportation bureaucrats who come up with these lame-brained ideas like this one.

Let us put a stop to this silliness before it is too late.

ASKING ALL MEMBERS TO SUPPORT THE CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM DISCHARGE PETITION

(Mr. LUTHER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LUTHER. Mr. Speaker, I am here today to ask all Democrats and Republicans to sign the campaign finance reform discharge petition. I say that, Mr. Speaker, because there is no issue more important to the future of this country than this particular issue.

I ask Members to ask themselves why it seems that Congress can never get anything done. I ask Members to ask themselves why Congress cannot pass health care reform legislation, child safety legislation, or the many other pressing issues facing this country. Ask why that supplemental funding bill this week was filled with pork barrel spending, rather than dealing with national priorities like education.

A good part of the answer is the way we fund campaigns in this country, the influence of special interests. We passed this bill, we debated it last year. We can pass it again now. We do not need to wait so that it gets tied up in budget negotiations or in politics of next year's elections. We can pass it for the American people today.

THE HISTORY OF CAMPAIGN FINANCE

(Mr. SCHAFFER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to the vacuous bleatings of my esteemed colleagues on the liberal side of the aisle who invoke campaign finance reform as their latest slogan.

How truly audacious for the very people who created the current campaign finance reform to now self-righteously proclaim their outrage at the way the government makes crooks out of the truly honest people among us.

Just what is it about the liberal mindset that allows them to avoid responsibility for so many of their bad ideas and failed initiatives?

Consider the history of campaign finance. The liberals imposed absurdly low limits on the participation of Americans in the political process. It is truly amazing how this has resulted in things that were entirely predictable.

What happened? Politicians were then forced to spend almost all their time raising money, and of course money then found other ways into the political process through soft money, through issue advocacy, and, dare I mention, through the Chinese Communist friends of the White House. And of course this money, unlike direct contributions, lacks full disclosure, which is an invitation to corruption.

Why are Democrats not talking about that?

URGING COSPONSORSHIP OF THE BORDER PATROL RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION ACT

(Mr. REYES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to urge my colleagues to cosponsor a bill that the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) and I are introducing today, the Border Control Recruitment and Retention Act.

This bill will correct a longstanding problem within the INS, and begins to address some of the recruitment and retention problems we have heard so much about lately. This bill is not a cure-all. It is, however, a step in the right direction.

I will continue to work with my colleagues on legislation for comprehensive pay reform for the United States Border Patrol. Currently most Border Patrol agents are kept at the GS–9 Journeyman level, with only 30 percent of the work force actually working at GS–11, even though their work is much more comprehensive.

The bill we are introducing today states that any GS–9 with a current rating of fully successful will automatically qualify for GS–11. What does this mean? It means that on the average, Border Patrol agents will move from a salary of about $34,000 a year to a salary of about $41,000. It addresses a pay disparity. It is fitting that we introduce this legislation today and push for its passage this year, which is the United States Border Patrol's 7th anniversary.

I believe that this is the least we can do for an agency that is at the front line of the defense for this country.

TO FORMER DEMOCRAT RUDY BRADLEY, WELCOME TO THE GOP

(Mr. STEARNS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, there is a trend going on in America today that is not talked much about, particularly on that side, at least on the national level. It is a phenomenon of party switching, and it is party-switching going in one direction and one direction only, from Democrats to Republicans.

Over 390 elected Democrats have switched to the GOP since Clinton and Gore were elected in 1992. Well, the Republican Party would like to welcome the latest party-switcher, State Representative Rudy Bradley of St. Petersburg, Florida.

Rudy Bradley is the only black Republican in the 160-member Florida legislature, for now. Here we have a lifetime proud Democrat who has finally come to the conclusion that the Democratic Party simply does not reflect his values or the values of his constituents.

He is tired of the Democrats' constant demonizing those who disagree with them. He is tired of rhetoric that says one thing while governing as a tax and spend liberal. He is tired of the attacks on the traditional values that made America great to begin with.

Rudy, welcome to the GOP.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

(Ms. BERKLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, every Member of Congress knows firsthand the control that money has over our electoral process, and what is worse, the American people know firsthand the control that money has over our electoral process.

The money spent on last November's election totaled $1 billion. This is an outrageous sum that hurts our democracy and it hurts our constituents. If voters are disgusted and turned off by the excesses in campaign financing they will not vote, and make no mistake, voters are disgusted. They are turned off and they are not voting.

Our constituents deserve better. The American people deserve better. Let us ban soft money and stop the attack ads disguised as issue advocacy soft money pays for. Let us strengthen the Federal Election Commission and give it the teeth it needs to enforce campaign finance laws. This Congress must act to restore confidence and participation in our electoral system.

Last month my colleagues and I signed a discharge petition to demand that Congress take up the important issue of campaign finance reform. The very fact that as Members of Congress we must petition our government speaks volumes and is a testament to the control money has over our electoral process.

We must prove to our constituents that we are serious about real reform. We must make sure that our political system represents everyone, not just those that can afford it.

AMERICAN LAND SOVEREIGNTY PROTECTION ACT

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 180 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 180

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 833) to preserve the sovereignty of the United States over public lands and acquired lands owned by the United States, and to preserve State sovereignty and private property rights in non-Federal lands surrounding those public lands and acquired lands. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Resources. After general debate, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute

rule for a period not to exceed four hours. The bill shall be considered as read. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII and except pro forma amendments for the purpose of debate. Each amendment so printed may be offered only by the Member who caused it to be printed or his designee and shall be considered as read. The chairman of the Committee of the Whole may: (1) postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment; and (2) reduce to five minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any postponed question that follows another electronic vote without intervening business, provided that the minimum time for electronic voting on the first in any series of questions shall be 15 minutes. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

□ 1030

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF WASHINGTON

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that House Resolution 180 be amended on page 2, line 2, by striking ''833'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''883''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. QUINN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 2, line 2, strike ''833'' and insert in lieu thereof ''883''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

(Mr. HASTINGS of Washington asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 180 would grant H.R. 883, the American Land Sovereignty Protection Act, a modified open rule, providing 1 hour of general debate to be divided equally between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Resources.

The rule provides for a 4-hour limit on the amendment process and provides that the bill shall be considered as read. Additionally, the rule makes in order only those amendments preprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and pro forma amendments for the purpose of debate. Amendments that are preprinted may be offered only by the Member who caused them to be printed or his designee, shall be considered as read, and may be amended.

The rule further allows the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole to postpone votes during consideration of the bill and to reduce voting time to 5 minutes on a postponed question if the vote follows a 15-minute vote. Finally, the rule provides for one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 883 was reported by the Committee on Resources. The bill would restore the constitutional role of Congress in managing lands belonging to the United States, preserve the sovereignty of the United States over its lands, and protect State sovereignty and private property rights in non-Federal lands adjacent to the Federal lands.

Under Article IV, section 3 of the Constitution, Congress is vested with the authority to regulate Federal lands. Yet, over the past 25 years, an increasing expansion of our Nation's public lands have been included in various land use programs with little congressional oversight or approval. Two notable programs are the United Nations Biosphere Reserves and the World Heritage Sites, both of which are under the jurisdiction of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization or UNESCO.

There are now 47 UNESCO Biosphere Reserves and 20 World Heritage Sites in the United States. By becoming party to these international land use agreements through executive action, but without congressional authorization, the United States may be indirectly agreeing to terms to international treaties which the Senate has refused to ratify.

By consenting to international land use designations, the United States in effect agrees to impose restrictions on surrounding lands which, in many cases, include a substantial amount of private property. Subjecting private property owners to land use restrictions imposed without their consent, or even the consent of their elected representatives, is a very serious matter. It is a practice which this Congress should emphatically reject.

In response to growing concern about this situation, H.R. 883 would amend the National Historic Preservation Act to require congressional approval before any nominated property may be included in the World Heritage list. It would require the Secretary of the Interior to submit a report to Congress describing what impact inclusion on the World Heritage list would have on the natural resources associated with these nominated lands.

The bill would prohibit the Secretary of Interior from nominating a property for inclusion on the World Heritage list until the Secretary makes findings that existing commercially viable uses of the nominated land or land within 10 miles of the nomination would not be adversely affected by its inclusion.

H.R. 883 would prohibit Federal officials from nominating any land in the U.S. for designation as a Biosphere Reserve and would terminate all existing Biosphere Reserves unless, one, the Biosphere Reserve is specifically authorized in law by a date certain, two, the designated Biosphere Reserve consists entirely of land owned by the U.S., and, three, a management plan has been implemented which specifically provides for the protection of non-Federal property rights and uses.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the bill would prohibit Federal officials from designating any land in the United States for a special or restricted use under any international agreement unless such designation is specifically approved by law, and would also prohibit including any State, local, or privately owned land in any such designation, unless that designation is approved by those affected parties.

The Committee on Rules has reported a modified rule, as requested by the gentleman from Alaska (Chairman YOUNG) of the Committee on Resources, in order to provide Members of the House seeking to amend this legislation with the full and fair opportunity to do so.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying bill, H.R. 883.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume and I thank my colleague for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution calls for a modified open rule which makes in order only those amendments preprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and limits debate of the bill to 4 hours. These restrictions are wholly unnecessary. Any time one imposes an arbitrary time limit, one runs the risk of limiting full debate. I oppose the rule in its current form and note that open rules best protect all Members' rights to fully represent their constituents.

Moreover, I have significant concerns about the legislation the rule makes in order. While the bill purports to preserve U.S. sovereignty over the use of Federal lands, in reality, this measure is unnecessary and could hinder United States participation in international efforts to protect and preserve valuable lands throughout the world. Similar dubious legislation has failed in two previous Congresses, and this bill will get the same fate.

The World Heritage Convention and the Man and Biosphere Program will provide the international community with means of recognizing areas with great natural and cultural significance. These honorific programs respect each State's sovereignty and have no legal jurisdiction over countries or communities.

Since 1973, the World Heritage Convention has successfully been implemented by the United States Department of Interior. The Convention was, in fact, a United States initiative under then President Richard Nixon.

A site may be listed as a World Heritage site only if it contains cultural or natural resources of universal value, and if the national government where the site is located nominates and protects the site.

Listing an area as a World Heritage site imposes no change in U.S. law nor any requirement for future changes in domestic law. It does not give oversight, management, or regulatory authority over United States lands to any foreign and national organization.

Nor does the United States Man and Biosphere Program place any U.S. lands or resources under the control of the United Nations or any international body. In fact, this is a domestic Federal program. It, therefore, does not impose any restrictions beyond those already in place under American law.

For over 20 years, under the auspices of four Republican and two Democratic Presidents, these programs have functioned with little or no controversy. The allegations by the proponents of H.R. 883 that these beneficial programs somehow threaten the United States sovereignty are pure fantasy.

However we do have a Federal, foreign encroachment on American lands, and I am referring to the mining and mineral rights that have been leased to foreign corporations with leases that cost about an average of $2.50 per acre per year. These leases have been in effect since the days of Ulysses S. Grant. If we would like to do something to protect our own lands, and stop cheating our taxpayers. We should change this disgraceful giveaway.

Our national parks do need attention, but Congress certainly could do better than this bill, which is designed to remedy an imaginary problem, the supposed encroachment of foreign domination over our public resources.

Mr. Speaker, another community woke this morning to the horror of a school shooting. It is not as bad as Columbine we are told. We hope that these are not going to be fatal shots. But surely this House can be better spending this time, rather than spending 4 hours on this one House nowhere bill, and be working on after-school programs and try to do something about bringing guns under some control.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this bill by the distinguished gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), chairman of the Committee on Resources, and the rule that brings this bill to the floor.

This bill does not prohibit or stop the United States from including land in an international land reserve. All it says is that there must first be congressional approval so that the private property rights of neighboring landowners can be protected.

What this bill is attempting to do is to allow a little more public input into this process and give the people a tiny bit of say about actions that can have tremendous impact on their land.

It really boils down to whether we still have a government of, by, and for the people, or has it become one of, by, and for unelected bureaucrats and elitists who want to control other people's land.

Jeane Kirkpatrick, our former ambassador to the United Nations, wrote to the Committee on Resources these words, ''In U.N. organizations, there is no accountability. U.N. bureaucrats are far removed from the American voters. What recourse does an American voter have when U.N. bureaucrats from Cuba or Iraq or Libya, all of which are parties to this treaty, have made a decision that unjustly damages his or her property rights that lie near a national park?''

Professor Jeremy Rabkin of the Department of Government of Cornell University testified in support of this bill, saying, ''The underlying problem is that international regulatory schemes now reach more deeply into the internal affairs of sovereign nations and have therefore begun to threaten internal systems of government,'' adding that ''such ventures are in some ways as much a threat to the stability of international law as they are to our own system of government at home.''

Professor Rabkin said we need this bill, not to slow this dangerous trend toward taking government further away from the people, but also, ''as a means of reasserting our own constitutional traditions.''

Professor Detlev Vagts of the Harvard Law School said international involvement in local and private land use decisions, ''pose an import problem'' in their ''tendency to shift powers and responsibilities from national and subnational units, with active, reachable legislative bodies to remote international bureaucracies.''

I realize that some opponents of this bill do not want to debate this on the merits, so they resort to childish sarcasm and try to make this bill seem less than serious by making fun of it.

But this bill deserves the support of all those who really believe in private property and limited government and the freedom that is protected by those two great traditions on which this Nation was built.

Private property is not only one of the key components of our prosperity. It is one of the main things that set us apart from the former Soviet Union and other socialist Nations.

Today almost one-third of our land is owned by the Federal Government, and another 20 percent is owned by State and local governments and quasi-governmental units. Governments at all levels are rapidly taking over additional land. Perhaps even more of a threat to freedom are the restrictions being placed by government on land still in private ownership.

We heard testimony from Steven Lindsey whose family has operated a ranch on Turkey Creek in rural Arizona since the 1860s. He was shocked to find out one day that a 60-acre private wetland on his property was now controlled by the international RAMSAR Convention agreement in addition to all the endangered species and other regulations he was already under.

□ 1045

Under Ramsar, Mr. Lindsey said, ''My rights as a private property owner are threatened and the Ramsar language can be used to violate my property rights and deprive me of the use of my land.''

He added these words, Mr. Speaker: ''The same government that promised my great, great grandfather and my great grandfather the land through the Homestead Act and pursuit of happiness is now the same government that is helping destroy these dreams.''

Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill, a serious bill; and people who truly believe in freedom, rather than big brother repressive government, should support it enthusiastically.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. VENTO).

(Mr. VENTO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule. Frankly, this bill is not correctable by amendment. I think the proper disposition of it is to defeat this bill. I think it is, obviously, a great misunderstanding. I think it reflects a fear that has been translated into legislative language which is inappropriate and I think the wrong direction clearly to move, and so I do not know how I could amend it.

In the last session, Mr. Speaker, a lot of concern arose because we proposed some 60 or 70 different amendments to this bill. It touches on about 82 areas in the United States that are classified as World Heritage sites, as Man and the Biosphere program, or as Ramsar sites. There may be more sites in the United States, but those are the three principal treaties that deal with natural and cultural resources of distinction, usually within our parks or in those areas; and Man and the Biosphere programs which focus on special natural environments, other types of environments that are used for scientific research; and the Ramsar sites, which protect wetlands.

There may be other treaties and compacts that are affected, Mr. Speaker. They have not been spoken of or explored in committee. In fact, I think most of the committee meetings have been based on a lot of emotionalism and misconceptions and obviously some distaste for the United Nations, which happens to be associated loosely with some of the designations here and recognitions that have taken place.

Incidentally, when I was looking at the numbers, there are nearly 2,000 sites globally that are recognized under these programs. The United States has very few sites that we have let in the development of these treaties and programs; and, of course, to in fact renege on this presents all sorts of problems to us in terms of our global leadership in terms of the environment.

But that I think is really at the heart of this that there are those that cannot attack these parks, these wildernesses directly, so they choose to wrap themselves in American sovereignty and some displeasure I guess with the U.N., Mr. Speaker, and it is manifest in this bill that we have before us today, H.R. 883.

The rule is really unfair because we had talked and while there was some fear that we might offer 70 amendments, as I said, it is not correctable, but nevertheless the Committee on Rules gets up and suggested that it is offering an open rule, that we can offer any amendments that we want. But then they impose this time limitation on the bill.

I do not think that any of us have any visions of keeping the Congress in session all day tonight and late into the hours, especially a day when many Members would like to travel home to their districts so they can work and be back together with their families and constituents, a goal certainly that I share with them. But, nevertheless, the Committee on Rules arbitrarily sets in place this 4-hour limit.

Unfortunately, in fact I think, Mr. Speaker, that my amendment is the only amendment that will be offered and that we will pursue that and see whether or not the fidelity of this group for American sovereignty carries through to commercial uses of the property for foreign countries and entities that might want to mine, they might want to harvest trees and do other exploitative activities in the land. If there is any enthusiasm for saving American taxpayers and saving their resources for America, we will see whether or not we can sell that particular idea.

But there is no reason for putting a time limit on this bill. I think it is a reflection, unfortunately, of the circumstances and the state of affairs that exists in this Congress today, in fact, in terms of what I say, a lack of trust between us, Mr. Speaker, which I think is unneeded.

And, therefore, I will oppose this rule. I think it is not an open rule. It is a rule which has a time limitation, and I think it is unnecessary and this House should reject the rule.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. QUINN). The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 240, nays 178, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 140]

YEAS—240

Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brady (TX)
Bryant
Burr
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Eshoo
Everett
Ewing
Fletcher
Forbes
Fossella
Fowler
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Isakson
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kasich
Kelly
King (NY)
Kingston
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuykendall
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
McCarthy (MO)
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moran (KS)
Morella
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Paul
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Reynolds
Riley
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Toomey
Traficant
Turner
Upton
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—178

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baird
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Bentsen
Berkley
Berman
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gejdenson
Gonzalez
Gordon
Gutierrez
Hastings (FL)
Hill (IN)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holden
Hoyer
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Klink
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Phelps
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schakowsky
Serrano
Sherman
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thurman
Tierney
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Waters
Watt (NC)
Weiner
Wexler
Weygand
Wise
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOT VOTING—15

Blagojevich
Brown (CA)
Burton
Doolittle
Dunn
Evans
Foley
Gephardt
Gilman
Kucinich
Napolitano
Ose
Salmon
Towns
Waxman

□ 1111

Messrs. ROEMER, SPRATT and HILLIARD and Mrs. JONES of Ohio changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. TANCREDO and Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 140 on H. Res. 180 I was unavoidably detained in an important meeting. Had I been here I would have voted ''yea.''

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOKSEY). Pursuant to House Resolution 180 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 883.

□ 1115

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 883) to preserve the sovereignty of the United States over public lands and acquired lands owned by the United States, and to preserve State sovereignty and private property rights in non-Federal lands surrounding those public lands and acquired lands, with Mr. STEARNS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. VENTO) will each control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG).

□ 1115

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. YOUNG of Alaska asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 883, the American Land Sovereignty Protection Act, asserts the power of Congress on the Constitution over the lands belonging to the United States, and this is all this bill does.

So that everyone understands, the concern here is the Congress and, therefore, the people. They are left out of the domestic process to designate World Heritage Sites and Biosphere Reserves.

This bill requires the participation, as the Constitution so states, that the Member of the Congress and the citizens of this Nation are in the process.

Many, many Americans from all over, sections of our country, have called my office, I am sure they have called my colleagues also, to say they are concerned about the lack of congressional oversight over UNESCO international land reserves in the U.S. and to express support for this bill. Within the last 25 years, 83 sites in the United States have been designated as Biosphere Reserves, World Heritage Sites or Ramsar Sites, all with virtually no congressional oversight and no congressional hearings. The public and local governments have not be consulted.

The World Heritage and Ramsar programs are based on a treaty. H.R. 883 does not end U.S. participation in the World Heritage or Ramsar Sites. We have domestic laws implementing these programs, and H.R. 883 proposes to change these domestic laws so that Congress must approve the sites.

The Biosphere Reserve Program is not authorized by even a single U.S. law or any international treaty. That is wrong. Executive Branch appointees, whatever their political party, cannot and should not do things that the law does not authorize, and I ask my colleagues, what is unreasonable about Congress insisting that no land be designated for inclusion in these international land use programs without clear and direct approval of the Congress?

What is unreasonable about having local citizens and public officials participate in decisions on designated land near their homes for inclusion in an international preserve?

If the boundaries of a national park are forced to change, even by a small adjustment, Congress must approve the change. However, a 15.4 million acre South Appalachian Biosphere Reserve encompassing parts of six States stretching from northeast Alabama to southwest Virginia was created by unelected bureaucrats, bypassing the Congress, and this is unconstitutional and it is wrong.

We need to reemphasize the congressional duty to keep international commitments from abridging traditional constitutional constraints. Otherwise the boundaries between our owners' lands and others or even between the government's land and private property are too easily and often ignored.

H.R. 883 will also prevent attempts by the Executive Branch to use international land designation to bypass the Congress in making land decisions and protect our domestic land use decision-making process from unnecessary international interference.

We are going to hear a lot today from the other side and those that oppose it about this bill being driven by the fear of black helicopters and catering to suspicions and conspiracy theories of extremists. We will also hear a lot about the effectiveness and importance of the wonderful programs. We are also going to be told that these programs are honorary and have no effect on the use, management or disposition of public lands. However, the World Heritage Centre says otherwise. The director of the World Heritage Centre told the Interior Department in a letter:

''Article 1 of the World Heritage Convention obligates the State Party to protect, conserve, present and transmit to future generations World Heritage Sites for which they are responsible. This obligation extends beyond the boundary of the site and Article 5(A) recommends the State Parties integrate the protection of sites into comprehensive planning programmes. Thus, if proposed developments will damage the integrity of the Yellowstone National Park, the State Party has a responsibility to act beyond the National Park boundary.''

Going beyond what Congress has set aside, I submit this decision as a responsibility of Congress, not some U.N. committee of unelected bureaucrats.

The public and local governments are almost never consulted about creating World Heritage Sites, the Ramsar Sites and Biosphere Reserves. Although proponents of these programs always keep saying the designations are made at the request of local communities, designation efforts are almost always driven by Federal agencies, usually the National Park Service. The Committee on Resources has not found one example where one of these designations was requested by a broad-based cross-section of either the public or local officials. On the contrary, these programs usually face strong local opposition. In my State the Alaska State Legislature passed a resolution supporting H.R. 883, and I will urge my colleagues to listen to the debate, make their decision, but remember their constitutional duty, and that is to make us the designees of lands use.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, when Members are speaking, charts are permitted to be displayed in the House Chamber and the Committee of the Whole; is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. With the permission of the House, when the question is raised, that is correct.

Mr. VENTO. And when Members have desisted from speaking, are charts still permitted to be displayed in the House?

The CHAIRMAN. The charts are taken out of the well at that time.

Mr. VENTO. Are they permitted to be in the other portions of the House and be displayed at that time?

The CHAIRMAN. They should not be displayed anywhere in the Chamber unless they are being used in the debate.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I think that there is a provision and the custom of the House is that these matters may be displayed in the Speaker's Lobby; is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. That is permissible, with the Speaker's approval.

Mr. VENTO. I thank the Chairman for his response to me.

Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 6 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this bill. This is not new legislation. It, I think, has, and it is a case, as I said, where we have heard this tune before for the last two Congresses, and the House has passed this after spirited debate, and the fact is that it has gone to the Senate and not received consideration in the Senate; and I think the fact is that listening to the discussion of our distinguished chairman and his debate, and he is very good at debate, but the fact is that the words here do not match the music in terms of what takes place with this legislation.

This is a bad bill. This really cuts the head off of these programs that the

United States has led in creating on a global basis over the last 25 or 30 years under President Nixon, under other Presidents that have served since then, both Democrat and Republican, Carter, Reagan, Ford; pardon me, Ford, and of course Bush and now President Clinton. These programs have been in existence, and these administrations have supported them because it is a good program. It permits the United States to provide global leadership in terms of the preservation and conservation of special areas such as World Heritage Sites, which are protected because of their natural or cultural resources, Man and the Biosphere programs which some 600-and-some sites globally, only about 47 in the United States incidentally, which are used for scientific research, these ecosystems where scientists can gain information, and of course, hopefully, we take that new knowledge and translate it into good public policy on a global basis.

And finally, of course, areas like wetlands areas like the Ramsar sites, which there are over 700 sites globally, only about 15 in the United States, again where we protect and provide areas for protection of various waterfall and other fauna and flora that happen, obviously occur in these areas.

Now my colleague and chairman, the distinguished chairman said that this is unconstitutional. Well, where is the court case? This has been in existence for 30 years. Where the court case that says that this is an action taken by one of these past administrations over the last 25 or 30 years, that says this is unconstitutional?

We had a constitutional lawyer, I believe Mr. Rufkin from Yale, that appeared before us. When he was asked that question, he was not able to come up with one court case, one decision that had been made that said that this was unconstitutional.

This is not unconstitutional. These designations are made in the United States on a voluntary basis, just as they are around the globe. These are voluntary designations. The Congress has exercised its responsibility and done it well in most Congresses with regards to land use questions. In fact, we designated parks, we have designated wildernesses, we have designated and passed on and permit the agencies to designate on their own areas of environmental concern, for instance, in the BLM and many other areas. But the Congress has jealously guarded, and I would jealously guard, the right of Congress to, in fact, identify and to designate these various lands for the purposes that we are entrusted to do so, but the fact is that what we are saying here is that these areas have already been designated.

Now the big complaint here really revolves around Yellowstone and a mine that was occurring outside of Yellowstone but in obviously the watershed of Yellowstone, and the fact of the matter is that area was designated a Man and the Biosphere area for research, and it was pointed out that if that mine occurred, that it would adversely affect the entire hydrology and watershed and other natural factors in that area. And the fact is that we think and I think that the parks and other lands have an extra boundary responsibility, that they can go and talk about activities outside the boundary of the parks, outside the boundary of a wilderness, outside boundaries. These trans-boundary issues are very important because we have to come to the realization that the de facto wilderness creation or park creation, that the areas that happen at their margin, boundaries, are causing these parks to be and these special areas that we set aside to be adversely effected.

That is what this is about. We already designated them a park. We have already designated wilderness. But not being able to attack the parks and the wilderness and the other conservation areas that we designated directly, they choose to do it through this particular claim of American sovereignty and wrap themselves in that particular issue with, I guess, a strong distaste for the U.N.

Mr. Chairman, this is one thing that the U.N. and UNESCO is doing right. This is one thing where past Presidents, both Democrats and Republicans and their administrations, have strongly supported. There are nearly 2,000 sites that have been designated and recognized by these international bodies just in these three treaty areas or protocol agreements that we have here, just in these three, but there may be others affected by this legislation. In the United States there are only 82 of those.

Our leadership has done a magnificent job here. Let us keep the United States in the forefront of it. Let us reject this bill.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 883 is not new legislation. The Congress first considered this idea in 1996, and then again in 1997. In both instances, the other body refused to consider this measure on the floor and the Administration indicated it would veto the measure if passed. Why? Because they don't have visions of blue helmets dancing through their heads.

H.R. 883 is misguided because it is aimed at the symbols of a federal policy when, what the supporters of the legislation really oppose, is the underlying policy itself. While some of my colleagues and I might like to see us doing even more, this country has set as a national policy goal—the long-term preservation of our environmental resources. The commitment this Nation has made to this preservation/conservation/restoration policy sometimes demands that certain activities which threaten these resources be prohibited, and/or tightly limited by us and no one else. The reality of the circumstance regarding these voluntary agreements is that no blue helmets will come parachuting behind national park lines in black helicopters to seize control of American lands all in the name of preservation or conservation. Besides, after today we may have made a statement as to a crack missile defense system to thwart any and all attempts to seize the sovereignty of our great Nation by those international agents of evil.

Any and all land use the restrictions in place are functions of U.S. law, not an international treaty or protocol. Our participation in the World Heritage Convention, the Ramsar Convention and the Man and the Biosphere program is emblematic of this underlying policy and the symbolic value and importance the U.S. places on its natural resources, our natural legacy. The twenty sites we have nominated under the World Heritage Convention are listed because Congress chose to enact policy and law to protect them, and establish special land managers to regulate and enforce such law. To address a specific example that gave rise to this bill, the problem with the New World Mine was that it was, in fact, too close to Yellowstone National Park, not that it was too close to a World Heritage site. If we want to debate the basic principles of environmental protection, that's fine. But, we should not waste our time passing legislation that seeks to abolish the programs which grow out of these basic principles which have evolved over 200 years of American land use ethic. Quite simply, this legislation turns logic on its head.

Let's be clear—the goal of H.R. 883 is to abandon these programs, not simply to regulate them. To require an Act of Congress for each and every parcel of land to be considered, is to effectively stop all future nominations and designations.

This legislation sends a signal around the world that our nation, the United States of America, which forged the policy path to institute the World Heritage Convention, is undercutting the values and benefits of international recognition for important cultural and environmental sites. At a time when the United States is thrust into a role as the dominant power and an essential role as a world leader in so many areas—why would we voluntarily abdicate perhaps the most important leadership position we occupy—that of a leader in the effort to make life on this planet sustainable. This would convey to the hundreds of nations part of the conservation treaties and protocol agreements, that domestic political considerations come first. If the U.S. cannot even permit recognition to be accorded, why should other nations?

Why are we pursuing legislation that is misdirected and misguided and based solely on gross misinformation? Each agreement covered by this bill states on its face that it contains no provision that affects, in any way, the authority or ability of a participating nation to control the lands within its border. These programs give the UN no more control over land in this country than the awarding of a gold medal gives the U.S. Olympic Committee control over an American athlete. To claim that these international programs somehow infringe on the sovereignty of this nation is simply factually inaccurate.

Finally, the largest threat to this nation's sovereignty isn't even addressed. Any foreign company or their subsidiary is still given full and free access for any and all of America's valuable natural resources. Each year we watch $1.8 billion worth of gold and silver stream out of our ports and into the coffers of foreign owned companies. What's worse, while we debate this phantom legislation, foreign nations are cashing in big-time, and

laughing all the way to the bank with our resources. I will introduce an amendment to correct this situation and bring balance back to the management of our natural resources.

Mr. Chairman, this is an issue of takings, not of private property, but of the stripped international recognition and esteem the citizens of the United States, and the world place on some of America's most stunning and ecologically important natural resources. Teddy Roosevelt ushered in a new era of conservation and respect for the natural heritage of the United States at the beginning of the twentieth century. How ironic it is that nearly a century later this Nation may come full circle and, if this legislation passes, denounce the importance of those very parks and resources on which the heritage of this nation is based.

I would urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 883.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. CUBIN).

Mrs. CUBIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 883, and I thank the chairman and the committee staff for getting this bill done in such good form and to the floor so quickly.

I am glad that I am speaking right after the gentleman from Minnesota because he made the statement that we all know this is about Yellowstone National Park, and I represent Wyoming which has the most of Yellowstone National Park, and he said that the U.N. is doing a good job by these designations, that the reason that Yellowstone was designated, because a mine was going to be developed north of Yellowstone that might affect the watershed.

Mr. Chairman, let me tell my colleagues the rest of the story. For 2 years an environmental impact statement had been going on, and professional scientists were not able in 2 years time to determine whether or not that developing that mine would put Yellowstone National Park in jeopardy.

□ 1130

They were working toward that, but they still had more work to do before they professionally could say that was true.

In 3 days' time, the United Nations came in. Three days later they determined that this indeed was an area in jeopardy, and then it was designated an area in jeopardy. So if that is what the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. VENTO) thinks is a good job, I certainly would have to disagree with him.

I do agree with him, however, on the fact that what this argument boils down to are these transboundary issues. As far back as 1818, the United States Supreme Court ruled in the United States v. Bevins that a State's right to control property within its borders was an essential part of its sovereignty, and I think that H.R. 883 is yet another affirmation of that principle. What was done when this designation was made around Yellowstone was it virtually built a buffer zone around Yellowstone.

It is something the administration had been trying to do for a long time but they could not get it done legislatively, even though it is clearly legislative responsibility to designate public land use. So they went around the back door and had the U.N. committee in 3 days make that designation.

This is a good bill. This is something that Americans have the right, the Congress has the right and the responsibility to make these designations, and all we are asking is that these designations be approved by the Congress.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 883.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. VENTO) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in total opposition to this bill because there is absolutely nothing out there that is broken that needs fixing. This addresses a problem that does not exist.

Let me say I know something about this issue because I own land that is designated by this. I own an inholding in the University of California property in Big Sur, California. We are proud of this designation. One cannot get a designation unless the landowner, in this case it would be the Federal Government for National Parks or for Bureau of Land Management lands, or in our case a private owner, has to request the nomination. That is the only way it can come is from the owner of the land to say we would like to participate in the program.

The program is essentially an international way of being able to have a common database about measurement of environmental factors, so that we can see whether there are like kind of factors around the world, there are like kinds of problems or are the problems that are developing in an area significant to that area.

To go out and say that we should have congressional approval for these designations is so ludicrous. I mean, why do we not have congressional approval and oversight for accreditation of universities? That is not done by Congress, or by any government. Why do we not have the AAA, the guides that go around and say that one can sleep in these hotels and motels, we do not have any congressional oversight of that. We do not have any congressional oversight of TV Guide or the motion picture movie ratings. We do not have any oversight of the Good Housekeeping or Consumer Reports Magazine. We do not demand that we have to look at these things.

Why? They are not a problem where one wants to involve congressional action in this thing.

To say that we should have Congress telling our local communities and States that they cannot have their property so designated, I think, is totally wrong. It is a usurpation of local control.

If the chairman would like to have Alaska properties and have Glacier National Park and have the Denali National Forest exempted, then he can do that for the State of Alaska, but for California we have community local water districts in Marin County; we have private lands in California; we have State parks in California. All of those requested to be part of this system because we want to be better informed, we want to be educated. We are not part of this flat earth society that is afraid of learning about something.

So this bill would deny our ability to get that nomination because one would have to go through this incredible congressional process. We cannot even pass legislation here to keep the country running. How are we going to make decisions on whether somebody should be able to voluntarily be placed in an international information system?

This is a ludicrous bill. Please defeat it.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to remind the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), who just spoke, who is a dear friend of mine, that the landowner in Yellowstone did not request that participation in the World Heritage Program. In fact, she opposed it and unfortunately she was not listened to.

In our hearings in New York, we had people that came to the committee and said that, yes, the Federal Government was trying to implement Heritage sites in their districts and they adamantly opposed it. It is happening right today in Lake Champlain.

So what I am just suggesting is as much as I admire the sincerity of the gentleman, I would like to have him look at some of the records.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN).

(Mr. HANSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I stand in strong support of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, Thomas Jefferson once said "When all government, domestic and foreign, in little as in great things, shall be drawn to Washington as the center of all power, it . . . will become as venal and oppressive as the government from which we separated." The current system for establishing international land reserves ignores Jefferson's warning by centralizing the power with the President and taking away the authority of Congress, the States and the average citizen.

During the last 25 years, our nation's public lands have slowly been consumed by international land reserves. Most notably 47 United Nations Biosphere Reserves, 20 World Heritage Sites and 16 Ramsar Sites. These reserves were created with virtually no congressional oversight, no hearings, and in the case of biosphere reserves, no legislative authority. I don't know about you Mr. Chairman, but my ability to represent my constituents as a voting member of this body is important to me! We cannot allow this administration to take our vote away. I ask that you support the American Land Sovereignty Protection Act.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, if that is the case then I would suggest within his authority as chairman of the Committee on Resources that the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) may want to just limit this then to Federal properties and not to State and local properties or private properties.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I believe my bill does that. It does limit it just to Federal properties.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON).

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to rise in support of H.R. 883. I do want to say to my friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), that I know that there are many places that perhaps are honored to have these designations bestowed upon them. On the other hand, in my district, a designation was going to be thrust upon people without any local input and I think that is what this legislation is trying to clarify.

I do want to thank the gentleman from Alaska (Chairman YOUNG) for his strong leadership on this issue and, in fact, the leadership he shows on many private property rights issues, and the work that he has done on behalf of private property owners.

I would also like to extend a similar thanks to the gentlewoman from Idaho (Mrs. CHENOWETH), who chairs the Subcommittee on Forests and Forest Health, who has been a devoted champion of private property rights. She recently came to my district in southern Missouri to represent the Committee on Resources and to chair a hearing on the legislation we are talking about today.

We heard from a lot of local people, farmers, county officials, ranchers, small businesspeople, property owners, those people who have the most at stake when international land designation issues arises.

Let me just talk a little bit about what the gentlewoman from Idaho (Mrs. CHENOWETH) and I learned during the recent field hearing in the Missouri Ozarks, but I am just going to take a second before that to talk about how I became involved in this issue.

Back in 1996, as I was traveling across my district, in every single little town in the center of my district, which is part of the Mark Twain National Forest, in which there is tourism that really promotes the local economy and some timber sales everywhere, Ellington, Van Buren, Salem, to name a few, people were concerned about these designations and particularly about something called the Ozark Man and the Biosphere program that basically would take 15 Missouri and Arkansas counties and put them into a biosphere reserve.

Let me say there was no local input involved whatsoever, and that my folks had to scrape and claw their way to find out anything about this. They were simply tipped off one day by a friend on the conservation commission. The amazing thing was, when they went to the agencies, the Department of Interior, specifically to ask about exactly what was happening, the Interior Department said, do not worry about this; it was going to be fine; we have talked to lots of local citizens around the district.

Well, the fact of the matter is, every single county in my district that would be impacted by this had absolutely no public solicitation by the Interior Department, Fish and Wildlife, whomever was involved, whatsoever. Not one county commissioner was called, not one local citizens group, and it was not until we had enough cattlemen's associations, enough farm bureau associations and finally all of the county commissions writing their own resolutions that this was a bad idea that the designation was dropped and these 15 counties in Missouri and Arkansas were saved from having to have a biosphere reserve designation put on them because, quite frankly, my citizens were afraid that once the designation happened then the government would find more and more reasons to seize the contiguous property around, and that would be their private property.

I think this really shows that we have a broken process and that experience makes the case for our bill today. All this bill would do would be to establish an appropriate process for biospheres and heritage area designations and ensure that local input and participation of Congress is involved. I do not think that is asking too much. I think it is very, very reasonable.

I will say, back when the gentlewoman from Idaho (Mrs. CHENOWETH) and I were in Missouri, we heard from 12 different panelists, one of whom was a county commissioner; one was the former chairman of the Missouri Conservation Commission; several private citizens, but Leon Kreisler, who was a cattleman, and a landowner in Salem, Missouri, said, and I quote, ''We feel strongly about property rights not because we share a common desire to abuse our natural resources but because landowners are often best suited to ensure productivity for our families and those of future generations. The Ozarks are a natural wonder and we intend to keep them that way, but national or international designations are not the answer.''

Mr. Kreisler makes the point that I would like to reiterate, that our farmers and our ranchers are among the best conservationists anywhere because they depend on the land for their livelihood and they know that if they do not take care of the land then the land is not going to take care of them.

We had also an owner from a sawmill in Potosi, Missouri. He spent 20 years as an analyst for Price Waterhouse before buying the sawmill.

Needless to say, Carl Barnes, the sawmill owner, talked about the threats from this coordinated resource management system and the threats that this would have upon outdoor recreation because they listed farming and mining as threats to outdoor recreation and our ecosystem health.

The fact of the matter is we can do it all, and I think that we do it all responsibly. We simply need to have this program put in place so that local citizens who live in areas for proposed designations have input, that is all it is, and that Congress have input, too.

I urge a yes vote on H.R. 883.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL), a member of the Committee on Resources.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. VENTO), for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this bill. This bill would undo some of the most important progress that has been achieved toward protection of internationally important cultural, historical and environmental resources.

What would enactment of this bill mean? Well, for starters, it would mean that the United States has decided to politicize the question of whether our country will continue to take part in the World Heritage Convention, the Man and the Biosphere Program, and the so-called Ramsar Convention regarding wetlands that have particular importance as waterfowl habitat. That might not be objectionable if our participation in these international programs involved any trade-offs in terms of our ability to make decisions about the management of our lands or resources, but the fact is that nothing in these international agreements affects the ownership or the management of any lands or other resources.

Similarly, I could understand the need for this legislation if, as some of its supporters claim, these international agreements have eaten away at the power and sovereignty of the Congress to exercise its constitutional power to make the laws that govern Federal lands, but here we are debating a bill that would be an exercise of exactly that constitutional power, and that constitutional power is fully intact today, fully intact with regard to each and every acre of Federal lands, including all the Federal lands that are covered by these international agreements.

So what is the real point of this bill? As far as I can tell, it is primarily a means for supporters to take a shot at the United Nations and particularly UNESCO, and to demonstrate their solidarity with some who seem to view the U.N. as engaged in a vast multiwing conspiracy to overthrow our constitutional government. I do not

think the U.N. is a threat to Congress' authority over Federal lands or to any other part of the Constitution. I do think this bill, if we take it seriously, is a threat to America's international leadership in environmental conservation and in the protection of historical and cultural resources.

□ 1145

So I think this bill is bad for our country, and I know it is bad for my home State of Colorado.

I want to tell my colleagues about the two Biosphere Reserves that we have, areas that are part of the Man and the Biosphere Program. One is the Niwot Ridge Research area and the other is Rocky Mountain National Park. As it now stands, this bill would kick those areas out of the program unless Congress passes a new law to retain them.

To get a better idea of what that would mean for Niwot Ridge, I contacted Professor Bowman, the Director of the University of Colorado's Mountain Research Station, and he explained to me that having Niwot Ridge in the Biosphere Reserve System, it provided a framework for international cooperation of many important research efforts, including working with the Biosphere Reserve in the Czech Republic to address air pollution problems, which is a matter of great importance not only to us, but to the Czechs. He told me that the biosphere program also had been helpful to people at Niwot Ridge as they worked with the Forest Service to develop a land management plan that would promote multiple use by minimizing the conflicts that we all grapple with here over recreation and scientific and other uses, which is again a matter of great importance to Colorado and all other public land States.

I also talked to the National Park Service about Rocky Mountain National Park, which again is included as a biosphere reserve. They told me that it not only means that there are more research activities at the park, but that it meant a significant increase in park visitation, tourism, which not only provides important educational benefits but is an important part of our economy in Colorado. Kicking these areas out of the program would be bad for Colorado and something that I cannot support.

Exempting the Colorado areas from the bill would be an improvement, but I do not think that alone would make the bill acceptable. We need to reject this bill, move away from the posturing and begin working on the real problems that face us on our public lands.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT).

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Chairman. I am delighted to support this bill, the American Land Sovereignty Protection Act. I really want to thank the gentleman from Alaska for his efforts in this regard. He has been a champion of private property rights for many years, I have known him for 23 years, and I respect him greatly.

I represent the east side of the State of Washington, one-fourth of the size of our State, and in that portion of the State of Washington there are wonderful open space lands that people inhabit who are very protective of their private property rights.

The right to own property is a core principle on which our country was founded. Over the years, the Federal Government has established programs like the World Heritage Sites and Biosphere Reserves, without the approval of Congress, Mr. Chairman, and that overrides the intentions of the Constitution and our Founding Fathers.

Under the U.S. Constitution, Congress retains the power to, quote, ''make all needful rules and regulations governing lands belonging to the United States.'' The lands designated under the World Heritage Sites and Biosphere Reserves have been so designated without the approval of Congress.

So this bill restores the intentions of our Founding Fathers by requiring congressional approval for any nomination of property located in the United States for inclusion in the World Heritage list. It prohibits any Federal official from nominating U.S. property for designation as a biosphere reserve and prohibits any Federal official from designating any land in the U.S. for a special or restricted use under any international agreement unless the designation has been authorized by law.

It simply says Congress is going to be involved in this, these approvals of the disposition of Federal lands. I think they are common sense changes here that restore the role of Congress in the process of changing designation of lands that are Federal lands, and it restores the intentions of our Founding Fathers, and I hope that my colleagues will support it.

I thank the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentlewoman from Idaho (Mrs. CHENOWETH) for their engagement and involvement in this.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL).

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the American Land Sovereignty Protection Act. This bill is unnecessary, it is unjustified. It addresses a phantom problem. It would seriously damage our country's continued participation in important international efforts to protect valuable land around the world. But worst of all, it caters to the suspicions and the conspiracy theories of extreme organizations and individuals, and it leads directly to scare tactics such as those used by the American Policy Center in attempts to alarm American citizens and frankly, to raise money under false pretenses, and this bill ought to be opposed and defeated.

I would like to read from a letter from the American Policy Center which I will include for the RECORD at the end of my statement. This is a letter written by the American Policy Center, signed by Tom DeWeese, the president, urging citizens to send money in to pass this bill, H.R. 883, to ''stop the U.N. land grab of American soil,'' a land grab, Mr. Chairman, that does not exist; urging citizens and this Congress to stop the U.N. from designating any more U.S. soil as World Heritage Sites or Biosphere Reserves. The U.N. does not make those designations, Mr. Chairman.

It identifies a U.N. land grab of American soil; calls for the Congress to stop liberals from terminating the United Nations' influence on 51 million acres of U.S. park land. Mr. Chairman, the U.N. does not have influence over 51 million acres of United States national park land. It says that liberals know this bill will lead to the end of international treaties and agreements that give the U.N. control over development of American soil. There are no such international treaties and agreements, nor should there be, nor would this Congress vote for, nor would any President negotiate such international treaties. It is just bogus.

The letter talks about radicals like AL GORE and Bruce Babbitt that enforce treaties in a way that give the U.N. authority over our land and our private property every day. GORE and Babbitt are not radicals and they are not doing any such thing. This letter talks about open warfare in coming weeks to pass this bill. Mr. DeWeese talks about meeting with the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and saying that the American Policy Center will back him all the way in the battle to pass this bill.

Of course, then Mr. DeWeese goes to the heart of the matter and asks for any contribution from $17 to $1,000 to help the American Policy Center in their efforts.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is not needed. We should oppose it. It is nothing but scare tactics from the right wing. We should vote ''no.''

AMERICAN POLICY CENTER,
Herndon, VA.

DEAR FRIEND OF APC: I have just come from an emergency meeting on Capitol Hill, and I have important news for you.

I was meeting with several national leaders to plan a strategy to pass Congressman Don Young's ''American Land Sovereignty Protection Act'' (H.R. 883).

As I'm sure you remember, we were successful last year in passing this bill in the House of Representatives to stop the UN land grab of American Soil.

But we were stopped cold in the U.S. Senate. We didn't even get a hearing on the Senate version of the Bill. Because the Senate did not act, we have to start all over again and pass it again in the House, while we build strength in the Senate.

We intend to win this time. We intend to pass the Bill in both Houses of Congress and stop the UN from designating any more U.S.

soil as World Heritage Sites or Biosphere Reserves.

We believe Congressman Young has the votes to pass it again in the House. In fact, he already has 158 co-sponsors, with more joining each day. He also has the support of new House Speaker Dennis Hastert.

The problem, again, is in the Senate.

Senator Ben Nighthorse Campbell of Colorado has again agreed to introduce the ''American Land Sovereignty Protection Act in the Senate. The Bill number is S. 510.

But Senator Campbell has only been able to sign on six co-sponsors. Without more support, S. 510 will again die in the Senate.

You and I can't let that happen. Not again. You and I need to storm the Senate. Here's how.

First, I have enclosed a ''Legislative Petition'' to Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott. He will be key in the fight to build support in the Senate.

Frankly, without his support there can be no floor vote on S. 510.

That's why it is urgent that you immediately sign and return your ''Legislative Petition'' to me right away. You and I must flood Lott's office with petitions to prove S. 510 has strong national support.

So please sign you petition and return it to me immediately.

But you and I can't stop there.

Senator Campbell needs more co-sponsors for the Bill. Please call both of your states U.S. Senators and ask them to co-sponsor S. 510. Simply call the Senate switchboard at 202–224–3121, and ask for your Senators by name.

Just as important, however is that you contact you Congressman to make sure he supports Congressman Young's House version (H.R. 883). We must have a strong show in the House as well. If not, all of our efforts in the Senate will be in vain.

So please, call your Congressman at 202–225–3121. Tell him to support H.R. 883.

It is vital that you do all you can—if we are going to stop the UN's land grab of American soil. To win, you and I will have to beat overwhelming odds.

But don't despair. You and I can win this battle.

Remember when the fight to stop the UN land grab started in the 104th Congress?

Democrats refused to even attend hearings. They laughed and called Congressman Young's bill the ''black helicopter'' bill. They called it ''preposterous,'' ''absurd'' and ''crazy.'' The very idea that someone was challenging the UN was laughable to them. They're not laughing now.

The liberals know they must stop the bill. And they know the Senate is their last chance. Liberals know this bill will terminate United Nations' influence on 51 million acres of U.S. national parklands.

Liberals know this bill will gut the extremist United Nations' environmental agenda and will lead to the end of international treaties and agreements that give the UN control over development of American soil.

Liberals know this bill forces them to take a side. Do liberals support your right to own and control your private property or not?

The bill exposes the left's property-grabbing agenda. It weakens to United Nations' influence in the world. That's why they know they must stop the American Land Sovereignty Protection Act at all costs.

So, right now, the Sierra Club, the Audubon Society, the Nature Conservancy and all of their extremist environmental buddies are charging up Capitol Hill, swarming over Senate offices, using all of their power to keep this Bill from gaining co-sponsors or a floor vote.

They know we can pass this bill. Our position is strong.

The whole purpose of the American Sovereignty Protection Act is to restore the role of Congress where it should have been all along—as the administrator with sovereign control over public lands in the United States.

That authority has been slowly eroded over the years by a series of environmental treaties and agreements that subject our public lands to the influences of UN officials and UN-dictated rules. And with the help of the Clinton Administration.

Those rules not only tell the United States what it must do with public lands—but they also affect private property as well.

Just ask the owner of the gold mine that was located outside Yellowstone National Park. He was on private land—his land. Now he's out of business. Why? Because the United Nations said so.

And these UN treaties, like the Biodiversity Treaty and the World Heritage Sites are incredibly dangerous when radicals like Vice President Al Gore and Interior Secretary Bruce Babbitt hold power.

They can enforce the treaties in a way that gives the UN authority over our land and our private property. And they are doing it every day.

The House of Representatives recognized the danger and passed Don Young's Bill in the 105th Congress. They know that the threat is real, and we can pass the Bill in the House again in the 106th Congress.

But the real battle is now in the Senate.

And I tell you with complete honesty—we will have to fight like the Dickens to withstand the coming liberal firestorm. The liberals will use everything in their arsenal to stop this Bill. And the Senate is not a friendly place for property owners.

Get ready for open warfare. It's coming. In the next few weeks.

At our meeting today, I promised Congressman Young that APC would back him all the way in the battle to pass the American Land Sovereignty Protection Act. And I meant it. That includes leading the fight in the Senate.

Your enclosed ''Legislative Petition'' is my first step. Please. It is urgent that you sign it and return it to me today. We simply must build pressure on Trent Lott to support the Bill. That's why it's also important that you begin making phone calls to your Senators and Congressman to ask them to co-sponsor and support the bills (H.R. 883 and S. 510).

Over the coming weeks APC will get this message to hundreds of thousands of Americans to build the pressure.

You and I can pass this bill and cut the power of the UN!

But to do it, I urgently need your financial support. Will you help me keep up this fight to save America from the UN land grab?

I've been appearing on radio and television programs and speaking before audiences across this nation to sound the alarm on the UN land grab. The response is incredible. When Americans know the truth—they do the right thing. But they are not hearing most of this story from anyone but the American Policy Center. But, through APC's effort, we are truly awakening a slumbering giant.

Will you help me stay in the fight by sending me your most generous contribution of at least $17?

Remember, the Sierra Club and their buddies have millions of dollars in their war chest. I have only you. So if you can send a larger donation of $25, $50, $100, $250, $500, or even $1,000, I will be able to counter the liberal barrage, word for word.

You know APC's record and what we can do when our action alert system is firing on all cylinders. But it takes dollars to fuel the engine. I need you now. There really is no more important legislation before the U.S. Congress than the American Land Sovereignty Protection Act.

The bill truly is the whole ball game for our property rights. Pass it—and the UN is less of a threat. That's why the liberals hate it with a passion.

Now is the time. This is the battle. Please help me win it.

Sincerely,

TOM DEWEESE,
President.

P.S. You and I will not fight a more important battle in 1999 than this one to pass the American Land Sovereignty Protection Act. It is crucial that I receive your signed ''Legislative Petition'' right away. Equally important is your financial support to keep APC in the battle. Without you, I can do nothing. Please help. Thanks for all you do.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, how much time remains?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) has 13½ minutes remaining; the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. VENTO) has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON).

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Alaska for yielding and for his work on this legislation. I do rise in support of it.

I want to respond to the gentleman from Pennsylvania as to what he indicated about this. I agree that there has been, and there always will be, overstatements about the dangers of potential actions that are taken, and in this case the dangers of the Biosphere Program. But the argument has been made that the United Nation's designation is important because it provides some international protections for these worldwide important sites. Well, if it provides some protections, then there is some implied authority, if not direct authority, that is yielded to that international body; otherwise, the designation would have no significance. If it has no significance, then why would anyone oppose this simple legislation.

I have a habit in this Congress of trying to read legislation, and I took the time to read this bill that has been offered by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), H.R. 883, and it says, ''Any designation as a Biosphere Reserve under the Man and Biosphere Program of UNESCO shall not be given any force or effect unless the Biosphere Reserve is specifically authorized by a law.''

Now, the argument is made, well, why should Congress engage in this activity? Well, I voted on naming postal buildings; I voted on naming Federal buildings; we vote on postage stamps. So there is a lot of designations that we do in this Congress.

I believe that private ownership of property is important. I believe that our National Heritage Sites, our parks are very important, and I think that Congress has a role, and when the constituents express a concern about a particular designation, that it is right and proper in this democracy for Congress to address it.

The Ozark Highland Man and Biosphere Plan was advanced in northern Arkansas and southern Missouri without public input. It was withdrawn after property owners, timber producers and other residents in the region learned of and opposed the designation.

I believe the Chairman's bill is reasonable. I believe it is appropriate. I believe it maintains the balance between executive action and legislative authority and certainly, when our constituents have a concern about these types of designations, that it is appropriate that we have congressional oversight and input into that process. So I ask my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE), a member of the Committee on Resources.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in vigorous opposition to H.R. 883, which really ought to be titled the American Land Paranoia Act, because the principal purpose of this act is to sow paranoia among Americans who ought to take pride in our interest in protecting some of our national treasures. I will tell my colleagues that this is not a small matter.

Some may think this is a small matter, we should not worry about it. I want to tell my colleagues a little story. I was up on the border of the State of Washington and Canada about three years ago, four years ago now; in fact it was in what used to be the district of the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT). I was talking to a fellow who was a businessperson, a nice fellow, a pillar of the community. He lives about 10 miles from the Canadian border. We got in a nice little discussion at a county fair.

He said, ''Jay, what are you going to do about those tanks the U.N. has up on those railroad cars just over the Canadian border?'' And I kind of chuckled. I said, ''Henry, what are you talking about?'' He said, ''Well, you know, those tanks that the U.N. has across the border that they are going to use to come in to establish this United Nations park in the North Cascades.''

I laughed. Then I saw he was serious. He was serious. And the reason he was serious is that the advocates of things like this bill have convinced this gentleman and a lot of people in America that somehow the tanks with the blue helmets and the black helicopters are coming to take away their livelihood, and that is flat wrong. Flat wrong. This is no unconstitutional loss.

Mr. Chairman, we sat in the hearings and I was engaged with the committee on hearings on this. People came forward and they sent to us this law professor or lawyer, I do not know if he is a professor, and he argued for 10 minutes passionately about how this violated the Constitution of America.

Then I asked him a simple question. I said, ''How long has this been on the books?'' He said, ''Well, since the late 1960s.'' Then I asked him, ''Well, have you ever gone to court to ask for this to be ruled unconstitutional, the loss of sovereignty?'' He said, ''Well, no.'' The reason he has never done it is he knows darn well it is not unconstitutional.

This is a bunch of flimflam where people are trying to foist these fears on the American people.

The last point I want to make, the World Heritage Convention that is under attack here as some kind of socialist plot was introduced under the administration of Richard Nixon. Richard Nixon came up with this socialist plot, and it is something that has been effective to try to get international attention to help us in this country preserve what we believe are our national treasures.

This is another sad step of my friends across the aisle, frankly, leaving that tradition of Teddy Roosevelt and even Richard Nixon. We ought to keep this thing on the books as it is and reject this bill.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO).

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Chairman, I am the newest member of the Committee on Resources, and I would like to commend my distinguished colleague from the great State of Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) for his leadership in introducing this bill.

Under Article IV, section 3 of the Constitution, quote, ''The Congress shall have the power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States.''

□ 1200

Mr. Chairman, the Constitution is clear. The United Nations, despite efforts by its supporters, is not a governing body superior in authority to this Congress.

I know that comes as a shock to some of my colleagues in this place and certainly some of the supporters from whom I have heard, who believe that the United Nations has some superior claim to the sovereignty of the United States, particularly when it comes to determining what is the appropriate use of the land within our borders. It is, however, not, as I say, not a superior authority to this Congress.

Yet, the U.N. is designating land within our country's borders for special protection without the consent of the House.

There are 83 U.N. sites in America, Mr. Chairman. In my home State of Colorado there are five United Nations biosphere reserves. I can tell the Members, having served in the Colorado State legislature for many years, those sites were designated without the express consent of the State of Colorado and without the Congress of the United States.

I have visited many of these areas. I agree they are incredible and breathtaking. I agree they are a treasure, but they are the property of the United States, and we must maintain absolute autonomy in our land management decisions.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of the bill, and urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, again, I rise in opposition to this bill. I would just point out to my colleagues that the only power with regard to the disposition or the use of the lands that are within these designations are inherent in the laws that Congress has passed and delegated to the Park Service, to the Fish and Wildlife Service, the BLM, the Forest Service, or other land managers to manage.

In fact, this is a voluntary thing. All of these designations that are being discussed here, whether it is the Ramsar treaty or the Man and the Biosphere, which happens to be the program associated with the UNESCO program, or the World Heritage Convention and the sites that are identified, only some 15 sites in the United States, are all voluntary.

The laws that govern these sites are the laws of the national and State governments, and the private property rights and laws are completely intact. They are not changed by these voluntary designations. In fact, when making the designations or the recognition of these sites on a global basis, one of the criteria is in fact that the laws and rules are in place that will accord the proper use of these lands. So that is one of the prerequisites.

I would point out that the laws that affected the New World Mine were those that were being applied through the Park Service and the Forest Service in the State of Wyoming, in the State of Montana, and the other States within which Yellowstone lies.

The point is that there is no impact. The impact here, of course, is one of cooperation and collaboration, building on the laws that we have and attempting to encourage other Nations to in fact emulate the stewardship, the conservation, and preservation efforts that we have made in terms of these important sites, because they are important as a natural heritage site or cultural site or because they are important for research or for water fall.

So the only issue here is one where we could say that the Man and the Biosphere program has not directly been authorized by Congress, although we have appropriated money for it.

We have many laws today where the authorization has expired or has not been made, where the Office of Management and Budget, because money is appropriated, the courts have ruled that in fact it has the force and effect of in fact Congress authorizing and lawfully permitting that type of designation, and we have done that for that program, clearly a case we made to bring up an authorization bill and deal with it in that manner.

But that has not been the disposition of the committee. What they have chosen to do, of course, is because, in my judgment, they cannot attack the parks, they cannot attack some of the land uses which they have an issue with directly, they have turned around and wrapped themselves in this question of sovereignty, which there is no constitutional case here. There is no court case here that has been pursued that has been positive that would indicate the statements being made are accurate.

They are not accurate. They have never been tested in court. I think they are inaccurate. They can test such issues in court and get answers back as to whether they are appropriate.

In fact, this has been praised by many. I just picked up a statement here, a press release by Secretary of Interior Don Hodel, most recently, of course, who led the Christian Coalition, but before that he worked in the State of Washington and on Bonneville Power, and was our Secretary of Interior under then President Ronald Reagan.

This letter was dated October 10, 1986, a press release in which he stated how enthusiastic and proud the Department was of the Statue of Liberty which was designated a World Heritage Site. So I think this just sort of indicates across the board how important this is. This is why all of the environmental groups and conservation groups oppose this legislation.

I will offer an amendment in this process, Mr. Chairman, which will address some real concerns, and that is the commercial use by foreign entities of U.S. properties for mining, for grazing, for timber harvesting.

If we are so concerned about the preservation and conservation of these areas, then maybe we should really be concerned about those what we call exploitive activities that go on on these lands by foreign powers, actual activities, rather than these phantom concerns that we have with tanks and other issues that may be in the minds of our constituents. But I am sure that my colleagues have made every effort to dispel these unwarranted fears, and have faced up to the issues of this misinformation campaign that has existed.

I trust they would do that, Mr. Chairman; that they would face up to that type of issue and not let that type of misunderstanding and misinformation spread across the land such fear that would result in imprudent types of actions by this Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to also recite Mr. Hodel, the past Secretary of the Interior.

The last paragraph says, ''This legislation Chairman Young is sponsoring, H.R. 883, will bring welcome relief to property owners threatened by a United Nations bureaucracy that has grown out of control.'' I support H.R. 883 thoroughly.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON).

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support this legislation. I find it very difficult to understand the arguments of those who oppose it.

What is wrong with Congress being in control? What is wrong with the people in our districts, if they agree or disagree, having a right to talk to their Congressman?

Don Hodel also said, ''During the Reagan administration, these designations were honorary and benign in nature. However, like so many United Nations programs, this one has fallen subject to inappropriate mission creep. It has become a proxy for international attempts to override national sovereignty and control land use.''

Why was America founded by Europeans and Asians? Because they wanted additional freedom, they wanted control, they wanted to be in charge, and they certainly do not want people from other countries, and designating is fine, but having other people to have a say about how land is used in our parks, in our public lands, makes no sense in this country.

This is about sovereignty. This is about freedom. This is about America being in charge of Americans; having relations with other countries, but they should not have a say in America, and the American public should have Congress to go back to. That is all we are asking, for Congress to be the final word.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Idaho.

(Mrs. CHENOWETH asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) for his outstanding leadership on this issue.

I have come to the floor many times during my tenure in Congress to discuss this very important issue that H.R. 883 addresses, the constitutional duty that we have as Members of Congress to protect the sovereignty of our lands in every possible way.

Yet, every time this matter is brought before the House, I hear many of my colleagues vigorously argue that this has nothing to do with our constitutional duty to preserve and protect our Nation's sovereignty.

I have also heard arguments today from the floor that we should not be meddling in these kinds of things. I know as chairman of the Subcommittee on Forests and Forest Health we even have to have a bill to move a boundary on a wilderness area a half a mile. We have to have a bill to name buildings.

So what would the opposition to this bill have us do, just stay busy naming buildings and moving boundaries, or protect the sovereignty of this Nation? That is our first and foremost responsibility.

Mr. Chairman, another thing that I have heard from the opposition to this bill is that it does not involve private property. I can tell the Members, it does involve private property when they seized control and took over the New World Mine, a patented mine. That was in fact private property.

In fact, the American taxpayer had to pony up $68 million to pay off the Canadian leasehold interests for their loss in the property. The woman who owned the property, who had the patent on the mine, still stands empty-handed. This Congress must deal with that problem, too.

Mr. Chairman, this very simple bill enacts three very basic requirements. Number one is it requires the Secretary of the Interior to require the approval of Congress for any nomination of property located in the United States for inclusion in the World Heritage list.

Number two, the bill would prohibit Federal officials from nominating any land in the United States as a biosphere reserve unless Congress ratifies and enacts the Biosphere Reserve Treaty.

Finally, H.R. 883 simply prohibits any Federal official from designating any land in the United States for a special or restricted use under any international agreement unless such designation is specifically approved by law.

I might remind my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that while the World Heritage sites have been or the treaty was approved by the Democrat-led Senate during the Nixon administration, nevertheless, the biodiversity treaty has never been ratified by the United States Senate, never. Yet, there is enough land that has been set aside under designations of these two designations to fill up the entire State of Colorado.

I think it is time we act. We have a responsibility to the American people to protect the sovereignty of our land.

Mr. Chairman, these very simple provisions do not represent massive changes in policy, nor are they born out of paranoia. There is nothing that says anything about blue helmets or tanks. They are very important items that ensure our Federal officials properly allocate taxpayer resources, and that we as a Congress maintain the total governance of our lands required under Article IV, Section 3, of the United States Congress.

This section, very succinctly, states that ''The Congress shall have the power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States.'' It is very clear. It does not take a rocket scientist to interpret what the Constitution says, and neither does it take a court to interpret this provision for us to act. We

do not need the court decisions for the Congress to act in a responsible way.

Mr. Chairman, there are some who actually believe that the U.N. Biosphere and World Heritage designations, which encompass 68 percent of the land in our national parks, preserves, and monuments, and make up an area the size of Colorado, are benign and have the mere purpose of placing a plaque or a label that these areas can use to attract tourism.

That is utter naivete. However, in the Committee on Resources we have heard testimony from citizens living in Alaska, Arkansas, Missouri, Minnesota, New Mexico, New York, and Wyoming that suggest otherwise. These individuals testified about how these designations affected their property value, their economic activity, and most candidly, their ability to play a role in the designation process. They were left out.

Even the U.N.'s own documentation on these programs describes its proactive role on land policy. One such publication defining the purpose of biodiversity reserves call for extensive land policy initiatives such as ''strategies for biodiversity, conservation and sustainable use,'' and for action plans provided for under Article VI of the Convention on Biological Diversity.

I am not going to trade our responsibility to manage our lands under this constitutional provision for Article VI of the Convention on Biological Diversity, and I do not think the American people want us to do that, either.

□ 1215

Mr. Chairman, to me this type of strategy involves a lot more than just a harmless plaque. Nevertheless, the question every Member of this body should be asking themselves today is not whether or not these designations do in fact intrude on our vested power to govern our lands, but whether we should even take that chance.

Mr. Chairman, if World Heritage areas or Biodiversity Reserves really are harmless or benign, it should be Congress that makes that determination, not our unelected officials. I do not think that Article IV, section 3 of the Constitution advises that in governing our lands that we simply opt out of policies that may appear ineffectual. But instead, it expressly requires that we, the Congress, make all needful rules and regulations.

I do not think, Mr. Chairman, the danger can be stated any clearer than it was before the Committee on Resources by the Honorable Jeane J. Kirkpatrick, highly respected U.N. Ambassador during the Reagan administration, when she stated, and I quote, ''The World Heritage and Man and Biosphere committees make decisions affecting the land and lives of Americans. Some of these decisions are made by representatives chosen by governments not based in democratic representation, certainly not the representation of Americans.''

Ms. Kirkpatrick went on to say, ''What recourse does an American voter have when U.N. bureaucrats from Cuba or Iraq or Libya, all of which are parties to this treaty, have made a decision that unjustly damages his or her property rights that lie near a national park?''

Mr. Chairman, the only relevant argument that the Clinton administration has made against this bill is that it would add unnecessary bureaucracy to the designation process. I do not believe that is the case. I think that this would simply clarify and straighten out a mess that we have found ourselves in in this administration.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I would point out that clearly the gentlewoman from Idaho (Mrs. CHENOWETH) is confused about the Biodiversity Treaty, which is not a part of this agreement. We are talking about Man and the Biosphere.

I mean, we would obviously stipulate that the Biodiversity Treaty, the Rio Treaty, is something that the Senate has to consider. But apparently we were misplacing our words.

I would suggest that the national protection and international protection of cultural and national heritage in Article VI, this particular program points out that, and I will quote from this, ''Whilst fully respecting the sovereignty of States of whose territory the cultural and natural heritage mentioned in Article I and II is situated, and without prejudice to the property right provided by national legislation, the State parties to this Convention recognized that such heritage constitutes a World Heritage for those whose protection it is the duty of the international community as a whole to cooperate.''

So the issue that we are dealing here with is not whether the countries are members of this, because we know that there are many nations who are members of these programs. In fact, with regards to the World Heritage Convention, 150 nations are members of that; with regards to Man and the Biosphere, it is 125 Nations; and with regards to the Ramsar Treaty, there are 92 Nations.

As I had spoken earlier, nearly 2,000 sites, some 1,932 sites that I have and still growing, I suppose, and in the United States, we have some 82 of those sites where less than 5 percent of the sites are located in the United States, and it is based upon the existing land laws that the Committee on Resources, the administration, that U.S. law provides, whether through the national government, through the State governments, the property rights are intact.

No one can raise one case where, for instance, the Statue of Liberty has been designated a World Heritage site. What have we lost? What has changed in terms of its administration? Tell me one instance where something has changed that is due to the designation or the recognition that is accorded to these 82 sites, not one witness that appeared.

The gentlewoman from Idaho (Mrs. CHENOWETH) raised the question that there was a witness from Minnesota. Well, unfortunately, I am from Minnesota. We do not have any sites in Minnesota. I would like to have some sites in Minnesota, and I hope someday that we do. But we do not have any in Minnesota. But I guess that witness from Minnesota knew something that I did not.

But the fact is, and this is the sort of, I think, misunderstandings that this legislation is based on, not one of these sites has been brought to our attention where there has been any change in the land management that is due to these cooperative voluntary international agreements.

While I have tried to portray this as not having a an impact, obviously our park laws, when I wrote and when our committee writes legislation on parks or on wilderness or on BLM or other types of land classifications, I mean what I say when we designate those sites that they ought to be protected, that there are transboundary issues that are affected. I meant what I said.

But, unfortunately, I think what is unfolding here is an effort to try, through this American sovereignty claim, through criticism and fear of the U.N., to try to turn around and blame the U.N. and these programs, these international programs. We have everything at stake in terms of providing this type of leadership on a global basis, in terms of trying to encourage other nations on a voluntary basis, whether it be China, whether they be democratic governments or governments which we think are not democratic, to in fact pursue the preservation, the conservation of their resources on a voluntary basis. We have had spectacular success.

This is a place, as I said, if it is a criticism of UNESCO in terms of Man and the Biosphere, in terms of research, this is an area that is working. This is one area that we should not be debating or disagreeing about in terms of research and gaining information and knowledge. That is the essence of what the Man and the Biosphere program has. It has nothing to do with the Biodiversity Treaty, as was indicated here, a misstatement I guess on the part of the proponents of this.

The same is true of these World Heritage sites. They deliver tourism. Individuals, just like in a park pass, look at these World Heritage sites, some 506 sites, and they try to go to as many as they can. It encourages tourism in this Nation. We have but 20 of those sites. Obviously our parks are a great attraction and globally known and renowned for the wonderful features that characterize them.

The Ramsar Treaty obviously is one. There may be other treaties that are affected. These are the three that have stuck out that we have discussed, but

almost any other agreements that we come to on a voluntary international basis are struck down and put back before Congress. I think we know what the disposition of that is.

Read the bill. I have read this bill and studied it carefully. It makes an almost insurmountable test in terms of any type of designation of the Man and the Biosphere programs. It goes 10 miles outside the boundary of any of these where there would be a Man and the Biosphere designation and demands that it have absolutely no economic effect.

I would suggest that it would almost be impossible to pass the type of test that has been put in here. But I think it has been put in here for good reason; that is, my colleagues want to kill these programs. They want to cut the head off of the Man and the Biosphere program. They want to stop the World Heritage Convention. They want to stop the Ramsar Treaties, which are the basis, really, just the fragile basis of cooperation that we have on an international basis to provide some conservation and leadership.

Frankly, in my view, we ought to be doing a lot more on an international basis, dealing with water quality, dealing with air quality, dealing with the way that landscapes are treated in terms of how we treat our forests and, indeed, that biodiversity issue treaty that was raised by my colleague.

I certainly am a proponent of trying to work on a global basis to protect these resources and to rationally use them and to, in fact, provide for some policy path that would be reasonable with regards to preserving our environment.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote against this measure. It is a bad measure. It is misunderstood and unfortunately a bill the House should not consider at all. I urge defeat of this measure, H.R. 883.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of our time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I want to clarify the Biosphere Reserve Program is operating without any congressional authority at all. Our constitutional system is designed to make our government responsible to the people; that is, the American citizens who are the ultimate sovereign authority in our system, a people who must satisfy the concerns of outsiders before they are no longer sovereign. That is why this is called the American Sovereignty Act.

I respectfully request my colleagues to vote for this legislation, get us back in control under our Constitution. That is our role. That is our charge. Not to do so is neglecting our responsibility.

Mr. Chairman, I include the following for the RECORD:

SENATE,
STATE OF MINNESOTA,
St. Paul, MN, May 11, 1999.

Hon. TOM COBURN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN COBURN: As Chairman of the Minnesota Senate Committee on Natural Resources and Environment, I commend your efforts to defund the Man and Biosphere Program (MAB). Since one of the major opponents of your efforts is Congressman Bruce Vento of Minnesota, who represents a compact urban district with little undeveloped land, I would like to tell you about the painful experience northern Minnesota had with the MAB program in the past.

During the mid-1980's the National Park Service proposed a massive Northwoods International Biosphere Reserve that included lands in my Senate district which were included without notifying me or any other local elected officials. In 1984 the state-sponsored Citizen's Committee on Voyageurs National Park took up this issue after a casual comment from the then Voyageurs National Park Superintendent Russell Berry that our area had been nominated as a biosphere reserve. At a public meeting of that committee on December 1, 1984 in Minneapolis after the nomination was made, Mr. Berry, partially explained one reason for the biosphere reserve by stating ''I'd like to be in as strong a position as possible to influence activities outside the boundaries that would adversely affect the Park in the context of things that would be detrimental to the ecosystem within the Park.''

Because the park is surrounded by thousands of acres of private property, Mr. Berry intended to use the biosphere as a means to implement land use controls on private property. Since my constituents did not want their constitutionally-guaranteed private property rights further threatened, they strongly opposed this proposal. Consequently, in 1987 the Northwoods International Biosphere Reserve nomination was withdrawn by National Park Service Director William Penn Mott.

Until the MAB program is authorized by Congress and statutory protections for private property are guaranteed, I will support all efforts to defund this program. Without these protections, unelected federal bureaucrats will again use biosphere reserves as a means of implementing federal land use controls on private property.

Since Mr. Vento's district is 300 miles away from the ill-fated Northwoods International Biosphere Reserve proposal, I would encourage you to listen to those who represent people who live and work in the affected area rather than those who recreate in the area on weekends.

Thanks again for your efforts in defense of local control and private property.

Sincerely,

Senator BOB LESSARD.

CHESAPEAKE, VA,
May 18, 1999.

Congressman RICHARD POMBO,
United States Capitol Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. POMBO: Thank you for asking for my comments on the process of UNESCO designation of World Heritage Sites.

During the Reagan Administration, these designations were honorary and benign in nature. However, like so many United Nations programs, this one has fallen subject to inappropriate mission creep. It has become a proxy for international attempts to override national sovereignty and control land use.

The current Administration has submitted a thirteen year old press release to invoke my name in support of the World Heritage Site proposals. This is unfortunate political game-playing and deceptive in that it does not represent my position. Favorable statements made about an honorary and benign program more than a decade ago are patently not applicable to that program as it is now being utilized.

The American Land Sovereignty Protection Act, as I understand it, will require congressional approval of United Nations World Heritage Site proposals. I believe that this is a necessary and reasonable safeguard for American citizens against overreaching, unelected, unaccountable domestic and international bureaucracies.

This legislation Chairman Young is sponsoring, H.R. 883, will bring welcome relief to property owners threatened by a United Nations bureaucracy that has grown out of control.

Sincerely,

DONALD PAUL HODEL.

STOCKTON, CA,
May 13, 1999.

Hon. RICHARD POMBO,
Member of Congress, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN POMBO: Thank you for contacting me regarding the House Committee on Resources' March 18 hearing on the American Land Sovereignty Protection Act, H.R. 883.

As you know, before President Ronald Reagan appointed me Assistant Secretary for Fish, and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, I served Governor Ronald Reagan as the Director of California's Department of Fish and Game. I am especially proud of the environmental agenda we were able to implement, and the success we had with programs that encourage ranchers, farmers and other private landowners to maintain, develop and enhance wildlife habitat on privately owned land. Those benefits continue to this day, and they serve as excellent examples of public benefits that flow from private land ownership without government intervention or funding.

Before coming to Washington, D.C. in 1980 to serve President Reagan, I gave 20 years of volunteer service on the board of directors of the National Wildlife Federation (NWF), including two terms as the Foundation's president-elect (1976–78).

Before my career and commitment to wildlife resources and the environment, I defended America's freedoms, including the right to own private property, when serving 4½ years with the U.S. Marine Corps during WWII, and another three years during the Korean Conflict.

At the March 18 hearing of the House Committee on Resources, I understand that the U.S. Department of the interior witness entered into the official record a 17-year old letter I signed while serving the Reagan Administration as Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks. I recently reviewed the letter in question, and you should know that it merely dealt with the technical issue of creating a standardized form for recording information on World Heritage Sites. The letter must not be interpreted as anything other than that.

The record of the Reagan Administration and the current Clinton Administration regarding UNESCO's World Heritage, and Man and the Biosphere programs are starkly different. Under the Reagan Administration, these designations were indeed voluntary, non-regulatory, and honorary. This is in sharp contrast with the current Administration that invited the World Heritage Committee to Yellowstone National Park to condemn private property located outside of the Park! The World Heritage Committee delegation present was comprised largely of non-elected bureaucrats from Third World countries. Such an action by the World Heritage

Committee clearly runs roughshod over America's sovereignty.

H.R. 883 is sorely needed to require Congress to oversee non-elected bureaucrats, in both the United States and the United Nations, from threatening our nation's sovereignty and private property rights of American citizens. Former United States Ambassador to the United Nations, Jeane J. Kirkpatrick, stated this best in a May 5, 1999, letter she sent to the House Committee on Resources on this issue. she wrote, inter alia: ''In U.N. organizations, there is no accountability. U.N. bureaucrats are far removed from the American voters. Many of the State Parties in the World Heritage Treaty are not democracies. Some come from countries that do not allow the ownership of private property. The World Heritage, and Man and Biosphere Reserve committees make decisions affecting the land and lives of Americans. Some of these decisions are made by representatives chosen by governments not based on democratic representation, certainly not the representation of Americans. What recourse does an American voter have when U.N. bureaucrats from Cuba or Iraq or Libya (all of which are parties to this Treaty) have made a decision that unjustly damages his or her property rights that lie near a national park? When the World Heritage Committee's meddling has needlessly encumbered a private United States citizen's land and caused his or her property values to fall, that citizen's appeals to these committees (if that is possible) will fall on deaf ears.''

I strongly support H.R. 883 and urge its passage. I believe H.R. 883 is desperately needed, and I know that it is in the best interest of our nation and her citizens to require our elected representatives in the United States Congress to properly oversee the actions of non-elected bureaucrats within the United States and the United Nations.

Sincerely,

G. RAY ARNETT,
Former Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks.

CLARK RANCH,
Paso Robles, CA, 14 May 1999.

Hon. RICHARD W. POMBO,
Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN POMBO: I greatly appreciate you informing me about the May 12, 1999 letter from Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior Stephen Saunders to House Resources Committee Chairman Don Young regarding H.R. 883, the American Land Sovereignty Protection Act.

The Saunders letter cited a letter I signed 15 years ago as Secretary of the Interior regarding the U.S.'s continued participation in the World Heritage Convention at a time when our nation decided to withdraw from the United States Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). My letter is characterized by Mr. Saunders as showing ''a strong bipartisan consensus that U.S. involvement with the World Heritage Convention and other international conservation conventions at issue in H.R. 883 pose absolutely no threat to U.S. sovereignty.''

That was true fifteen years ago. It is no longer the case today.

When I was Secretary of Interior for President Ronald Reagan, World Heritage sites were merely honorary designations. They did not threaten private property rights or national sovereignty. They were designed to recognize outstanding natural and cultural resources in America without creating new layers of regulation on private landowners and rural communities.

Unfortunately, this program has been used in some cases by the current administration to threaten private property owners and national sovereignty. For example, in its efforts to stop a proposed mine on private property outside Yellowstone National Park, the current administration in 1995 invited the World Heritage Committee to the park to evaluate alleged environmental threats caused by the proposed mine. This visit by unelected United Nations bureaucrats created a circus-type atmosphere whereby the World Heritage Committee made the owners of that private property a pariah in the international community. Partially as a result of this visit and a formal declaration later against the proposed mine by the World Heritage committee, the mine was never developed.

I also understand that some in the current administration are attempting to use our membership in the World Heritage Committee to help stop a proposed mine in Australia that is strongly supported by the duly elected government of that country. Such an effort against a sovereign nation would have been unthinkable under the Reagan Administration which honored the sovereignty of democratically elected governments.

My review of H.R. 883 shows it merely provides congressional oversight of the World Heritage Program to prevent an international agency from threatening private property rights and national sovereignty as it did in Yellowstone and is attempting to do in Australia. This legislation will provide the type of adult supervision from elected officials that every domestic and international bureaucracy needs.

I appreciate you alerting me that my 15 year old letter is regrettably being used for political purposes in Washington, D.C.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM P. CLARK.

PULP & PAPERWORKERS' RESOURCE COUNCIL.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The Pulp and Paperworkers' Resource Council (PPRC) strongly urges you to support H.R. 883, the American Land Sovereignty Protection Act, which soon will be voted on by the full House. This bill provides for Congressional oversight of United Nations Biosphere Reserves and World Heritage Sites in the United States. The biosphere program is not even authorized by Congress, nor is the program part of an international treaty.

PPRC is a ''Grassroots'' organization representing more than 300,000 Pulp and Paper Workers and some 900,000 Wood Products Industry Workers. Many of our members are unionized workers and we have members in virtually every state of the union. We support natural resource policies that allow our mills to thrive and keep our members and their families employed in well-paying union jobs.

PPRC is very concerned how America's sovereignty over its natural resources is increasingly threatened by international agreements and unelected bureaucrats at international organizations which often are dominated by Third World nations that have poor records in protecting their own natural resources. This was painfully evident when several PPRC officers participated in the World Commission on Forestry and Sustainable Development conferences.

United Nations Biosphere Reserve and World Heritage Site designations, administered by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), are nominated through a secretive process that excludes local governments, union workers, private landowners and other average citizens. Only high-ranking unelected officials at the State Department, other federal agencies, UNESCO and national environmental advocacy groups are involved in this nomination process.

Our Members, from diverse states such as New York, Arkansas, Kentucky and Minnesota have fought hard to get a seat at the table when biosphere reserves were proposed in their areas. In all cases, officials from federal agencies ardently worked to keep them out. H.R. 883 would open up this process by requiring that all existing biosphere reserves in the United States be authorized by an Act of Congress by 2002 or they would cease to exist. This would empower average citizens to become involved in these designations.

At House Resource Committee hearings in Tannersville, NY, Washington, D.C. and Rolla, MO, PPRC testified in strong support of this legislation. It embodies a basic principle of open government that citizens and communities have a right to know about decisions affecting them before they are made.

Again, the Pulp and Paperworkers' Resource Council strongly supports H.R. 883.

Sincerely,

DON WESSON,
PPRC National Secretary.

MAY 5, 1999.

Hon. Bruce F. Vento,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. VENTO Thank you for your letters of March 24th and April 28th regarding my testimony before the House Resources Committee on the March 18th hearing of the American land Sovereignty Protection Act, H.R. 883. In my opinion the important issue here is protection of Americans' rights of democratic process. I sought to emphasize the dangers I see in Congress's waiving of its role and responsibilities over matters which fundamentally affect citizens of the United States and ceding that role and its associated powers to a global organization in which affected Americans have no representation.

As I understand it, the proposed Act does nothing more than affirm Congressional role in the management of our public lands, a role mandated to it by the Constitution under Article IV, Section 3, which states: ''The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States.'' I believe that is a clearly worded duty which Congress is bound by the Constitution to uphold.

Your letter raises several questions concerning my testimony, each of which I have addressed below.

I. Please explain the simultaneous decision to continue our active participation in the World Heritage Convention and the U.S. Man and the Biosphere Program [after your support for the successful U.S. withdrawal from UNESCO], both of which are coordinated at the international level by UNESCO.

The United States' Permanent Representative to the United Nations oversees U.S. participation in many United Nations' programs and organizations, including aspects of U.S. participation in UNESCO. The World Heritage and Man and the Biosphere programs, however, were not among them when I held that job.

As you know, the Department of the Interior has primary responsibility for the World Heritage and the Biosphere programs. The Department of the Interior, along with a federal interagency panel controls all aspects of these programs. No member of Congress is included on this panel. Neither was a United States' U.N. Ambassador when I held that position. The Code of Federal Regulations July 21, 1980 public notice of proposed U.S. World Heritage Nominations or 1981 states U.S. law at the time I was our UN Ambassador: *''In the United States, the Secretary of the Interior is charged with implementing the provisions of the Convention, including preparation of U.S. nominations.* Recommendations

on the proposed nominations are made to the Secretary by an interagency panel including members from the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, the Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service, the National Park Service, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service within the Department of the Interior; the President's Council on Environmental Quality; the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and the Department of State.''[1] (Emphasis added). I was never included on the panel as the Department of State Representative. I was never invited to participate in any decisions concerning these programs.

I raised the issue of the U.S. withdrawal from UNESCO to make a point: the UNESCO of the 1980's demonstrates quite well both an example of an incompetent and corrupt international organization and the nearly insurmountable obstacles of trying to reform it and hold it accountable. During my tenure as U.S. Ambassador, I sought to limit the proliferation and scope of U.N. based on international organizations which were accountable to no responsible, democratically elected government. This discussion serves to reinforce the point I was trying to make during my testimony, namely that Congress should take an active role in the oversight of programs which impact private citizens in this country.

II. [A]s you know, 7 of the 20 World Heritage Sites in the United States were listed as such during your tenure as our Ambassador to the U.N. In your capacity as U.N. Ambassador, did you oppose these nominations based on the fact that Congress had not specifically authorized these listings? At any point in your tenure, did you attempt to have any existing designations withdrawn on the same basis?

I refer you to my answer above. The Department of the Interior is charged with implementing the provisions of this program, not the United States' UN Representative's office. I had no role and I was not aware of the details of these programs. Now, however, that this issue has ripened, I believe it is time to restore Congress' proper role in this matter.

III. ''Your prepared testimony . . . includes the statement, 'International Committees—whatever the substance of their decisions—do not represent the American people and cannot be held accountable by them,' (emphasis added). Is it accurate to conclude from this statement that you believe specific Congressional authorization should be required for U.S. participation in any program which involves an 'international committee?' ''

Obviously, these committees do not represent the American people. That is not their function. I want to be absolutely clear on this point. Only our representatives on those committees represent Americans. Obviously, the Cuban or Libyan delegates to these committees do not represent the American people and, in fact, often oppose American interests, regardless of the issue. Neither do the New Zealand—to take a country at random—or Brazil. The United States' Congress, on the other hand, is elected and does, in fact, represent the American people. U.N. based committees, unlike Congress, are not accountable to the American people because they have not been elected by or chosen in any way by the American people. They do not represent and are not concerned with U.S. national interests nor the interests of U.S. citizens.

In this democracy, the citizens grant powers to our elected leaders through our votes from the local and state levels up to the Congress and the Presidency. We give them the power to declare our lands national parks and the right to enact the laws that restrict our use of our properties. We give our duly elected leaders the authority to select the judges who will interpret those laws. Our elected leaders, in turn, respond to our wishes because, just as we have granted them power, so may we take it from them in the next election. Representation and accountability are the foundation of the freedoms we cherish. Having fought and won elections yourself, you know this principle well.

In U.N. organizations, there is no accountability. UN bureaucrats are far removed from the American voters. Many of the States Parties in the World Heritage Treaty are not democracies. Some come from countries that do not allow the ownership of private property. The World Heritage and Man and the Biosphere committees make decisions affecting the land and lives of Americans. Some of these decisions are made by representatives chosen by governments not based on democratic representation, certainly not on the representation of Americans. What recourse does an American voter have when UN bureaucrats from Cuba or Iraq or Libya (all of which are parties to this Treaty) have made a decision that unjustly damages his or her property rights that lie near a national park? When the World Heritage committee's meddling has needlessly encumbered a private United States citizen's land and caused his or her property values to fall, that citizen's appeals to these committees (if that is even possible) will fall on deaf ears.

As for your question ''Is it accurate to conclude from this statement that you believe specific Congressional authorization should be required for U.S. participation in any program which involves an 'international committee?,' '' my answer is, in any U.N. based committee which makes decisions that importantly affect American citizens. Speaking to the issue at hand, which is the requirement of congressional authorization of World Heritage and Biosphere site designations, I definitely believe congressional authorization should be required. Congressional role should be protected, I believe, should be required, in any process, any time the Constitution specifically places a duty on Congress to act. The question presented here is specific. The Constitution mandates congressional responsibility over public land management. The World Heritage and Biosphere programs directly impact the management of public and private lands in the United States. Congress should be involved.

The Constitution grants and requires Congress' broad control over the management of the public lands. The Executive branch, through the Department of the Interior and in conjunction with the World Heritage and Man and the Biosphere programs (the ''international committees'' created by this Convention) should not be allowed to exercise Congress' constitutional authority.

IV. ''Should Congressional authorization be required for any international agreements/contracts which allow use of our national resources and public lands, such as mining or timber harvesting? If it is the case that your support for requiring Congressional authorization is limited only to those areas included in H.R. 883, please explain the specific characteristics of 'international committees' dealing with conservation which makes them particularly threatening?''

First of all, as you know, any U.N. based agreements or contracts which allow use of our natural resources and public lands require various forms of authorization from our elected officials. In this particular case, the authorization must come from Congress. The Convention itself requires that ''the inclusion of a property in the World Heritage List requires the consent of the State governed.'' [Article II, Section 3] The State in question is the United States and its consent requires the consent of the people through their duly elected representatives in accordance with the Constitution. That means Congress, the body delegated the authority over land management by the Constitution. The ''American Land Sovereignty Protection Act'' is consistent with both U.S. and international law.

In the second part of your question, you ask what are the specific characteristics of ''international committees'' dealing with conservation which makes them particularly threatening?'' My answer is, those communities which affect substantial interests of U.S. citizens. If American citizens have an interest in the conservation of a particular area, that decision should be made by Congress, the body delegated responsibility by the Constitution for making these decisions in full view of the American public. And if each decision requires consideration of costs and benefits to the property rights of individual voters affected, so be it. UNESCO committees are not competent to address the complex private property and public interest issues presented here. They have no interest in how their actions affect private U.S. citizens. I believe Congress should not abdicate its responsibilities for land management to international groups whose members have no concern for protecting individual property rights and American interests.

Sincerely,

JEANE J. KIRKPATRICK.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support H.R. 883, The American Land Sovereignty Protection Act. We must preserve and protect our nation's private property rights for our citizens and for our country.

The American Land Sovereignty Protection Act will require Congressional approval before nominating U.S. property as U.N. land designations for inclusion on the World Heritage List. This legislature will also prohibit U.S. property from being nominated as a Biosphere Reserve and it will terminate existing Biosphere Reserves if they do not meet the proper conditions. Under H.R. 883, Congress will be re-established as the ultimate decision-maker in managing public lands and maintain sovereign control of U.S. soil, not the United Nations. We must pass this legislation and halt designations made without consulting Congress or landowners.

Mr. Chairman, the United Nations has identified 92 sites in 31 states and the District of Columbia for acquisition. The fact is, property owners and local governments are routinely shut out of the process and have little recourse if their land is claimed by the U.N. or other international agencies. We must put an end to this uncalled-for seizure of our nation's land and restore control to landowners and local officials.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 883 and continue to protect our nation's soil. We must never allow foreign nations or international organizations to bully American landowners.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the American Land Sovereignty Protection Act. I and 182 of my colleagues who co-sponsored this bill believe that it is not only common sense, but also Congress' Constitutional duty, to protect the sovereignty of America's people and her land.

[1] ''Proposed U.S. World Heritage Nominations for 1981, Public Notice,'' 45 FR 48717, July 21, 1980. You will find the same language in each annual notice.

As you have heard, UN Land Designations, World Heritage Sites and Biosphere Reserves, take place without the approval of Congress and with little or no Congressional oversight; consequently, the citizens of the United States are excluded from the process. These decisions infringe upon State sovereignty, individual rights of United States citizens, and private interests in real property.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud of the beautiful forests, monuments, national parks and other lovely places in the U.S. as anyone and am thrilled that others outside the U.S. see the beauty in them as well. However, I feel very passionately that if the United Nations decides to designate the Uwharrie Forest—in the 8th District of North Carolina—as a World Heritage Site, that the people of my district should have the opportunity to address how this designation might affect them. Receiving this designation would mean that United States agrees to manage the Uwharrie Forest in accordance with an underlying international agreement which may have implications on private property outside the forest. At best, a World Heritage Site or Biosphere Reserve designation gives the international community an open invitation to interfere in how the Uwharrie, and land surrounding it, are used.

The voters of my district might decide it would be in their best interest to accept the UN designation. If that were the case, I would gladly honor the will of my constituents. However, it is their community, their lands and their livelihoods being affected, they have the right, and should have the opportunity, to have a say.

The Uwharrie Forest is just one example of a beautiful site in my district. I know each of you can think of several beautiful places in your own districts that would be prime for a UN World Heritage Site designation.

I urge you to give your constituents the chance to be involved in decisions that affect them, their private property rights and our sovereignty as a nation. I urge you to vote in favor of the Land Sovereignty Protection Act.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, when I was sworn into office, I took an oath to uphold the U.S. Constitution. Each of us has taken that same oath, and I rise to remind us of our oath of office and reflect on the words of the Constitution. Article IV, section 2 of the U.S. Constitution states, ''The Congress shall have the power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States.''

Clearly, the U.S. Constitution gives the U.S. Congress and only the U.S. Congress the authority to make all rules and regulations over Federal lands.

This authority is not given to the President, it is not given to the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations. No one in the State Department or the Department of the Interior is given this authority. The Constitution does not give this authority to the United Nations, UNESCO or any other body. The authority to establish rules and regulations over Federal lands is reserved to the U.S. Congress and only the U.S. Congress.

What does H.R. 883, this bill, require the Government to follow? The U.S. Constitution. The bill requires the specific approval of Congress before any area within the United States is subject to an international land use nomination, classification, or designation. Is this so offensive?

H.R. 883 requires the consent of Congress before the Secretary of the Interior may nominate any property in the United States for inclusion in the World Heritage list. I believe this is certainly consistent with Article IV, section 2.

H.R. 883 specifically prohibits Federal officials from nominating any land in the United States for designation as a biosphere reserve. Such designations are left to Congress to determine.

The bill requires the Congress to reconsider for designation as a biosphere reserve those sites that have already been designated as biosphere reserves by previous administrations. It restores to Congress the authority to choose to redesignate or not redesignate these sites. This is a process that should have been in place all along.

H.R. 883 prohibits Federal officials from designating any land in the United States for a special or restricted use under any international agreement unless such designation is specifically approved by law.

I call on all of my colleagues to uphold the U.S. Constitution and the constitutional authority of this body. A vote for H.R. 883 is a vote to preserve the authority of this body. A vote against H.R. 883 is a vote that quite frankly, in my opinion, is inconsistent with Article IV, section 2, and the oath that we have taken.

''The Congress shall have the power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States.''

Mr. HILL of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I believe it is critical for the United States to ensure that our lands are not subject to special international restrictions without careful consideration of the implications before a designation is made.

The increasing interdependence of the world's economic stability, environmental quality, and peace and human development are often dependent on international cooperation, but this cannot preempt the United States from meeting our obligations to our own citizens.

This legislation restricts Federal officials from designating lands under the World Heritage List of the United Nations without the express consent of Congress.

Furthermore, it amends the National Historic Preservation Act to restrict United States' lands from being designated as a Biosphere Reserve.

It gives Congress the necessary authority to approve all land designations and change any existing designations. These measures are key elements to ensuring that America remains in full control of American land.

It is critical for the United States to ensure that our lands are not subject to special international restrictions without careful consideration of the implications before a designation is made.

There is no denying that our world is becoming increasingly interdependent.

Economic stability, environmental quality, and peace and human development are often depending on international cooperation.

This interdependence, however, cannot preempt the United States from meeting our obligations to our own citizens.

I cannot support policies that place limitations on our ability to manage our own affairs.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 883.

This bill asserts that Congress under the U.S. Constitution has the power over federal lands. The American Land Sovereignty Protection Act would give Congress the authority to review, not attack, existing Biosphere Reserve and World Heritage Site designations, in order to decide if such designations are necessary.

I find it troubling that initiatives such as the United Nations Biosphere Reserves, World Heritage Sites and Ramsar Sites have been designated with virtually no Congressional supervision. Also, I find it disconcerting that all of these designations have had virtually no input from state and local officials.

Private property rights are a cornerstone to the American heritage. Our founding Fathers protected the rights of land owners. Many people in the United States have found that their private property rights are being restricted because they live in proximity to biosphere reserves. Restrictive regulations that govern these reserves are the brainchild of the United Nations, not the United States government.

Land management decisions should be made and reviewed by Congress, not arbitrarily by bureaucratic officials in the Executive Branch or international agencies.

What do my colleagues from the other side fear from Congress doing their job? Why do they fear individuals, local, state and federal entities being involved in the process? Congress should not relinquish their duty of maintaining and protecting federal lands. We must ensure the rights of American private property owners at the federal and international level. I urge the passage of this important legislation. Vote yes on H.R. 883.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule for 4 hours and is considered read.

The text of H.R. 883 is as follows:

H.R. 883

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''American Land Sovereignty Protection Act''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations governing lands belonging to the United States is vested in the Congress under article IV, section 3, of the Constitution.

(2) Some Federal land designations made pursuant to international agreements concern land use policies and regulations for lands belonging to the United States which under article IV, section 3, of the Constitution can only be implemented through laws enacted by the Congress.

(3) Some international land designations, such as those under the United States Biosphere Reserve Program and the Man and Biosphere Program of the United Nations Scientific, Educational, and Cultural Organization, operate under independent national committees, such as the United States National Man and Biosphere Committee, which have no legislative directives or authorization from the Congress.

(4) Actions by the United States in making such designations may affect the use and

value of nearby or intermixed non-Federal lands.

(5) The sovereignty of the States is a critical component of our Federal system of government and a bulwark against the unwise concentration of power.

(6) Private property rights are essential for the protection of freedom.

(7) Actions by the United States to designate lands belonging to the United States pursuant to international agreements in some cases conflict with congressional constitutional responsibilities and State sovereign capabilities.

(8) Actions by the President in applying certain international agreements to lands owned by the United States diminishes the authority of the Congress to make rules and regulations respecting these lands.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purposes of this Act are the following:

(1) To reaffirm the power of the Congress under article IV, section 3, of the Constitution over international agreements which concern disposal, management, and use of lands belonging to the United States.

(2) To protect State powers not reserved to the Federal Government under the Constitution from Federal actions designating lands pursuant to international agreements.

(3) To ensure that no United States citizen suffers any diminishment or loss of individual rights as a result of Federal actions designating lands pursuant to international agreements for purposes of imposing restrictions on use of those lands.

(4) To protect private interests in real property from diminishment as a result of Federal actions designating lands pursuant to international agreements.

(5) To provide a process under which the United States may, when desirable, designate lands pursuant to international agreements.

SEC. 3. CLARIFICATION OF CONGRESSIONAL ROLE IN WORLD HERITAGE SITE LISTING.

Section 401 of the National Historic Preservation Act Amendments of 1980 (Public Law 96–515; 94 Stat. 2987) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a) in the first sentence, by—

(A) striking ''The Secretary'' and inserting ''Subject to subsections (b), (c), (d), and (e), the Secretary''; and

(B) inserting ''(in this section referred to as the 'Convention')'' after ''1973''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsections:

''(d)(1) The Secretary of the Interior may not nominate any lands owned by the United States for inclusion on the World Heritage List pursuant to the Convention, unless—

''(A) the Secretary finds with reasonable basis that commercially viable uses of the nominated lands, and commercially viable uses of other lands located within 10 miles of the nominated lands, in existence on the date of the nomination will not be adversely affected by inclusion of the lands on the World Heritage List, and publishes that finding;

''(B) the Secretary has submitted to the Congress a report describing—

''(i) natural resources associated with the lands referred to in subparagraph (A); and

''(ii) the impacts that inclusion of the nominated lands on the World Heritage List would have on existing and future uses of the nominated lands or other lands located within 10 miles of the nominated lands; and

''(C) the nomination is specifically authorized by a law enacted after the date of enactment of the American Land Sovereignty Protection Act and after the date of publication of a finding under subparagraph (A) for the nomination.

''(2) The President may submit to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate a proposal for legislation authorizing such a nomination after publication of a finding under paragraph (1)(A) for the nomination.

''(e) The Secretary of the Interior shall object to the inclusion of any property in the United States on the list of World Heritage in Danger established under Article 11.4 of the Convention, unless—

''(1) the Secretary has submitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate a report describing—

''(A) the necessity for including that property on the list;

''(B) the natural resources associated with the property; and

''(C) the impacts that inclusion of the property on the list would have on existing and future uses of the property and other property located within 10 miles of the property proposed for inclusion; and

''(2) the Secretary is specifically authorized to assent to the inclusion of the property on the list, by a joint resolution of the Congress after the date of submittal of the report required by paragraph (1).

''(f) The Secretary of the Interior shall submit an annual report on each World Heritage Site within the United States to the Chairman and Ranking Minority member of the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives and of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate, that contains for the year covered by the report the following information for the site:

''(1) An accounting of all money expended to manage the site.

''(2) A summary of Federal full time equivalent hours related to management of the site.

''(3) A list and explanation of all nongovernmental organizations that contributed to the management of the site.

''(4) A summary and account of the disposition of complaints received by the Secretary related to management of the site.''.

SEC. 4. PROHIBITION AND TERMINATION OF UNAUTHORIZED UNITED NATIONS BIOSPHERE RESERVES.

Title IV of the National Historic Preservation Act Amendments of 1980 (16 U.S.C. 470a–1 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 403. (a) No Federal official may nominate any lands in the United States for designation as a Biosphere Reserve under the Man and Biosphere Program of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.

''(b) Any designation on or before the date of enactment of the American Land Sovereignty Protection Act of an area in the United States as a Biosphere Reserve under the Man and Biosphere Program of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization shall not have, and shall not be given, any force or effect, unless the Biosphere Reserve—

''(1) is specifically authorized by a law enacted after that date of enactment and before December 31, 2000;

''(2) consists solely of lands that on that date of enactment are owned by the United States; and

''(3) is subject to a management plan that specifically ensures that the use of intermixed or adjacent non-Federal property is not limited or restricted as a result of that designation.

''(c) The Secretary of State shall submit an annual report on each Biosphere Reserve within the United States to the Chairman and Ranking Minority member of the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate, that contains for the year covered by the report the following information for the reserve:

''(1) An accounting of all money expended to manage the reserve.

''(2) A summary of Federal full time equivalent hours related to management of the reserve.

''(3) A list and explanation of all nongovernmental organizations that contributed to the management of the reserve.

''(4) A summary and account of the disposition of the complaints received by the Secretary related to management of the reserve.''.

SEC. 5. INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS IN GENERAL.

Title IV of the National Historic Preservation Act Amendments of 1980 (16 U.S.C. 470a–1 et seq.) is further amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 404. (a) No Federal official may nominate, classify, or designate any lands owned by the United States and located within the United States for a special or restricted use under any international agreement unless such nomination, classification, or designation is specifically authorized by law. The President may from time to time submit to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate proposals for legislation authorizing such a nomination, classification, or designation.

''(b) A nomination, classification, or designation, under any international agreement, of lands owned by a State or local government shall have no force or effect unless the nomination, classification, or designation is specifically authorized by a law enacted by the State or local government, respectively.

''(c) A nomination, classification, or designation, under any international agreement, of privately owned lands shall have no force or effect without the written consent of the owner of the lands.

''(d) This section shall not apply to—

''(1) agreements established under section 16(a) of the North American Wetlands Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 4413); and

''(2) conventions referred to in section 3(h)(3) of the Fish and Wildlife Improvement Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 712(2)).

''(e) In this section, the term 'international agreement' means any treaty, compact, executive agreement, convention, bilateral agreement, or multilateral agreement between the United States or any agency of the United States and any foreign entity or agency of any foreign entity, having a primary purpose of conserving, preserving, or protecting the terrestrial or marine environment, flora, or fauna.''.

SEC. 6. CLERICAL AMENDMENT.

Section 401(b) of the National Historic Preservation Act Amendments of 1980 (16 U.S.C. 470a–1(b)) is amended by striking ''Committee on Natural Resources'' and inserting ''Committee on Resources''.

The CHAIRMAN. No amendment to the bill is in order except those printed in the portion of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD designated for that purpose and pro forma amendments for purpose of debate. Amendments printed in the RECORD may be offered only by the Member who caused it to be printed or his designee and shall be considered read.

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone a request for a recorded vote on any amendment and may reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the time for voting on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote, provided that the time for

voting on the first question shall be a minimum of 15 minutes.

Are there any amendments to the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF ALASKA

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 10 offered by Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

On page 9, line 13, strike ''2000'' and insert instead ''2003''.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a technical amendment which simply extends the time for grandfathering existing Biosphere Reserves by 3 years to 2003. I ask my colleagues for their support.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I gladly yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to the amendment. Perfecting this bill is a very tall task, but the gentleman has made one modest effort to do so.

As long as the gentleman continues to yield, I point out that I understand that I will offer just one amendment, as I had indicated to the gentleman. I was not aware that of course the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) has an amendment, and I understand the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY) has an amendment. I was not aware of those amendments yesterday at the Committee on Rules.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, neither was I. So the gentleman is true to his word.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I have no objection to trying to improve this bill. It needs significant improvement.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. VENTO

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 9 offered by Mr. VENTO:

At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

''SEC. 7. INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS CONCERNING THE DISPOSAL, MANAGEMENT, AND USE OF LANDS BELONGING TO THE UNITED STATES.

Title IV of the National Historic Preservation Act Amendments of 1980 (16 U.S.C. 470a–1 et seq.) is further amended by adding at the end the following new section:

SEC. 405.—No Federal official may enter into an agreement with any international or foreign entity (including any subsidiary thereof) providing for the disposal, management, and use of any lands owned by the United States and located within the United States unless such agreement is specifically authorized by law. The President may from time to time submit to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate proposals for legislation authorizing such agreements.''.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I guess according the rule we are not going to read the amendment, but this amendment is an important amendment that deals with the key component of the pending legislation.

This legislation specifically requires to approve the recognition of any U.S. lands for conservation purposes as a result of an agreement with a foreign entity. However, at the same time, the legislation does not require similar congressional action when U.S.-owned lands are leased, oftentimes at a loss to American taxpayers, to foreign-owned countries for such things as drilling, mining under the 1872 mining law, timber harvesting, or other types of commercial endeavors.

My amendment establishes a parity in that process. My amendment would suggest that commercial users and development of U.S. lands by foreign companies and their U.S. subsidiaries may only be established when specifically authorized by law. My amendment would not prevent such activities from occurring. It would simply require Congress to approve such actions.

The Vento amendment in which I am joined by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL) and the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), the ranking member of the Committee on Resources in this amendment is a responsible provision that responds to the abuses which are now occurring and which neither Congress nor the administration can legally stop.

Many of my colleagues may recall the public outcry when it was revealed that the concession facilities at Yosemite National Park were going to be managed by a Japanese conglomerate, Matsushita. No legal recourse was available to block that action.

A similar outrage was voiced when the Secretary of Interior was required under Federal law to lease lands containing more than $10 billion in gold to a subsidiary of a Canadian-owned corporation who paid less than $10,000 for that particular $10 billion gold mine.

Nothing has been done to prevent a repeat of this type of continued rip-off. A foreign firm can still operate the concession for the Statue of Liberty or any other of our national parks. Foreign firms can continue to exploit American resources while at the same time at the expense of the American taxpayers.

We now have an opportunity to change that policy. The Vento amendment will not prevent these activities from moving forward, Mr. Chairman, it would simply require the Congress to consider the national consequences and specifically authorize these actions.

If we are going to require Congress to approve actions to recognize U.S.-owned lands for conservation purposes of all things to save migrating waterfall, for instance, on a global basis or to recognize our World Heritage sites, some of our outstanding crown jewels, our parks, our natural or cultural areas in the parks, or simply for Congress to approve when we are going to agree with the cooperative research like under the Man and the Biosphere program, then Congress should also approve actions by foreign firms or individuals to in fact use exploitative activities on U.S. lands.

I understand those activities, the U.S. lands, of course, are going to be used for mining, for timber harvesting, for grazing, water rights, a variety of other things, but the issue is that, if it is going to be done by foreign entities, we hand over the ownership, this has real impact, this particular amendment. Unlike this bill which simply relies upon the existing laws, the fact is this has real impact in terms of trying to limit these types of activities.

So I want to add this particular amendment to this for that reason, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, the black helicopters are circling over our lands.

And the agents of foreign powers are indeed locking up our public lands, intent upon not only controlling them, but ultimately, America's very natural resource heritage.

But to be sure, the pilots of these helicopters are not wearing the blue helmets of the United Nations.

Rather, they are wearing the corporate emblems of companies based in South Africa, Australia, Luxembourg and Canada.

These foreign agents are not from the United Nations. Their weapons are not world heritage sites or international biospheres.

Indeed, the true threat comes from foreign conglomerates, multi-national mining firms, who swoop down upon our public lands and extract gold and silver with no rents or royalties paid to the American people.

The UN Charter, in this instance, is not the issue.

It is our very own Mining Law of 1872 which continues, with reckless disregard to our economy and our environment, to turn over federal assets to the control of foreign nationals.

And so, I rise in support of the Vento-Rahall-Miller amendment to this bill, the American Land Sovereignty Protection Act.

For if we are to protect the sovereignty of our American lands from foreign powers, then we must include commercial developments undertaken by foreign powers in the legislation.

This is what this amendment is all about.

Our lands, our resources, owned by all Americans, are being claimed by foreign entities.

The hardrock minerals on these lands are being mined with no return to the public.

And these lands are being privatized by foreign entities for a mere pittance—$2.50 an acre.

Allowed under the Mining Law of 1872? Yes.

Should these practices continue to be condoned in 1999. No. Of course not.

So the real issue here today is not what the proponents of H.R. 883 make it out to be.

It is not about the UN. It is not about black helicopters descending upon an unsuspecting populace.

It is, in these times of budgetary constraint, about the relinquishment of our lands, and our minerals, to multinational conglomerates for fast food hamburger prices.

Cast a vote for America.

Vote yes on Vento-Rahall-Miller.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I reluctantly accept the amendment.

□ 1230

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. BASS). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. VENTO).

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 180, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. VENTO) will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. UDALL OF COLORADO

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 5 offered by Mr. UDALL of Colorado:

Page 9, line 6, after ''in the United States'' insert ''(other than an area within the State of Colorado)''

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple amendment. It would exempt all the Biosphere Reserves in Colorado from the provisions of the bill that would end the participation of U.S. sites in the Man and the Biosphere program unless we pass and the President signs a new law to continue their participation.

As I noted in general debate, currently there are two of these reserves in Colorado, the Niwot Ridge Research Area and Rocky Mountain National Park. They include lands within the Second Congressional District which I represent.

Mr. Chairman, these areas are not involved in some conspiracy. They are not part of any sinister foreign plot to undermine our Constitution or our way of life. On the contrary, they are places where good things are taking place.

In the Niwot Ridge area, scientists associated with the University of Colorado are doing important research about air pollution and other environmental issues in cooperation with scientists from other countries, such as the Czech Republic. This is important work, work that needs to continue; and my amendment would allow that to happen without interruption.

As for Rocky Mountain National Park, all I can say is that this is one of Colorado's brightest gems, one of the things that makes us proud to be Coloradans. Rising up from the edge of the Great Plains, it straddles the Continental Divide and includes snow-capped peaks, high-altitude tundra, and a diverse array of other land forms and a splendid diversity of vegetation and wildlife.

As Coloradans, we are glad to share its beauty with the Nation and we invite the world to experience it. And the world is doing just that, at least in part, because of its designation as a Biosphere Reserve. The National Park Service tells me that many visitors say that they learned of the park because it was included in the Man and the Biosphere program and that is what made them want to visit it.

As one who believes there is a benefit to every visitor to special wildlands like Rocky Mountain National Park, I am convinced that that is reason enough to keep the park in this program. But it is also true that tourism is a very important part of Colorado's economy, and that is another reason to keep the park in the program, which my amendment would do.

Let me be clear, Mr. Chairman. Adoption of my amendment will not make this a good bill. Even if this amendment is adopted, that alone will not be sufficient for me to be able to support the bill. But this amendment will protect Colorado from some of the worst consequences of the bill, and to that extent I think it is very, very important.

Accordingly, I urge adoption of the Udall amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

These Biosphere Reserves were designated without congressional authorization and without consulting the public or State and local governments. This amendment invades the responsibility, again, of the Congress under Article IV, section 3 of the Constitution, making all laws concerning disposal or regulation of lands belonging to the United States with Congress.

Under H.R. 883, existing Biosphere Reserves would have until December 31, 2003, to get authorization. They are not automatically disenfranchised. If the Colorado Biosphere Reserve had the strong local support claimed by the gentleman that offered the amendment, then there would be no problem of getting the passage of this legislation in this Congress.

If I am still chairman of that committee, I will commit to the gentleman that I will support it if his people want to have it in that district. If they do not, it would not occur.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment of my good friend and colleague from Colorado (Mr. UDALL). The sites that he identifies that presently exist in Colorado, the Niwot Ridge Reserve and specifically also the Rocky Mountain National Park, are being designated sites under the Heritage Act.

Specifically, the Rocky Mountain National Park, of course, has been around for a long time and has been the protected environmental jewel in the crown of Colorado for a long, long time. It is peculiar, to say the least, that some other kind of designation, some United Nations designation, would help continue or would help preserve the environmental uniqueness of this particular property, or anything else in the State of Colorado, for that matter.

My colleague talks about the many tourists that flock to the State to see these places, especially Rocky Mountain Park. He is certainly correct in that; and, of course, they come in droves. In fact, one of our problems in Colorado is that oftentimes we have far too many people trying to get into these particular areas and preserves, into Rocky Mountain National Park; and our problem is trying to deal with the numbers coming in and the impact that that has on the Rocky Mountain Park and on many things that we are trying to protect.

When I was in the committee, Mr. Chairman, and we were debating this bill, it was a very interesting situation that occurred, in that in the State of Wyoming there was an attempt on the part of some people in the State of Wyoming to develop some mining adjacent to Yellowstone National Park, and all the processes were underway. The environmental impact statements had been ordered and were underway.

We had spent years actually in the process of identifying the problems and trying to come to a solution as to whether or not it was appropriate to let this mine go forward. All of a sudden, within I think it was a short period of time, a week or less, that we were going to actually get the final go-ahead on this project in Wyoming, the head of the Park Service stepped in and called upon the United Nations to come out to this particular area and give it a designation that would, in fact, prohibit any future development. And when that happened, the administration intervened and everything stopped.

Now, this is the kind of thing I am concerned about in the State of Colorado, and this is why I certainly oppose the amendment of the gentleman that would exempt Colorado from the protection provided by this particular bill. We need this protection just as much as any other State in the Nation because the same thing could happen in Colorado.

We think we know about how to preserve and protect the land that we have under our control in the State of Colorado and with the Department of Parks and Recreation. We do not need the United Nations to tell us how to manage that land. We do not need the imprimatur of the United Nations on Rocky Mountain Park in order to encourage tourism to Colorado. We can do it without them.

In fact, oftentimes, as in the case I just stated, this United Nations designation becomes much more problematic from the standpoint of the proper regulation of the land within any State, in this case Colorado.

So I certainly rise to oppose the amendment of the gentleman from the Second Congressional District.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, at the risk of getting involved in this Colorado feud, obviously this does not improve the bill enough, but I think it is a modest step, and I want to support the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) whenever I get a chance, Mr. Chairman.

The fact is that most of the land designations, I would suggest to my colleague from Colorado, whether it is Park Service Organic Act or the Frasier Experimental Station or the others, inherent in them, in these designations of wilderness, is the concept of doing scientific research. I mean, that is what the Organic Act has, that is what the Wilderness Act of 1964 has in it. That is one of the purposes.

And so, insofar as the Man and the Biosphere program that my colleague was alluding to, and I guess I saw four sites that were affected by that. My colleague said there were two. The gentleman had earlier said there were six. I found four. So there are some sites in Colorado that may not be well understood where they are. But one is the Frasier Experimental Station, as my colleague probably has noticed. Another was the Rocky Mountain National Park, a wonderful area.

Now, I suppose the problem of getting people in and out, that that was such a big problem, I think that is a good problem in terms of Rocky Mountain. And I hope we can solve some of the transportation problems that exist around those parks, but I would not suggest that to solve that we take away the designation of the park, and I am sure my colleagues from Colorado would not suggest that, either.

In any case, that was the purpose. The purpose of this is, and just as a way of using this amendment to point out, that most of the laws that are applicable that are engaged in the agreements we have are already in place. We already passed judgment on these issues. We did it once.

Now, some of my colleagues may want to do it again. Some may have objections. Obviously, we continue to hear about the Ozarks issue, a large area that was proposed as a biosphere. But in that case, whatever system was in place, however cumbersome it was, it worked. They did not designate that particular site.

With regards to Yellowstone, I think it is important to recognize, and the gentleman from Colorado, our friend and colleague, brought up the issue of Yellowstone again, as did our colleague from Wyoming (Mrs. CUBIN), that in fact it was designated a World Heritage Site long throughout the process of the mine evaluation, EIS.

What happened is that the committee decided that if that mine was going to go in, it became a Heritage Site at risk, endangered type of site. And of course the committee can make that declaration. It had absolutely no effect on the decision that was made, other than it might have persuaded the Park Service or others to pay a little closer attention.

I mean, we cannot take away free speech in this process. We cannot take away free thought in terms of what is going to happen. We cannot do that with legislation here. In fact, we as a Nation enshrine the concept of free debate and free thought with regard to these issues. And it is as if this legislation is trying to reach out and prevent somebody from making a judgment about the U.S. and how we manage our lands. We cannot do that.

For instance, if somebody is mismanaging lands in other areas, we obviously are going to speak about it, whether it is Amazonia and/or other parts of the world, other rain forests. So we are going to speak out about it.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VENTO. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for yielding.

I just wanted to make a couple other comments in response to the points that my colleague from Colorado made, as well as my colleague from Minnesota.

It seems, as I hear this debate today, all roads lead to the New World Mine. We keep coming back to that particular situation. And I think there is a continued debate about what happened there, and we ought to continue to figure out ways in the long run to mitigate those kind of situations when we have a big mining project on the edge of a national park that is so important to us, the Yellowstone National Park.

But I am offering my amendment in the spirit of let us not let that conflict and that situation affect what is going on in Colorado. There are important research projects occurring at Niwot Ridge and occurring in Rocky Mountain National Park. I do not see what the problem is that we are fixing in Colorado. In fact, I think we are creating a problem by doing this.

So I urge adoption of my amendment. Let us not hurt Colorado and some of the other States that are involved in these projects, this important Man and the Biosphere project, because of what happened in one case in Yellowstone National Park.

□ 1245

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. BASS). The time of the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. VENTO) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. VENTO was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I of course rose in support of the amendment. But I use this as an indication of what is generally wrong with the entire thought process and what is going on with this particular legislation. I do not think it is repairable by this amendment or others that might be offered. It is a flawed bill. These discussions and debates ought to be going on in subcommittee rather than the sort of exaggerated statements that we had. Unfortunately, they did not. So we are on the floor. I would think that there would be more important business that could and should be considered by this Congress on this floor.

Mr. Chairman, I support this amendment.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO).

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Chairman, I just would conclude with a comment, a quote actually from Jeane Kirkpatrick that I think encompasses everything we have tried to establish here on our side about our concerns with regard to this amendment in particular and to the concerns of our opponents to this bill in general:

> If American citizens have an interest in the conservation of a particular area, that decision should be made by Congress, the body designated responsibility by the Constitution for making these decisions in full view of the American public. And if each decision requires consideration of costs and benefit to the property rights of individual voters affected, so be it. UNESCO committees are not competent to address the complex private property and public interest issues presented here.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SWEENEY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. VENTO. I appreciate the quotes from the former U.N. representative Jeane Kirkpatrick. Seven World Heritage sites were designated while she was in that role. So apparently, as with Mr. Hodel, he has now since then, being strongly in support of them in the 1980s when they were in control or in power, now have found reason to oppose these sites. But I think actions speak louder than words. I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL).

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 180, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. SWEENEY

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 4 offered by Mr. SWEENEY:

Page 9, line 16, after ''management plan'' insert the following: ''that specifically ensures that the designation does not affect State or local government revenue, including revenue for public education programs, and''.

(Mr. SWEENEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) for affording me the opportunity at rather a late moment to introduce my amendment. My good friend the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) just said that all roads in this bill and this debate and this discussion seem to lead to the New World Mine. The reason I am happy I am able to introduce my amendment is because I think it will serve a number of purposes. But one point that can definitively be made is that that is not true, that all roads are not leading in this matter to the New World Mine, that it has impact on the individuals, of people throughout this Nation and in particular in my district.

We have heard eloquent debate on both sides of the issue, speakers who have spoken of the need for greater local input and greater input from individuals, and those who have said or who have perceived that these issues involve just the use of public lands. That is not true at all. My amendment expands the existing provisions of H.R. 883 by requiring the Secretary of Interior as part of the management plan to also ensure that the biosphere designation does not affect the revenue of State and local governments, including and probably most importantly the revenue for public education programs.

Mr. Chairman, as we have heard, the manner in which international land use agreements have been carried out can tend at times to infringe on the authority of our local municipalities and individuals. My amendment would help protect State and local governments from experiencing a decrease in real property values. As those in many struggling local townships and counties in upstate New York which I represent know all too well, depressed property values serve to depress property tax revenues, the major source for education funding in this country. Today, there are 47 U.N. Biosphere Reserves and 20 World Heritage Sites and there is not an argument on this side of the aisle that there is not some legitimacy and need for these agreements. But many of these international agreements were established without local input and certainly without congressional input or approval. This is not government of the people, for the people, by the people, it is detached internationalism in the eyes of many. Most U.N. designations, including the ones in my district, encompass privately held lands, not just public lands.

Most of all, there have been instances where no communication with local officials and community residents took place about the effects of designating these lands. These are the people that it affects the most. These are the people in most instances who have rightful ownership of the property that is being affected, who define their freedom in fact by virtue of that ability to own these lands. The current process of selecting U.N. Biosphere Reserves with no recourse for those local residents and their elected officials affected must end.

In the 22nd Congressional District of New York, which I represent, there is now one of the largest U.S. Biosphere Reserves housed in the Adirondack Mountains. The private landowners and townships in the Adirondacks had no idea that the Adirondack Park Agency, a quasi-State agency, quietly approved the U.N. biosphere designation and residents were helpless to impact on that, to stop it, to comment on it. In fact, that designated area encompasses 7 million acres of privately held land. It encompasses territories outside the purview and jurisdiction of the Adirondack Park Agency. Yet it has become part of that designated area.

Let me tell my colleagues from experience, the U.N. biosphere is an unwanted cloud now that hangs over a good part of the Adirondack region. My congressional district is one with the greatest interest in seeing that this practice is reined in, that the input and the voice of the local individual be heard. It is unfair that my constituents are not included in any discussions that directly affect them and that I as their representative in Congress have practically no avenue to express their concerns.

The Secretary of Interior must be required to make the case of U.N. designation to State and local governments as well as this Congress and our Federal bureaucracies should be held accountable to this Congress for any of the effects that international agreements will cause. It is imperative that we protect the rights of our private property owners and the legitimate interests of local governments and their citizens. This bill accomplishes those objectives and my amendment I believe strengthens it by elevating the interests of State and local governments and the effects of U.N. designations on their ability to collect revenue. It is important to the private property owners, it is important to the citizens of those regions, it is important to public education in those areas.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support my amendment and support this important bill.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to take this opportunity to speak today in support of this important legislation, H.R. 883—the American Land Sovereignty Protection Act.

My district in upstate New York has one of the largest U.N. Biosphere Reserves in the United States, thus I have a direct interest in H.R. 883 and strongly support its passage.

H.R. 883 clearly addresses the concerns many of us have had with the U.N. Biosphere Reserve and World Heritage Sites programs.

As we know, the U.N. Biosphere Reserve program has been operating with essentially no public or congressional oversight for the past 25 years. And without such oversight often, no one is accountable.

These designations can have a marked impact on the properties in and around the biosphere region, yet, in most cases, neither local government nor property owners are ever consulted regarding the designation or site consideration.

As an example, in my congressional district, the Champlain-Adirondack Biosphere Reserve was created in 1989 at the request of a quasi-governmental agency—the Adirondack Park Agency.

This was done without hearings or formal input from local citizens of the Adirondacks; thus the residents were left feeling helpless and in the reality had no impact upon it. The result was a very bitter feeling and rightfully so over an unwanted imposition on private landowners.

Given negative effect on property values, and compounded by the cavalier attitudes of those handing down designations and the blatant disregard for local authority, I would submit that with congressional oversight and public input, many of these U.N. sites would not have been approved in their current form.

The American Land Sovereignty Protection Act unequivocally states that no land in this country can be included in international land use programs without the clear and direct approval of Congress.

H.R. 883 is a first step in the right direction in returning power to the local citizens as well as the elected Representatives in Congress.

Most importantly, this bill reasserts the constitutional rights of property owners to make property decisions, within local zoning authority, without interference from the United Nations whose mandate does not necessarily include concern for our town halls, school houses, or individual property owners in any given area.

What recourse do affected landowners have against the United Nations bureaucracy?

Absolutely none.

This bill changes that. I urge your support.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York spoke of 7,000 acres of land that apparently falls under a biosphere, some other impact.

Mr. SWEENEY. If the gentleman will yield, seven million acres.

Mr. VENTO. Seven million acres.

Mr. SWEENEY. In the Adirondack region of New York State that are privately owned.

Mr. VENTO. I appreciate that and am happy to yield to the gentleman briefly.

Did the gentleman have any instance where there was some problem that arose out of that designation with regards to private property owners?

Mr. SWEENEY. There have been a number of instances where private property owners in the use of their property, in the valuation of their property and their ability to develop and cultivate that property have been infringed upon based upon the designation. I think the gentleman misses the point, that the most predominant frustration that those constituents of mine have——

Mr. VENTO. Just reclaiming my time for a minute, we have been through this with others that have claimed that but we have yet to substantiate any of those types of claims. So if the gentleman could help substantiate that, I think it would go a long way towards solving a problem. Because right now the way the bill stands, I think it is purporting to solve problems, in my judgment, that do not exist. On the amendment that the gentleman has, he suggests to insert after ''management plan'' on line 16, and it is amendment No. 4, I believe; is that correct?

Mr. SWEENEY. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. VENTO. The gentleman says that after ''management plan,'' he wants to put in language that specifically ensures, and I am quoting from the gentleman's amendment, ''that specifically ensures that the designation does not affect State or local government revenue, including revenue for public education programs, and.''

What if the revenue increases? What if it decreases? According to this amendment, you would have to demonstrate that you would have a static situation, that there would be no increase and no decrease in revenue. That is the effect of the gentleman's amendment. Is the gentleman aware of the effect of his amendment?

Mr. SWEENEY. If the gentleman will yield further, that is not the effect at all. I think the effect is one that is a basic premise of citizenship, and that is the right of citizens to know the impact that their government or any other entity might have on their particular property.

Mr. VENTO. Reclaiming my time, it is not just a question of knowing this. It is this is one of the requirements. It says that ''any designation under this law, the Man and Biosphere Program, shall not have, and shall not be given, any force or effect,'' and then you are putting down, ''that specifically ensures that the designation does not affect State or local government revenue, including revenue for public education programs.''

So it can have no effect, no effect going up, no effect going down. That is what it says. That would completely vitiate the ability to, and this is almost an impossible test in this bill in any case.

So I might say, I do not know, this is sort of what I would call piling on in football. I would have long ago blown the whistle. This is what the amendment has. I understand that the gentleman may not have had that intention. But we are not going on the basis of intention. We are going on what is written in the law.

Mr. SWEENEY. If the gentleman will yield further, this is not an issue of remedies, it is an issue of notice. I think it is fundamental in the proposal that any U.N. Biosphere area be designated, that this Congress and the individuals and the constituents in that area affected have the right to know of the effect of that designation.

My amendment simply calls for the providing of that notice. It says nothing to the effect of imposing any sanction or remedy.

Mr. VENTO. Reclaiming my time, if the gentleman will look at his amendment again. It says that specifically ensures, the plan has to ensure that the designation does not affect State or local government revenue, including revenue for public. So it does not affect it. What does he mean by does not affect it? He means it goes up or down, does he not? What happens to revenue?

Mr. SWEENEY. If the gentleman will yield, it requires the Secretary of Interior to report back to Congress of the cost effects, the property tax in particular, effects on any of those affected individual properties.

Mr. VENTO. What if the values go up as a result of this designation?

Mr. SWEENEY. That should certainly be part of the debate that we have at that time on any of those designations.

Mr. VENTO. It would be invalidated based on that. I just think it is an inartfully drawn amendment. As I said, I think the amendment just represents piling on. For that reason, I do not intend to support it. I think it is not well drawn, and I wanted to point out the effect of that. I think the test here in this bill would make it nearly impossible to have this voluntary scientific cooperation in the process. I do not know the purpose of this. This amendment obviously is not drawn well. But unfortunately under the rule that the gentleman perhaps voted for, I did not, we had to preprint everything in the RECORD ahead of time and we are all limited in time here. You do not really have the right to perfect your amendment or correct these types of problems, another little issue the gentleman ought to take up with the Committee on Rules under a so-called open rule.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF ALASKA TO AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. SWEENEY

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Young of Alaska to amendment No. 4 offered by Mr. Sweeney: Insert ''adversely'' before ''affect''.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, it is my intent to offer this amendment, which I have just done, I do think it is germane, to try to improve the amendment of Mr. SWEENEY, which I do believe his amendment is clear, but the gentleman from Minnesota has raised a question. I want to make sure that this now is perfectly clear, for adverse effect only.

□ 1300

Mr. Chairman, I urge support of the amendment.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. BASS). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY).

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY), as amended.

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 180, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY), as amended, will be postponed.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this legislation and in support of the Vento and the Udall amendments that have been offered and against the Sweeney amendment that has been offered in the committee today.

First and foremost, let me say that I think this is a very unfortunate piece of legislation. It plays into some conspiracy theories that somehow, when we receive the honor of the designation of World Heritage area or the Biosphere Reserve Program or were part of the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands, that somehow this is land use planning by the United Nations. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Mr. Chairman, there is nothing in these designations that changes any Federal, State, local laws or regulations pertaining to these lands or changes the manner in which private property owners can use their lands, but what it does do is it provides an honor for some of the great natural assets of the United States and some of the great historical assets of the United States that leads to increased tourism, improved economics, and recognition of what this Nation has done in setting aside some of the great national parks and public spaces in the entire world, and I think we ought to welcome that kind of designation.

I also want to say that it is very clear when we consider the Vento amendment that much more harm has been done to public lands and done to private lands because of the acquisition of these lands by foreign entities that then come in here and take the resources from those lands, whether it is mining or whether it is timber or grazing or other proposals like this, where then we end up spending hundreds of millions if not billions of taxpayers' dollars cleaning up after these entities, making up for erosion, making up for the destruction and the deterioration of those natural assets.

That is why I think that the Vento amendment is very, very important for its adoption today because we should not just have a willy-nilly process where people come in, buy these assets, exploit the resource and then leave it to the American citizens to pick up the cost of their bad policies, their bad management and mistakes in the use of those lands and those resources.

So I would hope that Members would vote against this bill on passage, and I would hope that they would support the Udall and the Vento amendments, and I want to thank the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. VENTO) very much for his managing this bill on the floor today, and his involvement in this issue over the last several years in trying to put this argument into perspective and show how foolish it is and how much it is based upon fallacy and misrepresentation of facts.

Also, I think he said something in the Committee on Rules the other day that is very important, that success with this legislation is really about the first step in removing the designations from our great wilderness areas, from our parks areas, from our national monuments, because the same people who support this legislation in fact oppose the designation and the protection and the acquisition of these great lands for the use of the people of the United States, for all of the people of the United States. As much as those people support it, we have a small group of people in the Congress and in this country who insist that somehow these lands really do not belong in the public domain in spite of the fact that millions of Americans will pick up their families, their children, and they will travel across this country to visit the Statue of Liberty, to visit Liberty Hall, to visit the Grand Tetons, the Grand Canyon, Bryce, Yosemite and so many other great monuments and great natural assets in the national park systems of this country.

There is still a few in this Congress who want to believe that we should roll back designations. This legislation is the first step in that process, and this Congress ought to reject that effort.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's support in this battle, and I think we are winning it and we should win it.

Mr. Chairman, the problem in our country is not with the designation and the parks that are embraced by our people. They are, in fact, among the most popular and the most strongly supported by the public. The parks really represent what is right with our country. It is one of the best ideas we have ever had. And it is not, Mr. Chairman, I might say, the scientists that are doing research on natural resources that are at risk. These are not the problems in terms of our public lands and in our communities, in terms of scientific research that is being done in these parks or in these areas. That is not a problem, but this bill purports to solve that problem. It solves the problem of the designation of our parks, recognition of our parks. It tries to solve the problem of scientific research, to strip away the ability to do collaborative research. That is what the essence of these treaties and agreements exist.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) has expired.

(On request of Mr. VENTO, and by unanimous consent, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. VENTO. So it is not the scientists that are doing research that are the problem, and in fact we can on a global basis cooperate and encourage other nations to work with them and do the type of scientific research that is necessary. We can study all we want within the United States, but we have got 1,900 other sites around the world that this permits us to study in, and other sites that it permits us to recognize as natural or cultural.

So this is an assault on parks. It is an assault on research. That is really what it purports. The problems here are the mines, they are the clear cuts, they are the destruction of rain forests, the burning of rain forests. They are the uncontrolled types of mining that goes on in other nations. That is where the problems exist largely, and we ought to be coming to grips with those: the drift nets in the oceans, the destruction of the biosphere.

Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, the first efforts, the first timid efforts of this Nation and of this global community to try to deal even with the recognition of parks in a honorific way and the research of scientists, this bill attacks. I think it is a misunderstood bill, I think it is a bad bill, I think it is bad policy, and I hope the Congress will reject this, the House will reject this, today.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, and let me just say, as my colleagues know, it is with great pride that the American people point to their national park system, it is with great pride that the American people know that the Statue of Liberty stands in New York Harbor and sends a beacon to the world about the tenets and the values of this Nation, and it is a great pride that those assets, the Grand Canyon, the Everglades, the Statue of Liberty and others, when the rest of the world honors, honors the decision that people in this country made about setting aside those public lands for public use, and it is a great honor that the millions of Americans choose to visit those parks each year to enjoy them, to participate in them, to learn from them. But it is also a task of this Congress and of the world community to make sure that we learn more about those parks that we are able to maintain.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, we are able to maintain and protect those parks, and this Congress has a rather checkered past on that. But if we put it to the American people, they would vote to spend billions of dollars to maintain and protect the great parks of this Nation.

It is an honor to this Nation that people come from all over the world to visit these parks, that nations come to us and send their representatives here to learn how to do the same thing in Asia and Africa and Europe, all over. All over the world people want to emulate what Theodore Roosevelt started and what we have protected on a bipartisan basis.

Now we have a group of people who decided that they are going to roll that back, they are going to take away that designation, they are going to remove this honor from the American people. The pride of this Nation, the beacon we send to the rest of the world; they now have decided that they want to remove this honor and start that process of denigrating these most valuable and cherished public lands in our Nation. The pride of our Nation as we send out messages to the world about conservation, about the protection of public lands, about the values of this country.

This legislation is absolutely looney, it is absolutely looney. It is based in some unknown conspiracy, unsubstantiated, based upon the fact that some people believe that day in and day out they see black helicopters swooping in to protect the national parks of the United States.

No, Mr. Chairman, that is not how it is done in this country, it will never be done that way in this country, and this legislation should not try to validate those kinds of crazy conspiracy theories.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Are there further amendments to the bill?

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have just heard one of the greatest presentations of looney tunes I have ever heard. Very frankly, this is nothing to do with the parks. We do not invade the parks, we do not invade any of the other areas. We are trying to reestablish the congressional activity in designating land and not letting the U.N.

I have to remind people the U.N. organizations are not accountable. U.N. bureaucrats are far removed from the American voters, and remember, many of the U.N. delegates that make these decisions do not believe in privately-held property. Their countries are owned by dictators or owned by governments that do not have private property, and when they make decisions, the United States, under our Constitution affecting private property rights, that is wrong.

All my bill does is have the Congress get back involved in the designation of lands. If they are so heavily supported, those outside the parks, then I suggest respectfully they will be easily passed in this Congress. It does not affect any of the parks or any of the reference here or any of the Heritage Sites such as the Statue of Liberty. My bill does not affect that. All we do is put the committee, this Congress, back into the process of designating the lands.

UNESCO,
Paris, France, March 6, 1995.

Hon. GEORGE T. FRAMPTON, Jr.,
Assistant Secretary for Fish & Wildlife & Parks, U.S. Department of the Interior, Office of the Secretary, Washington, DC, USA.

DEAR MR. FRAMPTON: I am writing to you with respect to a letter from a group of North American conservation organizations, addressed to Dr. Adul Wichiencharoen, Chairman of the World Heritage Committee, and dated 28 February, 1995. The World Heritage Committee is the executive body of the Convention and is elected by its 140 States Parties. I note that a copy of this letter was sent to your office. The letter concerns the possible listing of Yellowstone National Park on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The World Heritage Committee had been made aware of some of these concerns in a brief report by the United States Delegate to the July 1993 meeting of the World Heritage Bureau.

The fourteen organizations signing this letter are as you know among the most prestigious and influential in the field of natural resources conservation. We believe that the concerns they raise about the threats to Yellowstone must be carefully examined and addressed.

Included with their letter was a briefing book containing copies of correspondence from the Governor of Wyoming and Senator Baucus of Montana, each raises serious questions about the potential damage to Yellowstone National Park, in particular from the proposed mining operation. Similar letters of concern are provided from professional geologists, geomorphologists and hydrologists who have investigated the proposed mining operation. This correspondence is sufficient to raise considerable concern about the long-term sustainability of the World Heritage values of this World Heritage site.

From the report it appears that while a draft Environmental Impact Statement has been prepared, it did not resolve several major questions and many issues remain under review. Thus it would appear premature to reach any conclusions at this time.

With respect to the List of World Heritage in Danger, there are no specific criteria. The Committee has the authority to place a site on the List of World Heritage in Danger when it is of the view that the World Heritage values for which the site was inscribed are seriously threatened.

The procedure for listing normally involves a monitoring report by the World Conservation Union (IUCN), in consultation with the State Party and the management authority responsible for the site. IUCN reports to the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee which meets in July and the Bureau makes a recommendation to the Committee, which usually meets in December of each year.

While we have taken note that the conservative organizations have requested that the World Heritage Secretariat involve itself in the EIS process, we simply are not staffed to do so. We would, however, be pleased to address these organizations on any aspects of the operation of the World Heritage Convention. We could also request IUCN as our technical advisors, to review the Environmental Impact Statement. We are confident that as the State Party responsible for the implementation of the Convention the essential professional skills are available to you.

It is important to note that Article 1 of the World Heritage Convention obliges the State Party to protect, conserve, present and transmit to future generations World Heritage sites for which they are responsible. This obligation extends beyond the boundary of the site and Article 5 (A) recommends that State Parties integrate the protection of sites into comprehensive planning programmes. Thus, if proposed developments will damage the integrity of Yellowstone National Park, the State Party has a responsibility to act beyond the National Park boundary.

Examples of the need to act beyond park boundaries are found at the Everglades National Park, Glacier National Park and Glacier Bay National Park, all World Heritage sites. In two of the sites the Government of British Columbia acted to close major mining operations rather than risk possible damage to downstream World Heritage values in both Canada and the United States.

Clearly if there are threats to World Heritage values the State Party has a responsibility to act. If enabling legislation is not adequate, new legislation should be considered, as was the case in Australia with respect to the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage site.

The World Heritage Committee has the authority to act unilaterally in placing a site on the List of World Heritage in Danger. However, in the past the Committee has demonstrated a clear desire to work in consort with the State Party. In this respect we would appreciate receiving a comprehensive report on the situation in time for the meeting of the World Heritage Bureau to be held in Paris in early July. Such a report would enable the Committee to give serious consideration to the listing of Yellowstone National Park on the List of World Heritage in Danger, should such a decision be warranted, at its nineteenth session to be held in December 1995.

The United States has an exemplary record in support of and in accordance with the principles and requirements of the World Heritage Convention. We look forward to continuing this cooperation.

Yours sincerely,

BERND VON DROSTE,
Director, World Heritage Centre.

LEGISLATIVE RESOLVE NO. 13

Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Alaska:

Whereas the United Nations has designated 67 sites in the United States as ''World Heritage Sites'' or ''Biosphere Reserves,'' which altogether are about equal in size to the State of Colorado, the eighth largest state; and

Whereas art. IV, sec. 3, United States Constitution, provides that the United States Congress shall make all needed regulations governing lands belonging to the United States; and

Whereas many of the United Nations' designations include private property inholdings and contemplate ''buffer zones'' of adjacent land; and

Whereas some international land designations such as those under the United States Biosphere Reserve Program and the Man and Biosphere Program of the United Nations Scientific, Educational, and Culture Organization operate under independent national committees such as the United States National Man and Biosphere Committee that have no legislative directives or authorization from the Congress; and

Whereas these international designations as presently handled are an open invitation to the international community to interfere in domestic economies and land use decisions; and

Whereas local citizens and public officials concerned about job creation and resource based economies usually have no say in the designation of land near their homes for inclusion in an international land use program; and

Whereas former Assistant Secretary of the Interior George T. Frampton, Jr., and the President used the fact that Yellowstone National Park had been designated as a ''World Heritage Site'' as justification for intervening in the environmental impact statement process and blocking possible development of an underground mine on private land in Montana outside of the park; and

Whereas a recent designation of a portion of Kamchatka as a ''World Heritage Site'' was followed immediately by efforts from environmental groups to block investment insurance for development projects on Kamchatka that are supported by the local communities; and

Whereas environmental groups and the national Park Service have been working to establish an International Park, a World Heritage Site, and a Marine Biosphere Reserve covering parts of western Akaska, eastern Russia, and the Bering Sea; and

Whereas as occurred in Montana, such designations could be used to block development projects on state and private land in western Alaska; and

Whereas foreign companies and countries could use such international designations in western Alaska to block economic development that they perceive as competition; and

Whereas animal rights activists could use such international designations to generate pressure to harass or block harvesting of marine mammals by Alaska Natives; and

Whereas such international designations could be used to harass or block any commercial activity, including pipelines, railroads, and power transmission lines; and

Whereas the President and the executive branch of the United States have, by Executive Order and other agreements, implemented these designations without approval by the Congress; and

Whereas the United States Department of Interior, in cooperation with the Federal Interagency Panel for World Heritage, has identified the Aleutian Island Unit of the Alaska Maritime National Wildlife Refuge,

Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, Cape Krusenstern National Monument, Denali National Park, Gates of the Arctic National Park, and Katmai National Park as likely to meet the criteria for future nomination as World Heritage Sites; and

Whereas the Alaska State Legislature objects to the nomination or designation of any World Heritage Sites or Biosphere Reserves in Alaska without the specific consent of the Alaska State Legislature; and

Whereas actions by the President in applying international agreements to lands owned by the United States may circumvent the Congress; and

Whereas Congressman Don Young introduced House Resolution No. 901 in the 105th Congress entitled the ''American Land Sovereignty Protection Act of 1997'' that required the explicit approval of the Congress prior to restricting any use of United States land under international agreements; and

Whereas Congressman Don Young has reintroduced this legislation in the 106th Congress as House Resolution No. 883, which is entitled the ''American Land Sovereignty Protection Act'';

Be it resolved that the Alaska State Legislature supports House Resolution 883, the ''American Land Sovereignty Protection Act,'' that reaffirms the constitutional authority of the Congress as the elected representatives of the people over the federally owned land of the United States and urges the swift introduction and passage of such act by the 106th Congress; and be it

Further resolved that the Alaska State Legislature objects to the nomination or designation of any sites in Alaska as World Heritage Sites or Biosphere Reserves without the prior consent of the Alaska State Legislature.

Copies of this resolution shall be sent to the Honorable Bill Clinton, President of the United States; Honorable Al Gore, Jr., Vice-President of the United States and President of the U.S. Senate; the Honorable Trent Lott, Majority Leader of the U.S. Senate; the Honorable J. Dennis Hastert, Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives; and to the Honorable Ted Stevens and the Honorable Frank Murkowski, U.S. Senators, and the Honorable Don Young, U.S. Representative, members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

STATE OF ALASKA,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Juneau, May 11, 1999.

Hon. BRIAN PORTER,
Speaker of the House, Alaska State Legislature State Capitol, Juneau, AK.

DEAR SPEAKER PORTER: I am transmitting the engrossed and enrolled copies of the following joint resolution, passed by the Twenty-first Alaska State Legislature, to the Lieutenant Governor's Office for permanent filing: CS for House Joint Resolution No. 15(RES) ''Relating to support for the 'American Land Sovereignty Protection Act' in the United States Congress.'' Legislative Resolve No. 13.

Sincerely,

TONY KNOWLES,
Governor.

STATE OF ALASKA,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Juneau, May 11, 1999.

Hon. DRUE PEARCE,
President of the Senate, Alaska State Legislature, State Capitol, Juneau, AK.

DEAR PRESIDENT PEARCE: I am transmitting the engrossed and enrolled copies of the following joint resolution, passed by the Twenty-first Alaska State Legislature, to the Lieutenant Governor's Office for permanent filing: CS for House Joint Resolution No. 15(RES) ''Relating to support for the 'American Land Sovereignty Protection Act' in the United States Congress.'' Legislative Resolve No. 13.

Sincerely,

TONY KNOWLES,
Governor.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Are there any further amendments to the bill?

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 180, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed in the following order:

Amendment No. 9 offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. VENTO), Amendment No. 5 offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL), Amendment No. 4 offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY), as amended.

Pursuant to House Resolution 180, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. VENTO

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. VENTO) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 262, noes 158, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 141]

AYES—262

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baird
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barr
Barrett (WI)
Bass
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Bonior
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Camp
Campbell
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehrlich
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Forbes
Ford
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Gordon
Green (TX)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hastings (FL)
Hefley
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Ney
Northup
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Phelps
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rohrabacher
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Schakowsky
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Shimkus
Shows
Sisisky
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Sununu
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (MS)
Thurman
Tierney
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Wise
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (FL)

NOES—158

Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Berry
Biggert
Bliley
Blunt
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brady (TX)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Canady
Cannon
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Cooksey
Cox
Crane
Cubin
Davis (VA)
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dreier
Ehlers
Emerson
Everett
Fletcher
Fossella
Fowler
Gallegly
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (WI)
Hansen
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Herger
Hilleary
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hutchinson
Hyde
Isakson
Istook
Jenkins
John
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
King (NY)
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuykendall
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lucas (OK)
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Myrick
Nethercutt
Norwood
Nussle
Ose
Oxley
Packard
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Portman
Radanovich
Reynolds
Riley
Rogan
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sanford
Scarborough
Schaffer
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shuster
Simpson
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (TX)

Souder
Stump
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Toomey
Walden
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—13

Bilbray
Borski
Brown (CA)
Deutsch
Dixon
Foley
Horn
Largent
Moakley
Napolitano
Salmon
Stark
Towns

□ 1334

Messrs. MCCOLLUM, BATEMAN, DREIER, RYUN of Kansas, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. TAUZIN and Mr. BLUNT changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. QUINN, HEFLEY, BOYD, HILL of Montana, BASS, SUNUNU, LOBIONDO, WAMP, WELLER, HOBSON, UPTON, CUNNINGHAM, SHIMKUS, STEARNS, CAMP, COBLE and HUNTER, and Mrs. MORELLA changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 141, I was inadvertently detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes.''

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 141, the Vento amendment, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes.''

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. BASS). Pursuant to House Resolution 180, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device will be taken on each additional amendment on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. UDALL OF COLORADO

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 191, noes 231, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 142]

AYES—191

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baird
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Bentsen
Berkley
Berman
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Crowley
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (TX)
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hastings (FL)
Hill (IN)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Klink
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Phelps
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sawyer
Schakowsky
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Sherwood
Slaughter
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thurman
Tierney
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Weygand
Wise
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOES—231

Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Boswell
Brady (TX)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Everett
Ewing
Fletcher
Forbes
Fossella
Fowler
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Granger
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Isakson
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kasich
Kelly
King (NY)
Kingston
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuykendall
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Ose
Oxley
Packard
Paul
Pease
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Regula
Reynolds
Riley
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sandlin
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thune
Tiahrt
Toomey
Traficant
Turner
Upton
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—11

Brown (CA)
Dixon
Foley
Graham
Largent
Moakley
Napolitano
Salmon
Stark
Thornberry
Towns

□ 1344

Mr. MCINTYRE changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mrs. MORELLA changed her vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. SWEENEY, AS AMENDED

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. BASS). The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY), as amended, on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 407, noes 15, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 143]

AYES—407

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry

Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crowley
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fletcher
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—15

Bilbray
Blumenauer
Castle
Cubin
Filner
Jackson (IL)
Klink
Kucinich
Markey
Meehan
Morella
Schakowsky
Scott
Shays
Thompson (CA)

NOT VOTING—11

Brown (CA)
Cox
Foley
Gonzalez
Granger
Largent
Moakley
Napolitano
Salmon
Stark
Towns

□ 1352

Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. PICKETT, and Mr. PASTOR changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. There being no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD) having assumed the chair, Mr. BASS, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 883) to preserve the sovereignty of the United States over public lands and acquired lands owned by the United States, and to preserve State sovereignty and private property rights in non-Federal lands surrounding those public lands and acquired lands, pursuant to House Resolution 180, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 883.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

□ 1400

ANNOUNCEMENT REGARDING AMENDMENT PROCESS FOR H.R. 1401, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000 AND LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, FISCAL YEAR 2000

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to inform the House of the plans of the Committee on Rules in regard to H.R. 1401, the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2000 and the Fiscal Year 2000 Legislative Branch Appropriations bill.

Today the gentleman from California (Chairman DREIER) informed the House of the Committee on Rules' plan regarding these bills in two ''Dear Colleague'' letters.

The Committee on Rules will be meeting the week of May 24 to grant a rule which may restrict the offering of amendments to the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000.

The bill was ordered reported by the Committee on Armed Services on May 19. A copy of the bill and report will be available for review in the office of the Committee on Armed Services on Monday, May 24. The bill is also expected to be available for review on the Committee on Armed Services' web site this evening.

Any Member contemplating an amendment to the bill should submit 55 copies of the amendment and a brief explanation to the Committee on Rules in H–312 of the Capitol no later than Tuesday, May 25 at 5 p.m.

Amendments should be drafted to the text of the bill as ordered reported by the Committee on Armed Services.

The Committee on Rules is also planning to meet the week of May 24 to grant a rule which may limit the amendment process for floor consideration for Fiscal Year 2000 Legislative Branch Appropriations Act.

The Committee on Appropriations ordered the bill reported Thursday, May 20, and is expected to file its committee report on Thursday, May 25, 1999.

Any Member wishing to offer an amendment should submit 55 copies and a brief explanation of the amendment to the Committee on Rules in room H–312 of the Capitol no later than 12 p.m. on Tuesday, May 25. Amendments should be drafted to the bill as reported by the Committee on Appropriations. Copies of the bill may be obtained from the Committee on Appropriations in room H–218 of the Capitol.

Members should use the Office of Legislative Counsel to ensure that their amendments are properly drafted and should check with the Office of the Parliamentarian to be certain that their amendments comply with the rules of the House.

DECLARATION OF POLICY OF UNITED STATES CONCERNING NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE DEPLOYMENT

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 179 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 179

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 4) to declare it to be the policy of the United States to deploy a national missile defense, with a Senate amendment thereto, and to consider in the House a motion offered by the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services or his designee to concur in the Senate amendment. The Senate amendment and the motion shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to final adoption without intervening motion.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Yesterday, the Committee on Rules met and granted a rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 4, Declaration of Policy of the United States Concerning National Missile Defense Deployment with a Senate amendment.

The rule is twofold. First, it makes in order a motion to concur in the Senate amendment in the House. Second, the rule provides 1 hour of debate on the motion equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4 is a straightforward bill, declaring that it is the policy of the United States to deploy a national missile defense system as soon as it is technologically possible and to seek continued negotiated reductions in Russian nuclear forces.

Mr. Speaker, in 1957, during a speech here in Washington, D.C., General Omar Bradley warned that we are now speeding inexorably towards a day when even the ingenuity of our scientists may be unable to save us from the consequences of a single rash act or a lone reckless hand upon the switch of an uninterceptible missile.

Forty-two years later, General Bradley is still right, not because we may be unable to stop an incoming missile, but because we cannot.

Not long ago, this House approved the national missile defense program by a margin of 317 to 105, a ratio of better than three to one. I am urging my colleagues to demonstrate their overwhelming support for this rule and its underlying bill once again.

Besides thousands of nuclear warheads on ballistic missiles maintained by Russia, China has more than a dozen long-range ballistic missiles targeted at the United States, and countries like North Korea and Iran are developing ballistic missile technology and capability much more rapidly than once believed.

The argument that rogue nations need more than a decade to obtain ballistic missile capability is both technically irresponsible and politically naive. The threat is real. The threat is here. The threat is now.

Even worse, most Americans do not realize that we have absolutely no defense, none at all, against a missile attack. We have been lulled into a false sense of security, unaware that nations across the globe are currently developing ballistic missiles which pose an immediate threat to our security.

In fact, just last year, Iran launched a medium-range ballistic missile with the help of North Korea and Russia.

We can protect ourselves from missiles of these potentially hostile nations. Deployment of a national mission defense system would cost less than our last six military peacekeeping missions.

Let us pass this rule and pass this declaration of policy and protect our Nation and its people from the threat of a missile attack.

I would like to commend the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE), and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Research and Development, for their hard work on this very important measure.

I urge my colleagues to support this rule and to support the underlying legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. FROST asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, while I support the Senate amendments to H.R. 4, I rise in opposition to the rule. I oppose the rule because of the process or the lack thereof.

The Democratic members of the House Committee on Armed Services were totally bypassed on this bill; and that, Mr. Speaker, is reason enough to oppose the rule. The process is really incomprehensible, Mr. Speaker, since the Senate amendment to the House-passed version of the bill states very simply that it is the policy of the United States to deploy as soon as is technologically possible an effective national defense missile system that will protect the territory of the United States from missile attack.

That simple statement of policy is the distillation of what has been acrimonious public debate for over 15 years. What has changed, Mr. Speaker? I think most of the Members of this body can agree that what this bill calls for is not the Reagan Star Wars of the 1980s. Indeed, the Senate amendment wisely adds language that subjects any missile defense system to the annual appropriations process which, in this era of fiscal restraint, places real constraints on any proposed missile defense system.

In addition, H.R. 4 does not mandate one system over another, nor does it mandate a date for deployment. In its simplicity, this bill acknowledges that the United States might well find itself subject to an attack that we should be prepared to defend against, but that we should do so within the context of the technological and financial realities of 1999.

Mr. Speaker, few of us in this body can deny that the world has become, since the end of the Cold War, an even more dangerous place than we might have imagined. There are rogue nations and factions that seek to harm, if not destroy, the United States.

This bill is an attempt to move forward the debate on the issue of the national missile defense without the acrimony that has accompanied the discussions on this subject in the past. H.R. 4 provides us with a good start, and I am hopeful that it will help us move to a resolution to a thorny, but incredibly important, issue.

Mr. Speaker, this rule will allow 1 hour of debate on the Senate amendments, a time limit that might have, given the importance of this matter, been extended to allow all Members who are interested in this matter an opportunity to speak.

In spite of the fact that the House has conducted very little business in the past few weeks, the Republican majority continually fails to give matters of great importance adequate time to be fully aired on the floor. I would hope that when we return from the Memorial Day recess, one that has now been extended through an entire week, the Republican leadership will consider a schedule that gives important legislation more time to be debated by the elected Members of this body.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), who is the House leading expert on missile defense.

(Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and in support of the underlying Senate amendments, but I am not happy with the legislation.

I am not happy because, when we brought this bill up in the House, we

had a clear and distinct debate. As the original author of H.R. 4, I made the point known to every Member of this body that this would be a vote for the President's policy or against the President's policy.

If my colleagues are supportive of holding this decision off for a year so it could be made during the middle of a Presidential election, then they should have opposed the House bill. And 102 brave Democrats and two brave Republicans did that. They opposed the bill.

But I said, if in spite of the President's letter of opposition on the morning of the vote, if my colleagues were for moving forward now to make that decision, then they should vote for the bill. And 214 Republicans did, joined by 103 Democrats, for a veto-proof margin. It was a clear and distinct point of opposition against this administration's policy. No mistake about it.

Then we saw the White House and Bob Bell try to suspend what we had just done, try to tell us that it really did not mean what we said it was. In fact, the Senate on the floor of debates agreed to two amendments. These amendments mean nothing. They mean nothing. They are simply cover for liberal Democrats who do not support missile defense to have a way to cover their you know whats.

One of them says that any missile defense program should be subject to the authorization and appropriation process. Well, duh. Everything we do in this Congress is subject to the authorization and appropriation process. Are we so naive as to think that somehow we pull manna from heaven and we bring dollars to the table and that is what funds programs? That amendment means nothing. It has no bearing on this bill or what we are doing here.

The second amendment says that we should continue to negotiate reductions in arms. Who disagrees with that? The irony is that the Senate put an amendment on that only refers to reductions in Russian arms. What happens, Mr. Speaker, if the Russians regard this as only being an attempt to get them to reduce their arms while the U.S. is not paralleling that process? The amendments unfortunately passed, and we could do nothing about that.

The Senate having the rules, they had forced us to take a bill that I am not happy with. But it does move the process forward, and I would say to my colleagues, in the full debate, we will have a colloquy that will be joined by the chairman of the full committee that will be joined by the majority leader and the Speaker who will clarify on the RECORD what this bill means by this body.

□ 1415

If the White House chooses to run for Congress, than they can interpret our bills. If Bob Bell chooses to step down and run for a House seat, he can change or he can then interpret our bills. But, short of that, nobody can interpret our legislation except for us. We are the ones who drafted the bill. We are the ones who passed the bill. We are the ones who passed the clean bill of this House, only to be amended by extraneous and irrelevant amendments on the Senate side.

I will be asking my colleagues today to vote ''yes.'' But clearly, during our debate and discussion we will clarify the record time and again to show that there is a clear and distinct difference between the position of this administration and the position that 317 Members of Congress supported.

I am outraged that right after we passed this bill President Clinton would send me a letter that says this: ''Next year we will determine whether or not to deploy for the first time a limited national missile defense against these threats.'' That is the letter.

That is not what this bill says. It does not say, Mr. President, next year. It says today we will pass this conference report, we will move forward, and we will do it in direct contradiction to what this administration is trying to spin.

And when the White House has its signing ceremony, I do not know whether I will be invited or not, but if I am, I will clearly make the case that it is a clear policy difference between this White House and their attempt to spin what we did that they could not defeat in this body. We could have overridden the veto because we had 103 Democrats agree with this, along with 214 Republicans, and this was at a time when the White House issued a statement in opposition to our bill.

These amendments mean nothing. All of us agree that an authorization and appropriation processes must be followed. All of us want to see reductions in arms by both Russia and America. Unfortunately, the Senate amendment only says Russia, which could be read as destabilizing.

The point is, the crux and the actual content of this bill is simple. Today we are saying in the Congress of the United States that it is time to deploy a national missile defense capability.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS).

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I want my good friend and colleague from Pennsylvania to know that I was one of the Democrats who voted for his resolution. But I must say, we held a hearing in the defense appropriations subcommittee, now called the Subcommittee on National Security Appropriations, this year. Lieutenant General Lester Lyles came over and briefed our committee. And, frankly, we are not doing very well in developing this technology. We have got serious problems.

I personally believe that if we look at missile defense, that the number one priority when we deploy our troops is to have a capable theater missile defense system. We need to focus on that first. And of course, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania well knows, we have had five failures of the THAAD system, which is fundamental to having a credible theater missile defense system. We have the Patriot 3, the PAC–3 program, which is doing quite well.

Now, if we cannot do theater missile defense, no matter how loudly we yell, we are not going to command a national missile defense system into being. Now, General Lyles has testified before our subcommittee that it is going to be at least 2005 before we have done the testing that is necessary to have any confidence that we would have a credible limited system.

So I think the language in this resolution that says let us be honest with ourselves, we cannot be in denial here, that we are going to do this, I voted to do it when it is technologically feasible. If the science is not there, if the engineering is not there, if the technology is not there, we cannot just wish it into existence.

And so I hope that my colleagues will think about this issue. This is one of the most important national security issues that we face. None of us likes the idea of being vulnerable to any country's potential for using a ballistic missile. But think about it. We had the whole era of the Cold War when the Russians had thousands of warheads aimed at the United States and we had thousands of warheads aimed at them. What did that produce? That produced deterrence. We knew that if either one of us struck the other that we would open up the possibility for a catastrophic war that would destroy both countries, and so we were deterred.

And today the United States has more offensive capability than any other country in the world and more credible and more capable offensive capability. And I believe that any country that thought about launching an attack against the United States would have to be out of their mind, because they would know that we would know where the missile launched from and we could have the potential to respond with overwhelming force. I think deterrence still is a valid doctrine that we should not forget about as we work towards getting a national missile defense system in place.

So I think the language of the Senate improves and makes more credible this resolution that we previously voted on. And I think my view is that I want this technology to work.

One of the companies from my State is in charge of trying to integrate this and make it work. But we cannot tell the American people that there is something out there that will work until we can demonstrate it, and we have not been able to demonstrate THAAD. We have not been able to demonstrate a comprehensive theater missile defense system.

And so I think we ought to be very sober about any of these exhortations that we are hearing about from people

here who want to wish this into existence.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON).

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, let us focus the debate on the facts.

Mr. Speaker, my good friend and colleague just spoke and made some points. First of all, he said the THAAD program has had five failures. What he did not properly explain is that of the five failures that occurred, none of them, none of them involved hit-to-kill. The five failures that occurred were caused by quality control problems of the Lockheed Martin contractor, and we in the Congress took the lead to force them to begin to pay for those failures.

We have never had a test yet to actually get to hit-to-kill, but in fact the THAAD program has accomplished 28 of 30 milestones. That is a tremendous success. So to characterize the THAAD program as a failure does a terrible disservice to those people who are working on that program because the facts do not bear that.

Second, the gentleman made the point that this is a terrible technology challenge. Well, it is. And he pointed out that a company in his area, Boeing, is a lead system integrator. What the gentleman did not mention is that the head of this program, Dr. Peller, in congressional testimony said the challenge to build the Space Station was more difficult than to build a national missile defense. Now, that is the top official of the company that comes from the district of the gentleman.

The third is deterrence, that we somehow can rely on the deterrence of the 1980s. That may have been true. I do not want to trust North Korea not to fire that Taepo-Dong 1 at one of our cities. And I would say to my good friend and colleague, 28 young Americans, half of them from my State, came back from Desert Storm in body bags because we could not defend against a low-complexity missile that wiped them out.

I agree with the gentleman, theater missile defense is our top priority; and I use my votes and my voice to help accomplish that. But we cannot ignore the threat to our country by saying North Korea will avoid attacking us because of deterrence.

And finally, this is what offends me. I will make a prediction on the floor today. The reason why the White House is spinning this the way they are is because next year, in the middle of the presidential campaign, Vice President Gore will announce that we are going to deploy NMD. That is an absolute travesty and an outrage for this country.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1¼ minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS).

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, again, I just want to say to my colleagues, we want a national missile defense system against a limited attack. I think that is a wise thing to do.

I am just saying to everyone here today, after having General Lyles come before our committee and after going through each of the technologies in place, I have to report to my colleagues that General Lyles says 2005 is the earliest we would have a capability, and that capability has not yet been demonstrated. We have not been able to do what it takes to put it in place. It does not exist. And we cannot just create something out of whole cloth.

Now, let us make it work. Let us be sober. Let us be realistic and honest with the House and the American people. Let us wait and do this when it is technologically feasible. We cannot do it, anyway. I mean, we cannot wish this into existence. So I urge everybody, including my colleague from the State of Washington, to be sober.

I can remember when these people came in from my own State and they told and told me in 1983 that this technology was in hand. Edward Teller came and told us that the technology was in hand. It is now 1999, we have spent billions, and it is not in hand. This is a hard problem.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), ranking member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. SKELETON. Mr. Speaker, let me take this opportunity to speak on the rule. I am compelled to do so because I speak today about the process, about the process that brings us to the floor. Mr. Speaker, I speak not as a Democrat but as a Member of this House and as a member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Just over 2 months ago, the House and the Senate passed H.R. 4 and S. 257, respectively, similar legislation, declaring it the policy of the United States to deploy a national missile defense. But since then, Mr. Speaker, the process has been hijacked.

There was no conference committee between the House and the Senate. As a result, differences in the two measures have not been reconciled as normally they are reconciled. Rather, we are being asked to concur in the exclusive work of the Senate on a take-it-or-leave-it basis. That is not right.

Implied in this fact is the notion that the Senate has a patent on all the knowledge and all the insight on this particular matter. And, of course, I reject that because we in this body, in our committee, have been very, very active on this issue.

And, therefore, I am disappointed that the views of the House Members, both Democrats and Republicans, have not been afforded regular order consideration in the matter that is before us today. I think the process that brings us here today is not only unfortunate but it is unnecessary.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, how appropriate the timing of this debate. As we speak, folks are lined up around the block across America to see the new Star Wars movie. And what better time than right now, with the refrain of that great Star Wars theme music, the opening day of ''The Phantom Menace,'' for us to be taking up this proposal.

Just like the original movie, this bill puts a tractor beam in the Capitol dome and aims it right at the wallets of the American taxpayer to support this defective system. This Star Wars scheme is a technological failure. It has failed one test after another, again and again. An accelerated program to test it has been described as ''a rush to failure'' by former Air Force Chief of Staff General Larry Welsh.

I am reminded of Han Solo's admonition to Luke Skywalker: ''Jumping through hyperspace ain't like dusting crops, boy.'' Well, hitting a bullet with a bullet, hitting in fact many bullets, with bullets raining down over the entire continental United States at 15,000 miles an hour, and doing it accurately and reliably, is not like dusting crops, either. And yet here we are, year after year, having demands to throw more good money after bad.

I disagree with my colleague from Washington State about this measure, but he is right about one thing. Wishing is not going to make it so. The first law of Disney Wish and make it so, does not apply here; rather it is the laws of physics and thermodynamics that control weather this can be accomplished.

□ 1430

Just 3 days ago, we acted in this Congress on spare parts and training and readiness. As Joint Chiefs Chairman Hugh Skelton said recently, the massive amount of experiments on these kind of Star Wars programs drain resources from personnel and readiness accounts. If there is a readiness problem, it is a problem that this Republican Congress created in preferring pork over readiness. We are diverting these kind of precious resources away from our true military and nonmilitary needs because we have people here who keep coming up year after year asking us to throw an infinite amount of taxpayer money at a problem that has real physical limitations.

I agree fully with my colleague from Texas, Mr. FROST, about the substance of this resolution, about the important meaning of the Senate amendments. But the effect I disagree with him on, because it is clear that the Star Wars advocates are using this measure to boost their cause. The missile defense that is being advocated, even if it worked, would not defend us from the real threats we face from terrorism, with bombings at the World Trade Center, with gas attacks like that that occurred in a Japanese subway.

If we really want to do something to address our security, the Congress

ought simply to read the National Research Council of the National Academy of Science report this week about the threat, the very real threat that we have from the potential or diversion of Russian nuclear materials. Our Energy Department had to spend $600,000 in emergency funds last year because guards at some of these facilities in Russia had no winter uniforms for outside patrols and left without paychecks searching for food. That is a real security threat that should concern every one of us. We are not doing very much about it.

Implementing the START II nuclear missile reduction treaty would eliminate 3,000 Russian nuclear warheads, in fact, that this fantasy proposes to deal with in outer space. Such implementation would do a great deal more to assure the security and safety of American families than this proposal. We should be giving that our highest national security priority. Instead of diverting attention from this vital objective, this Congress should be encouraging a START III to have further reduction in nuclear armaments around the world and truly protect our freedom.

What so many in this House fail to recognize is that national security is measured in terms other than simply how many bombs, bullets and missiles we possess. It is measured in economic strength, in productivity and in the success of our efforts to reduce threats from abroad. I urge the House to consider defense programs that meet our true security needs and reject this proposal.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I believe in ballistic missile defense if it is feasible, but we have yet to prove that it is feasible. I was the principal cosponsor of H.R. 4 because I thought we needed a focus to our ballistic missile defense program. I thought we needed to make a decision that we would go forward with the objective of fielding a system, a system that worked and would afford us at least limited protection against an accidental strike in this country. But I was honest to acknowledge on the House floor that we are not there yet. We have not proven the capability of this system. However, having spent $50 billion over the last 15 years, I thought it was time to bring those efforts to fruition, to build a workable system if we can as opposed to putting more viewgraphs on the shelf.

H.R. 4 was an effort to reach some kind of bipartisan consensus on a very basic proposition, that the focus of our efforts in ballistic missile defense would be to deploy a system. We passed that bill here with a hefty margin. We sent it to the other body, they struck everything in it, adopted a completely different bill and now they send it back to us in a process that is a breach of procedure, bypassing the procedures that are long established and that are intended to achieve a consensus between both Houses. Normally when we pass a bill and send it to the Senate and they pass a different bill, there is a conference to hammer out the differences, a conference to establish a record as to why the compromises in language were made to the extent that these are made. There is no record here. We have had no conference. We are bypassing the traditional procedure. For what reason I do not know. This is no way to legislate. It is also no way to build bipartisan consensus on something that has been sort of a political totem.

As I have said before, we do not debate ballistic missile defense the way we debated the MX or the B–2 or other major systems. This system is so charged with political significance that it is a totally different kind of debate. One of the things we will not have as a result of this procedure is a record, a record to explain the legislative history of what some truly ambiguous and unclear language in this particular bill actually means.

This bill calls for billions of dollars to be spent to deploy a national missile defense system, quote, as soon as it is technologically feasible, or possible. What does this mean? I am concerned that it could mean that as soon as we have got the technology or think we have it in hand, we are supposed to rush to deployment, even though we might end up with a suboptimal or a substandard system. I am concerned that it may mean before we have adequately tested, we will move to deployment. That is not an idle concern.

Yesterday in the defense authorization bill markup, an amendment was added which allowed the director of this program and the Secretary of Defense to begin deployment before this system was fully tested, a dispensation that is granted to very few defense programs. It could mean that we will deploy even though it is extravagantly expensive, far more expensive than the protection it would allow us. It could mean any number of different things. We do not know. There is no legislative history. We have not been able in the House to have the opportunity to give meaning to that particular phrase.

The bill specifies that this national missile system must be capable of affording us a limited defense, or defense against a limited ballistic missile attack. What does ''limited'' mean? Is it an unauthorized attack, an accidental attack, or an attack by, say, one submarine which could mean easily more than 100 warheads? Very, very critical to have that definition pinned down.

In our bill, we had legislative history. We said it was an accidental attack. We limited the scope of the effectiveness of the system. Here they talk about a limited attack. That could range from 5 warheads to 200 warheads. It is not clear at all. We have no opportunity to make it clear.

Furthermore, the timing of this bill, the timing of the previous bill, disturbed me. I know it disturbed the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), too. Because this bill is misperceived by the Russians. I said that on the floor, I said it in committee. The Russians see this bill as somehow a potential or anticipatory breach of the ABM treaty. I think that is unfounded.

I think what we are trying to move towards is a system where we can rely upon our defenses so that we do not have to rely so much upon the threat of a retaliatory strike. I think that would be an improvement in deterrence and an improvement in the stability in the world. The Russians do not see it that way yet. They see us moving away from the ABM treaty. This language in this bill is not bound to give them comfort and encouragement, because this bill says that in addition to deploying defenses in this country, we should also seek to negotiate reductions in Russian nuclear weapons. I agree that we should be negotiating with the Russians. We should have done START II. We should have pressed them to ratify it long before now. But they perceive START II as being tilted against them.

Now we are saying in this bill, ''We're going to build defenses and we want you to build down your missile systems,'' which suggests that we want complete superiority here. It is not the formulation for a successful bargain. It is not the kind of message we need to send the Russians, particularly at a time when we are leaning on them and Chernomyrdin is today in Belgrade trying to cut a deal with us. It is just ill-timed. I will probably vote for this bill because I believe in ballistic missile defense and I do not want to muddle that message on my part but I am very, very disappointed in the process and procedure it is taking.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

It is important that we take a look at reminding ourselves as we debate this rule that the national missile defense program, the vote most recently held in this House, was 317–105, better than a 3 to 1 ratio of the Members of this great body in support of a national missile defense program. Number two, on some of the questions with the rule, I would remind all of my colleagues that at the Committee on Rules yesterday, it was a voice vote on the rule approval that we have before us today.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I must go back to my opening remarks, that most Americans do not realize that we have absolutely no defense, none at all, against a missile attack. We have been lulled into a false sense of security, unaware that nations across the globe are currently developing ballistic missiles which pose an immediate threat to our security. Mr. Speaker, today is the day to act. I urge passage of this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 179, I offer a motion to concur in the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 4) to declare it to be the policy of the United States to deploy a national missile defense.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. Spence moves to concur in the Senate amendment.

The text of the Senate amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''National Missile Defense Act of 1999''.

SEC. 2. NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE POLICY.

It is the policy of the United States to deploy as soon as is technologically possible an effective National Missile Defense system capable of defending the territory of the United States against limited ballistic missile attack (whether accidental, unauthorized, or deliberate) with funding subject to the annual authorization of appropriations and the annual appropriation of funds for National Missile Defense.

SEC. 3. POLICY ON REDUCTION OF RUSSIAN NUCLEAR FORCES.

It is the policy of the United States to seek continued negotiated reductions in Russian nuclear forces.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 179, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE).

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, in 1995, Norway launched a weather rocket that was mistaken by sensors in Russia for a launch of an ICBM from one of our nuclear submarines. They were in a final countdown in the process of preparing to launch a missile attack against us, and only minutes away when they finally discovered the mistake and called off the launch. We were that close to being faced with nuclear warfare.

Mr. Speaker, most people in this country do not realize we have no defense against that type of an attack nor do we have a defense against even one missile launched accidentally from somewhere else in the world today. There are literally thousands of these missiles abroad in the world today. The threat of ballistic missile attack is real and it is here today.

Last summer, an independent study by the bipartisan Rumsfeld Commission unanimously concluded that the ballistic missile threat to our country is broader, more mature and evolving more rapidly than anticipated, and that the United States may have little or no warning of a ballistic missile attack. With each passing day, our Nation's vulnerability to missile attack grows. Rogue nations like North Korea, Libya, Iran and Iraq are working aggressively to acquire the capability to strike the American homeland with ballistic missiles carrying weapons of mass destruction. Russia and China already possess this capability. I am confident that the more than 200 Members who attended the Rumsfeld Commission extraordinary classified briefing here on this House floor back in March have a much greater appreciation of the need to move forward with missile defenses and of the reason why we need to make the kind of commitment that we are making in this bill.

□ 1445

Let me briefly make a few points:

First, contrary to intelligence estimates that predicted the ballistic missile threat was more than a decade away, the missile threat to our country is real, as I have said before, and it is here today.

Second, technology has matured to the point where moving forward and deploying a national missile defense system is feasible. There will always be test failures, there will always be technological challenges, but Americans have never shied away from a challenge and certainly never in the face of a threat that gets worse every day.

Third, the cost of a national missile defense system, by the administration's own estimates, will comprise less than 1 percent of the overall defense budget and less than 2 percent of our military modernization budget over the next 5 years. Because to deploy an initial national missile defense capability will amount to less than the amount our country has spent on peacekeeping developments, deploying missiles in the past 6 years, this strikes me as a small price and a sound investment.

Mr. Speaker, national missile defense is necessary, feasible and affordable, but in spite of the growing consensus that the threat is real and the technology is maturing, the administration has steadfastly refused to commit to actually deploy a national missile defense. H.R. 4 addresses the administration's unexplainable lack of commitment in this regard and represents the Congress' bipartisan belief that all Americans should be protected against ballistic missiles.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of this important bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to concur with the Senate amendments to H.R. 4, an act to declare it the policy of the United States to deploy national missile defense.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS).

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I want to say to my friend from Missouri, the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on National Security, that I concur with him and that we should pass this, and I am not at all upset about what the Senate did. I think putting in the phrase ''when technologically feasible'' means that we have to have something to deploy. And I have the greatest respect for the chairman of the committee but I must tell my colleagues, when we brought over the people who were running this program and we went through each of the various possibilities, they have said basically that at this point we do not have something to deploy. Now, we just cannot make it up. Either it is deployable or it is not. Either we have tested it and we know it will work or it will not.

So I urge everyone here that we should stay with our commitment to keep working on this problem, but to start deploying something that we have not tested is an absolute recipe for failure.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me. I hope that we get a national missile defense, but let us not waste money trying to deploy something that we have not yet demonstrated, and I think theater missile defense should be our first priority. I appreciate the gentleman having yielded to me.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to continue very, very briefly, and then I will yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SISISKY).

At today's motion I would like to, and I hope we all understand that the technology needed to develop an ICBM capable of delivering a warhead of mass destruction against large portions of these United States is today, in the hands of at least one so-called rogue actor nation. Worse, much of the needed technology has already been demonstrated, and now I believe it is not only possible but probable that significant portions of the United States will be threatened by ICBM-delivered warheads of mass destruction sometime before the year 2005, the time the administration says is needed to deploy a suitable limited national missile defense system.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SISISKY).

Mr. SISISKY. Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 4, and I ask my colleagues to support it.

As some of as my colleagues know, I changed my mind about the way we need to approach ballistic missile defense. I always believed we needed BMD, but over the last year I changed my mind about when we needed it, and that was because of the report of the Commission to Assess Ballistic Missile Threat to the United States. This was a bipartisan commission charged to assess the nature and magnitude of existing and emerging ballistic missile threats to the United States.

The report and testimony of the commission made two things clear. First, the ballistic missile threat to the United States may be coming faster than previously estimated. Second, the threat to our friends, allies and troops overseas already exists.

That is why I cosponsored this bill, and that is why Congress overwhelmingly decided to go on record in support of ballistic missile defense.

Now I think there are legitimate grounds to be unhappy with the procedure we are using today. I think everyone on our side agrees that accepting a Senate amendment without benefit of a conference is not the best way to do this, and those of us in the House would have liked to sit down with Members of the other body to talk about what they mean by phrases like ''technologically feasible.'' And for another thing, it fails to recognize tireless contributions and leadership of Members on our side, such as the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), but it does make the point by putting Congress on record that it is the policy of the United States to deploy an effective missile defense.

On balance, Mr. Speaker, I think this language sends a message that is vital to national security, and I urge this body to support it.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), the chairman of our Subcommittee on Military Research and Development.

(Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman and the ranking member for their support, and let me again clarify some points here.

First of all, none of us are mandating that something be deployed before it is ready, none of us. We are not that naive to put a date certain on requiring that something be done by a certain time, and no one should misinterpret this legislation as requiring that.

What we are saying is that we are making a clear and distinct policy change here as a Nation. For the first time we are saying publicly that it is the policy of this country to deploy a limited national missile defense system against those rogue threats that we see emerging.

We took great efforts in this process to bring the Russians in, to show them that this was not aimed against them. In fact, a number of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle traveled with us to Moscow the week before the vote with the former CIA Director of the Clinton administration, Jim Woolsey, with the former Secretary of Defense and White House Chief of Staff, Donald Rumsfeld, and with the former Deputy Secretary of State, Bill Schneider, and we took the time to give the Russian leadership the briefing as to the emerging threats and convinced them that this was not being done to score some type of strategic advantage over Russia. This was being done because in today's world North Korea is not a stable nation that deterrents will work with. In today's world the Chinese now have at least 18 long-range ICBMs. We know that Iran and Iraq both have medium-range missiles and are developing long-range capabilities.

So, Mr. Speaker, for all of these reasons we are making a clear and distinct policy change that will occur when the President signs this bill. And the key thing that I want to keep stressing is, one, that when the President signs this bill, that is the change in policy of this government, that we are deploying a national missile defense system as soon as that technology is available, not before it is available, not prematurely, but as soon as it is available. We do not recommend the technology. We do not say land-based over sea-based. We do not say one site over three sites. We say as soon as available and as soon as it is ready, we deploy it.

That is a clear and marked difference over the policy that exists today, and for the White House to try to spin what we are doing is totally wrong. And I want the record to clearly show that this Congress and the other body are on record as interpreting our own bill, and there should be no one in the White House in future years who will try to spin what it is we are trying to accomplish today.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to enter into a colloquy with our distinguished chairman for the record. I rise to engage in a colloquy with the chairman.

There has been some misconception concerning this national missile defense bill. The purpose of this bill is very simply to establish a U.S. policy, the deployment of a national missile defense, as soon as technologically possible. In the chairman's view, does this bill commit the United States to deploy a national missile defense?

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, it does.

The intent of this bill is straightforward and unequivocal. However, I understand that in a May 7 letter the President indicated, and I quote, the legislation makes clear that no decision on deployment has been made, unquote. Following the Senate passage of S. 257 earlier this year, the Secretary of State even sent a cable to our embassies articulating this same opinion.

I do not understand how anyone could look at this legislation objectively and arrive at the same conclusion as the President and the Secretary of State. This bill makes it clear that the Nation is committed and is committing to the deployment of a national missile defense.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I insert for the RECORD both the White House letter as well as the State Department cable so that everyone can see what type of spin the administration is trying to place on this bill.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, May 7, 1999.

Hon. CURT WELDON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE WELDON: Thank you for your letter on National Missile Defense (NMD). We are committed to meeting the growing danger that outlaw nations may develop and field long-range missiles capable of delivering weapons of mass destruction against the United States and our allies.

Next year, we will determine whether to deploy for the first time a limited national missile defense against these threats. This decision will be made when we review the results of flight tests and other developmental efforts, consider cost estimates, and evaluate the threat. In making our determination, we will also review progress in achieving our arms control objectives, including negotiating any amendments to the ABM Treaty that may be required to accommodate a possible NMD deployment.

I am pleased that the Senate, on a bipartisan basis, included in its NMD legislation two amendments that significantly changed the original bill, which I strongly opposed. By specifying that any NMD deployment must be subject to the authorization and appropriations process, the legislation makes clear that no decision on deployment has been made. By putting the Senate on record as continuing to support negotiated reductions in strategic nuclear arms, the bill also reaffirms that our missile defense policy must take into account our arms control objectives.

We want to move ahead on the START III framework, which I negotiated with President Yeltsin in 1997, to cut Russian and U.S. arsenals 90 percent from Cold War levels, while maintaining the ABM Treaty as a cornerstone of strategic stability. The changes made in the NMD bill during Senate debate ensure these crucial objectives will be taken into account fully as we pursue our NMD program.

Thank you again for writing on this important matter.

Sincerely,

BILL CLINTON.

S. 257—NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE

Background.—U.S. policy regarding ballistic missile defense most recently was elaborated in reftels (n.b., identical text to different addresses). During the March floor debate on S. 257, the Cochran National Missile Defense (NMD) bill, the Senate on a bipartisan basis adopted two very important amendments that modified the original bill that had been reported out of the Armed Services Committee on essentially a party-line vote last month. The first amendment makes clear that any deployment of a limited U.S. NMD system must be subject to the authorization and appropriations process, thereby underscoring that no deployment decision has been made. The second amendment confirms that U.S. policy with regard to the possible deployment of a limited NMD system must take account of our objectives with regard to arms control. With these improvements, the administration informed Senate leaders that it would accept S. 257 as amended if it reaches the President's desk in this form. On March 17, the Senate passed S. 257 (as amended) in a rollcall vote, 97–3.

Posts are authorized to draw upon the materials contained herein in addressing this matter. The text of S. 257, as passed by the Senate is at paragraph 3. White House talking points prepared by the National Security Council are at paragraph 4. The text of a statement by the President, released on March 17, is at paragraph 5.

The text of S. 257 as passed by the Senate is as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress Assembled,

Section 1. Short title.

This act may be cited as the National Missile Defense Act of 1999''.

Section 2. National Missile Defense Policy.

It is the policy of the United States to deploy as soon as is technologically possible an effective National Missile Defense System capable of defending the territory of the United States against limited ballistic missile attack (whether accidental, unauthorized, or deliberate) with funding subject to the annual authorization of appropriations and the annual appropriation of funds for national missile defense.

Section 3. Policy on reduction of Russian nuclear forces.

It is the policy of the United States to seek continued negotiated reductions in Russian Nuclear Forces.

Begin White House Points:

The administration made clear its strong opposition to the Cochran NMD bill as it emerged from the Armed Services Committee last month. The Presidents senior national security advisors recommended that the bill be vetoed were it to reach the President's desk in that form.

We are pleased that the Senate on two bipartisan votes, adopted two very important amendments to the bill and thereby significantly improved it.

The first amendment makes clear that no decision has been made to deploy a limited NMD system. It does so by specifying that any such decision must necessarily be subject to the annual authorization and appropriations process.

The President has not proposed that any funds be authorized or appropriated in the FY2000 Defense Department budget for NMD deployment. Whether he requests such funds in FY 2000 (the first fiscal year in which the administration intends to address the deployment question) will depend on the administration's assessment of the four factors. Which it believes must be taken into account in deciding whether to field this system:

(1) Has the threat materialized as quickly as we now expect it will;

(2) Has the technology been demonstrated to be operationally effective;

(3) Is the system affordable; and

(4) What are the implications of going forward with NMD deployment for our objectives with regard to achieving further reductions in strategic nuclear arms under START II and START III?

The second amendment makes clear that in pursuing our policy with regard to the deployment of a limited NMD, we must also take into account our objectives with regard to securing continued negotiated reductions in Russian and U.S. nuclear forces.

Through START II and START III, the United States can realize the removal of up to an additional 8,000 Russian and U.S. strategic nuclear warheads. These treaties are clearly in our national security interests.

At the Helsinki Summit, Presidents-Clinton and Yeltsin declared that the ABM Treaty is of fundamental significance to the attainment of our objectives for START II and START III.

In this context, it is crucial that the United States negotiate in good faith any amendments to the AMB Treaty that may be necessary to accommodate any U.S. limited NMD system.

The second Senate amendment affirms the Senate's recognition that the arms control dimension of the NMD deployment question must be taken into account.

As a result of these two amendments, the administration will accept S. 257 if it reaches the President's desk in its current form.

If asked—does this mean that the administration will hold NMD hostage to the ABM Treaty?

The administration has articulated its strong commitment to the ABM Treaty, which it regards as a cornerstone of strategic stability. At the same time, the administration has also made clear that it will not give Russia—or any other state—a veto over any missile defense deployment decision that it believes is vital to our national security interests.

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

I am pleased that the Senate, on a bipartisan basis, included in its National Missile Defense (NMD) legislation two amendments that significantly change the original bill, which I strongly opposed. By specifying that any NMD deployment must be subject to the authorization and appropriations process, the legislation now makes clear that no decision on deployment has been made. By putting the Senate on record as continuing to support negotiated reductions in strategic nuclear arms, the bill reaffirms that our missile defense policy must take into account our arms control objectives.

We are committed to meeting the growing danger that outlaw nations will develop and deploy long-range missiles that could deliver weapons of mass destruction against us and our allies. Next year, we will, for the first time, determine whether to deploy a limited national missile defense against these threats, when we review the results of flight tests and other developmental efforts, consider cost estimates, and evaluate the threat. In making our determination, we will also review progress in achieving our arms control objectives, including negotiating any amendments to the Arm Treaty that may be required to accommodate a possible NMD deployment.

This week, the Russian Duma took an encouraging step toward obtaining final approval of START II. We want to move ahead on the START III framework, which I negotiated with President Yeltsin in 1997, to cut Russian and U.S. arsenals 80 percent from cold war levels, while maintaining the Arm Treaty as a cornerstone of strategic stability. The changes made in the NMD bill during Senate debate ensure these crucial objectives will be fully taken into account as we pursue our NMD Program.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman from South Carolina. We cannot have a policy to deploy without a commitment to deploy.

In his letter the President also said, and I quote, next year we will determine whether to deploy a limited national missile defense, unquote. However, when the President signs this bill into law, he will be committing the U.S. to deploy. When the President signs this bill, he is also committing the Nation to deploy a national missile defense system as soon as technologically possible. The law is the law.

I would also like to ask the gentleman from South Carolina if the President is correct in his view that subjecting a national missile defense program to the authorization and appropriation process can somehow be interpreted as meaning the decision on deployment has not yet been made.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, such an interpretation is not correct. The bill's language neither states nor implies anything of the sort. In fact, all Department of Defense programs are subject to authorization and appropriation.

This is a matter of current law in both Titles 10 and 31 of the U.S. Code. It is a constitutional requirement. Every weapon system we have deployed, bombers, missiles, tanks, fighters, ships and so on, goes through the authorization and the appropriation process. Deployment of these systems is simply the manifestation of policies that have been agreed upon to meet national security requirements.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. As the original author of this legislation, I fully agree. The administration has now recognized the threat, as evidenced by the CIA, and when the President signs this bill, he will be committing the Nation to the deployment of a national missile defense to meet that threat.

I would also state that in signing this bill the President is indicating a commitment to use the funds he has budgeted for national missile defense only for the execution of the policy he enacts and endorses by signing this legislation.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman. The President has budgeted $10.5 billion through fiscal year 2005 to support national missile defense deployment. When the President signs this bill, I believe it also reflects a commitment that these funds will be used to resolve the programmatic issues, to establish the technological feasibility of a national missile defense and, finally, to deploy a national missile defense system.

□ 1500

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Does the chairman believe that this bill in any way conditions deployment of a national missile defense system on further arms reductions with the Russians?

Mr. SPENCE. I do not. The section of this bill dealing with the arms reduction with the Russians is consistent with the current arms control policy and only reflects Congress' support for continued negotiations. There is no explicit or implicit linkage in H.R. 4 between achieving arms control reductions and the commitment to deploy national missile defense.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. I agree with the chairman. Russia, or any other country, does not now have nor will it ever have a veto over our Nation's deployment of a national missile defense to protect our citizens.

Mr. SPENCE. I thank my friend and colleague for his strong interest in clarifying the record on this important legislation.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

(Mr. ANDREWS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the underlying amendments and the underlying bill as well. I thank and congratulate the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE), the chairman, and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), the ranking member, and in particular my colleagues the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) for their efforts in this behalf.

At a time of multiplying chaos in the world, this bill gives us a measure of certainty. The sources of chaos are technological as new weapons systems and new instruments of terrorism proliferate every day. The sources of chaos are political as new states are imposed upon ancient religious and ethnic rivalries. The only thing that is certain in our political evaluation is that there will be more chaos in the years to come. The certainty that is behind this bill is that we are making a decision for certain as a Congress that it will be the policy of this country to deploy and defend ourselves in the very best way we can with a national missile defense system.

The arguments against this bill are diplomatic, economic and strategic. I find each of the arguments lacking. The diplomatic argument against this bill is that it will somehow destabilize the world.

I think the greatest source of destabilization is the risks that an accidental or rogue launch could plunge the nuclear powers of the world into an irreversible course of mutual destruction. I think a viable defense system is an instrument of stability, not instability.

For those who raise economic objections to this bill, yes, it is expensive. Yes, every dollar of taxpayers' money that we spend must be spent carefully, but it is important to understand the narrow scope of the expenditure that is before us. In this year's budget, for example, about one nickel out of every $100 that we spend as a government will be dedicated to this purpose. One nickel out of every $100 is, in my judgment, a prudent and sound investment for the defense of the country.

For those who raise strategic objections, I would simply say that every strategic instrument that is possible to be at our disposal should be so.

Will this succeed today technologically? Of course not, but we cannot succeed technologically, we cannot reach the goal technologically until we have the goal.

When President Kennedy in the early sixties said we would get to the Moon as the first country in the world that would do so, it was impossible technologically at that time, but because he set that goal and we followed it as a country we set in means the creative resources of the country and we did achieve it. I believe the same thing will and can happen here.

It is for those reasons that I would urge both Republican and Democratic colleagues to support this piece of legislation.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), the majority leader.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, just a few days after Congress first enacted this legislation, or acted on this legislation, the State Department sent an internal cable to our embassies abroad instructing them to explain away the President's support for the bill.

That cable, which Mr. Weldon just placed in the RECORD, told these embassies to say, in effect, even though Congress has passed and the President has endorsed legislation committing America to deploy a national missile defense, do not worry because the President intends to use loopholes to deny that commitment.

In this way, the Clinton State Department sought to comfort foreign governments who feared that we might render their offensive missile programs harmless and obsolete.

Just what are the alleged loopholes the President was to seize upon? Because the bill says that funds for missile defense are subject to annual appropriations and authorization, the President thinks he can sign it without really committing to protect our citizens from missile attack.

This is, of course, ludicrous. The entire Defense Department is subject to annual appropriations. Much of the Federal Government is. Those words merely restate the obvious. They do not add or detract any significant meaning from the bill.

When John F. Kennedy committed to America to land a man on the Moon in his decade, that commitment was no less real because the money for the space program had to be appropriated each year. Neither is this commitment.

The President is seizing on this language to conceal that he and his party have been forced to flip-flop on missile defense. After over a decade spent opposing missile defense, they have been mugged by reality. The reality of a North Korean ICBM test, the Southwest Asia arms race, the Ayotollah's missile program, the theft of our nuclear secrets by Communist China, and the spread of missile technology around the globe.

Once the cable to Moscow and Beijing and elsewhere came to light, we considered trying to rewrite the bill but then we realized, what would be the point. If the President and his aides can so absurdly misconstrue even the most innocuous language, then there are no words that might have fixed meaning for this administration. All we can do here is make our intentions and the meanings crystal clear.

Let me do so. This bill commits the United States to deploy an effective national missile defense system as soon as is technologically possible. If the President disagrees with this position, if he truly believes that we should leave our citizens vulnerable to missile attack, he should show the character of a true leader and say so, without disassembling, without equivocation, without seizing on nonexistent loopholes. He should veto the bill.

If, on the other hand, he signs the bill, we can, by rights, conclude that he agrees with the plain English meaning of the bill and that is that the United States is committed to deploy a national missile defense as soon as is technologically possible.

I will close with this: The President's endorsement of this language, whatever his private feelings on it, is a tribute to the vast public support that now exists for national missile defense. It shows that the debate that Ronald Reagan started in 1983 has now been decisively won by those who believe that the American people need a defense that defends.

I am very proud that today we are taking this important step to defend the American people from missile attack. I am very proud that in this age of high technology we can use that technology to give our children that which is better than what they have had, the technology of the 1950s of duck and cover.

Mr. SKELTON. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) for yielding me this time.

Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to this legislation. There were many reasons to vote against the original House bill, H.R. 4. There are even more reasons to vote against the bill as amended by the Senate.

H.R. 4 provided that it is the policy of the United States to deploy a national missile defense. I opposed all 15 words of H.R. 4 because of what it did not say. It failed to acknowledge how much national missile defense would cost, whether it would undermine arms control and whether a national missile defense would actually work. On the other hand, the authors of H.R. 4, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), saw virtue in what it did not say.

As I look at the Senate amendment, I think that the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) have a point.

The Senate's version says that it is the policy of the United States to deploy, as soon as technologically possible, an effective national missile defense system. As soon as technologically possible, what does that mean? One test? Two tests? A really good simulation?

There is a huge difference between technologically possible and technologically viable, or technologically reliable. We should not commit to deploy until a system is fully and successfully demonstrated. Rushing deployment leaves us vulnerable to failure.

This bill may only be a national missile defense policy statement but it sets us on a slippery slope. Hit-to-kill technology has only succeeded in 5 of 19 intercept tests. Now to be sure, some of those failures are in the booster phase and people believe they can be corrected, but if we have another THAAD, which has failed on all six flight tests, we should not deploy NMD.

For other major defense systems, we fly before we buy; but for NMD, however, we are buying before we fly, and that is not right.

The U.S. should decide to deploy a national missile defense not today but only if it is tested rigorously and proven to work; only if it does not undermine overall U.S. national security, by jeopardizing mutual nuclear reductions and the ABM treaty, and only if it is needed as a cost effective defense available against nations with ballistic missiles.

Let me provide some perspective on this Congress' approach to national security. This bill rushes to deploy an unproven national missile defense to defend against an ill-defined future threat. Yet this House recently refused to support the deployment of our men and women in uniform to save lives and bring peace to the Balkans.

Madam Speaker, in the Middle Ages the king would command the alchemist to turn lead into gold but no amount of money or political will could turn lead into gold. Unlike alchemy, national missile defense may work some day but we cannot deny that there is more to national missile defense than wishing it into existence. Please defeat this bill.

Mr. SKELTON. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time remains on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) has 19 minutes remaining and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE) has 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. SKELTON. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER).

Mr. TURNER. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4. I was pleased to be a cosponsor of the original legislation sponsored by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Research and Development of the Committee on Armed Services that I serve on.

I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) for his leadership, as well as the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), for their work.

This bill recognizes the reality of the world in which we live today, a world that is a much more dangerous place, a world in which we face threats from rogue nations like Iran and Iraq and North Korea. The threat of unauthorized, or intentional or unintentional ballistic missile attack is a very real one. This bill addresses that threat that we face.

The people of our country do not realize that we are defenseless against a nuclear missile attack. They do not realize that a missile launched from North Korea would take a mere 23 minutes to reach the continental United States. In fact, it would take only 32 minutes for that missile to reach my home district in Texas. These figures are startling, but it does reinforce the fact that we must take steps today to defend ourselves against this threat.

I join with the many colleagues in this House who are supporting this legislation today, because we believe that our country has no choice but to make this investment in our defense. This bill requires that the system be deployed only after it is determined to be technologically possible to implement such a system. That is the right way to proceed, and I am very confident that our military and the scientists of our country will have the ability to put such a system in place.

We stand here today united in an effort to defend our country against threats that we have to face in today's world. I am confident that this bill will do the job, and I urge all of my colleagues to join in supporting H.R. 4.

□ 1515

Mr. SKELTON. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

It is particularly ironic that we are having the debate this week with the release of the latest Star Wars movie. We might title this ''Star Wars, the Phantom Solution,'' because that is what this is. This is a phantom solution. Hitting a bullet with a bullet in outer space to intercept a North Korean missile.

Now, let us think about it a minute. North Korea has not yet built the missile, it has not been successfully tested, but they might build one or two and put warheads on them. Well, one thing that works in our arsenal of the anti-ballistic missile defense is the radar. We can track the warheads. Guess what? The second they shoot something at us, we will know. Guess what? We have thousands of nuclear warheads with which to retaliate if they have shot at us. Will they do that? No.

This is not a real threat to the United States of America, single missiles launched that could be tracked back to their source. Any nut who is going to attack the United States with weapons of mass destruction is going to do it in an undetectable manner, and yet we are doing nothing to deal with bioterrorism, chemical terrorism, smuggled nuclear weapons, while we spend billions over here to make the defense contractors happy who have yet to conduct a successful defense test after spending nearly $50 billion.

So what is the solution? Hurry up and deploy it. Deploy what? The phantom system against the phantom menace.

This is real life; it is not a movie. We have to make tough choices. Are we going to defend America against real threats? Are we going to fund pay raises for the young men and women in the military? Or are we going to throw more billions after billions in a failed dream, a dream of Ronald Reagan which was put forward back in the 1980s, an impenetrable shield above the United States?

We all know that even if this thing works, we can bring in a submarine and launch under it, or terrorists certainly can smuggle in a nuclear weapon. This does not defend the United States against real threats.

I say to my colleagues, do not, do not do this. Do not destabilize the ABM Treaty. Do not waste our precious resources, and do not give people a false sense of security while we are letting real threats go unchallenged. Vote ''no.''

Mr. SKELTON. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT).

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Madam Speaker, it reminds me of the patent chief commenting about the invention of the telephone who said, who is kidding whom about this rip-off? Anybody that believes that two Americans will be able to speak through a wire across town is trying to steal your money.

I say to my colleagues, I support this bill. I support this chairman, the ranking member, and I support the distinguished Members who are responsible for bringing it. We cannot protect America any longer with a Neighborhood Crime Watch, and I am not just concerned about rogue action.

If my colleagues have seen the latest report of a classified Pentagon release, China has developed a super missile that has been labeled by the Pentagon ''invincible.'' Invincible. They have seen nothing like it. Now, what infuriates me is the report further goes on to say it is American tax dollars that built it, with a $60 billion trade surplus China enjoys now. But what really frosts me, the report goes on to say that the design of the invincible missile is basically the design that was stolen from America.

We have a problem. We have a major problem. And to those naysayers, let me say this. Our number one duty is to secure the national security, to protect your citizens and my citizens, in your towns, in my town, in every town of the United States of America. And with all of the technology we have, I want to compliment the wisdom of the

leaders here, we can intercept their missile. Invincible, my ascot.

Madam Speaker, I want to close out by saying the stealing of our secrets should be investigated, and let the chips fall where they may. I want to know how China got access to these secrets. Second of all, the President and Congress better come together and provide for an umbrella of security for this Nation. It may not be a total, 100 percent fail-safe program, but by God, our military has done quite well on intercepting foreign missiles.

Mr. SPENCE. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON).

(Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I thank my distinguished chairman for yielding me this time.

I just want to again clarify for the record that the gentleman who spoke earlier made the point that North Korea has not yet built a missile. Well, if the gentleman would go talk to George Tenet or Bob Walpole at the CIA, he could receive a classified briefing where they are now publicly saying that North Korea on August the 31st fired the Taepo Dong 1 missile. Maybe he does not believe the CIA, and that is something that I cannot comment on.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Madam Speaker, I was at the so-called classified briefing which was conducted by people who are consultants for defense contractors, and actually, subsequently it has turned out the test was not entirely successful, despite their protestations at that time.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, reclaiming my time, if the gentleman would talk to Bob Walpole, who is our CIA expert on strategic threats, the test itself shows that North Korea now, in the minds of our intelligence community, can, in fact fire a three-stage Taepo Dong 1 missile with a light payload that would hit a city in the U.S.

Now, what they say is it will not be accurate. They may aim for St. Louis and hit Dallas, but if one lives in Dallas, does it really matter that it is not accurate? The point is that the gentleman's CIA agents and his own administration have now said publicly that North Korea has the capability today.

Second point, he mentioned that we are not dealing with other threats. Again, I would ask the gentleman, although since he has left the floor I cannot ask him personally, if he would comment on our past five defense authorization bills, because in each of those bills with the leadership of the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), along with the leadership of the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE) and Members on both sides of the aisle, we have plussed up funding in the area of weapons of mass destruction and cyber terrorism to a higher amount than the administration has ever requested.

We did not do that one year, we did it all five years. We have given this administration money that they did not ask for to deal with the threats of a terrorist device, the threats of coming through our ports. We take that threat very seriously, and we are dealing with it. So when the gentleman says that we do not care or we are not concerned about other threats, he is totally misinformed or just has not gotten the latest brief.

Let me say at this point I want to acknowledge the intellectual honesty of the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN). He came down to the well and in a very intellectually honest way opposed what we are doing. I respect him for that. I respect the other 105 Members of this body, 104 Members, 102 Democrats and two Republicans, who voted against what we are doing, because intellectually they are being pure.

What I really have a problem with are those Members in the other body who want to have cover; who have consistently opposed missile defense but then came up with nonsensical amendments to now say they are for missile defense. The gentlewoman from California, one of the Senators from California who has consistently opposed missile defense, with these amendments now says she can support this bill. That is outrageously simplistic and it is not being intellectually honest. I would rather have those Members do like the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) and oppose the bill because they oppose the policy.

We just disagree. Let me say this, Madam Speaker. We passed this bill overwhelmingly in the House. The Senate passed a bill that we are considering today overwhelmingly in the Senate. The President then came out and issued this letter that is now a part of the Record where he said we will make the decision in a year.

Now, what is he saying? In a year we will decide whether or not the threat has changed. Well, Madam Speaker, his own CIA is saying the threat is here today. It is not going to change a year from now. It is already here. He is saying that we will have to evaluate the cost. He has already requested $10.5 billion in his five-year budget. So why would the President then want to wait a year after we are making a policy decision today?

I hate to say this because this has been a totally bipartisan effort, and I applaud my colleagues on the other side for their leadership, because without that we probably would not be here today. But I can tell my colleagues why I think the President is saying postpone it for a year. He wants to give Vice President GORE a major campaign appearance where, in the middle of the spring of next year, he will hold a press conference and with all the gravity he can bring as the Vice President, he will say that we now have to deploy a national missile defense system.

Well, I want to let the President know, if the President is listening, and I would say to my colleagues I want to let the President know through them that we see through that facade. We are not going to stand here today and pass this bill and make this change, and have the President or the Vice President plan some kind of a political event a year from now so that they can enhance their standing in the polls. This bill means that when this President signs it, the policy to deploy on behalf of this country is today.

I thank my colleagues and the leadership in both parties for supporting this momentous piece of legislation.

Mr. SKELTON. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES).

Mr. REYES. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I rise today in support of this bill, although somewhat reluctantly. As an original cosponsor of H.R. 4 and a longtime proponent of national missile defense, I want to be supportive of this bill. However, I have several concerns that I must express on the floor today.

Like many of my colleagues, I supported this bill as originally drafted, both for what it said and for what it did not say. That bill did not say when a national missile defense system must be deployed, how a national missile defense system must be deployed, nor where a national missile defense system would be deployed. It did not include extra provisions that are not sufficiently defined, like ''technologically possible.'' Our bill also did not include language that could upset our colleagues in the Duma, something that is very important to us as we move towards better relations with Russia.

The Senate version which we are now being forced to take or leave today states that it is the policy of the United States to seek continued negotiated reductions in Russian nuclear forces. I understand the need to continue negotiating with the Russians, because that is the issue with the reduction in nuclear forces. However, traditionally, negotiations have included both reductions between the Soviet Union and between the United States. The Senate language could be perceived by the Duma as an insult because it includes only a reduction in their forces and it does not address reductions in ours.

Another concern is aimed directly at the other body as a whole. Many of us were under the impression that we would have the opportunity to go to conference with the Senate and work on a compromise between those two bills. Instead, the Senate simply chose to retain only our bill number and return the bill to us with their language.

As I noted, I have been a long time supporter of national missile defense.

Some critics of deploying a national missile defense system argue that the technology is not proven. National missile defense will use hit-to-kill technology. It is like hitting a bullet with a bullet.

Recently, another one of DOD's hit-to-kill missile defense programs, the PAC–3, showed that this technology can work. I repeat, this technology can and does work. The PAC–3 interceptor successfully destroyed the target over White Sands Missile Range in New Mexico this past March.

I know that perfecting national missile defense technology will be more difficult than for the PAC–3. However, I just want to make sure that all of my colleagues in this House understand that the Army has proven the hit-to-kill concept.

I also want to reiterate what my good friend CURT WELDON said earlier. THAAD is not a failure. Again, THAAD is not a failure. THAAD has accomplished 28 of its 30 milestones. Every time THAAD has failed to intercept the target missile, it has done so, but has shown that the failure was due to a low-tech problem. These problems with the THAAD have been quality control issues, not design defects.

We need to show our support of national missile defense and move forward with a program as quickly as we can. As such, I will support this bill today and I also urge all of my colleagues to do so. It is vital to the security of this Nation that we move forward on this issue today.

Mr. SPENCE. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SKELTON. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to merely say that much has changed since the Strategic Defense Initiative debate was born some 16 years ago, and a lot has changed since last year. So I ask all of the Members, Madam Speaker, to approach this bill, H.R. 4, as amended, with an open mind, as a good-faith effort to establish a bipartisan consensus on defending America. I intend to vote for it. I urge all of my colleagues to do the same.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1530

Mr. SPENCE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. We should not have to be here today. People cannot understand the frustrations we have had over a long period of time in having to literally fight our own government to protect our own people.

I will just go back to recent history. In 1996 we provided for national missile defense for our people, to protect our people from missile attack. The President vetoed that legislation. We have been trying time and time again since that time. No one could imagine the hoops we have had to jump through in an effort to force our government to protect our own people.

One example, just for the RECORD, to show the extent to which our own administration will go in an effort to resist our efforts to defend our people.

Back when the bill was vetoed in 1996, the administration had a politicized intelligence estimate put out by the CIA, the national intelligence estimate. It goes in part like this: Aside from the declared nuclear powers, it will be 10 years before any rogue Nation can develop the capability to threaten this country with missile attacks.

When I saw that, I said, my gosh, what about the declared nuclear powers? Are they not a threat? They were just brushed aside. And what about the fact that a Nation which does not have a capability can simply purchase a capability from someone else? They do not have to develop their own capability themselves from scratch, we say, they can buy it.

So I called up the Director of the CIA at that time in an effort to get him to issue a clarifying estimate that was not misleading to the American people, because the American people had been lulled into a false sense of security.

Well, the result was that the Director refused to change the estimate reflecting those things, so we had to appoint an outside commission, a bipartisan outside commission of intelligence experts, to assess the threat and report back to Congress of what their findings might be.

They reported back and they confirmed what we had said. Instead of 10 years to develop a capability, we would have little or no warning, according to this report.

On the part about taking 10 years to develop a capability, they confirmed what we said by giving an example of how China sold, intact, a mobile intercontinental ballistic missile system to another country. This other country becomes nuclear-capable overnight by simply buying the system.

This is just one example of what we have had to do along this line to get us to this place today. I hope that we are on our way now with the passage of this legislation. I pray that it is, and I pray that it is in time, and that we can develop a defense before we are actually faced with an attack.

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4 which states that it is the policy of the United States to deploy a national missile defense. I am convinced that this measure should and will pass by a large bipartisan majority. I am also convinced that the President of the United States will sign this important piece of legislation. In doing so the President will make a historic decision, a decision to protect the United States and its people from the grave threat of missile attack.

Today the United States faces these threats defenseless, unable to stop even a single missile launched at the United States. And yet there are dark clouds on the horizon. Countries like North Korea and Iran are moving ahead undaunted with weapons of mass destruction programs, including intercontinental ballistic missiles. The United States and the American people are at risk now, and H.R. 4 states clearly that we must do something to respond to these threats.

I would also like to take a moment to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his tireless work and leadership on this critical issue. It is rare that one individual can make such a difference on behalf of his country. The bipartisan support for this measure is a tribute to his hard work and dedication to protecting the American people from a clear and imminent threat.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this vital measure.

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this bill.

It is imperative that we move forward to counter the growing ballistic missile threat. Today our nation has absolutely no ability whatsoever to shoot down an incoming ballistic missile—even one fired by accident.

Meanwhile, rogue and terrorist states like North Korea and Iran are committing significant resources towards the development of these weapons. Last August, North Korea—notwithstanding the severe famine now going on there—launched a three-stage ballistic missile, demonstrating an ability to threaten United States territory for the first time. Likewise, Iran is actively seeking long-range missiles that could threaten our nation.

This bill reflects the Congress's bipartisan concern about this situation, and expresses the belief that all Americans should be protected against this very real threat. It will make it the policy of the United States to deploy a national missile defense system to defend against a limited attack as soon as technologically possible.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, I implore my colleagues to not commit the United States to a flawed policy with a flawed process.

It is a flawed policy to commit the United States to a missile defense policy that hasn't been proven technologically feasible.

The chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, one of our nation's highest military leaders, said ''the simple fact is that we do not yet have the technology to field a national missile defense.''

It is a flawed policy to commit the United States to a missile defense policy with an open-ended price tag.

Since 1962 we have spent $120 billion to develop missile defense system.

We paid $67 billion for the failed ''Star Wars'' initiative.

In the last 10 years we have put some $40 million into the program.

At $4.2 billion this year, missile defense is the largest single weapons program in the defense budget.

What about our other defense priorities?

It is a flawed policy to maintain a defense posture at the expense of all other domestic priorities.

We have not yet saved Social Security, we have not reduced class size, we have not provided for health care for all Americans.

In our zeal to protect our democracy we are actually jeopardizing our democracy by failing to protect our domestic tranquility.

I urge the defeat of H.R. 4.

Mr. SPENCE. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). Pursuant to House Resolution 179, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SPENCE. Madam Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 345, nays 71, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 144]

YEAS—345

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLauro
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Etheridge
Everett
Ewing
Fletcher
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Mink
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Ortiz
Ose
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Paul
Pease
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sanchez
Sandlin
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Toomey
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Upton
Visclosky
Walden
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—71

Allen
Baird
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barrett (WI)
Blumenauer
Bonior
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Capuano
Carson
Clay
Clayton
Conyers
Coyne
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
Doggett
Ehlers
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Gutierrez
Hinchey
Holt
Hooley
Jackson (IL)
Jones (OH)
Kaptur
Kilpatrick
Kucinich
Lee
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren
Luther
Markey
McDermott
McGovern
McKinney
Meeks (NY)
Miller, George
Minge
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Owens
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Rangel
Rivers
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schakowsky
Slaughter
Strickland
Tierney
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Vento
Waters
Watt (NC)
Weiner
Woolsey
Wu

NOT VOTING—18

Bilirakis
Brown (CA)
DeMint
Deutsch
Foley
Frank (MA)
Largent
McNulty
Moakley
Napolitano
Pickett
Rogers
Salmon
Stark
Thomas
Towns
Walsh
Waxman

□ 1555

Mr. BAIRD and Mr. RANGEL changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. HOBSON changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. THOMAS. Madam Speaker, I was not present for the vote concurring in the Senate amendment to H.R. 4. The National Missile Defense Act. If I had been present I would have voted ''yea.''

Mr. ROGERS. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 144, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

Mr. DEUTSCH. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 144, I was unavoidably absent from the Chamber. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

Mr. ROGERS. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably detained for rollcall vote No. 144, agreeing to the Senate amendment to H.R. 4, a bill declaring United States policy of the deployment of a national missile defense system. If I had been present, I would have voted ''aye.''

I am a strong supporter of this legislation and voted for the original measure when the House of Representatives earlier considered it this year.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SPENCE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 4.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT, FRIDAY, MAY 21, 1999, TO FILE A PRIVILEGED REPORT ON AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight, Friday, May 21, 1999, to file a privileged report on a bill making appropriations for agriculture, rural development, Food and Drug Administration, and related agencies programs for fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All points of order are reserved on the bill.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT, FRIDAY, MAY 21, 1999, TO FILE A PRIVILEGED REPORT ON LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight, Friday, May 21, 1999 to file a privileged report on a bill making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All points of order are reserved on the bill.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Ms. DELAURO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, I rise to inquire about next week's schedule.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY) for an explanation of the schedule for next week.

□ 1600

Mr. ARMEY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to announce that we have concluded legislative business for the week. The House will not be in session on Friday, May 21.

The House will next meet on Monday, May 24, at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour and at 2 o'clock p.m. for legislative business. We will consider a number of bills under suspension of the rules, a list of which will be distributed to all Members' offices. Members should note that we expect votes after 6 o'clock p.m. on Monday, May 24.

On Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday of next week, the House will take up:

H.R. 1259, the Social Security and Medicare Safety Deposit Box Act of 1999;

H.R. 1833, the United States Trade Representative and Customs Service Reauthorization Act;

H.R. 150, the Education Land Grant Act;

The Agriculture Appropriations Act;

The Legislative Branch Appropriations Act; and

H.R. 1401, the Defense Authorization Act.

On Tuesday, May 25, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for morning hour and at 10 a.m. for legislative business.

On Wednesday, May 26, and Thursday, May 27, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for legislative business.

Madam Speaker, we hope to conclude legislative business for the week by 6 p.m. on Thursday, May 27.

I would like to remind Members that the Memorial Day District Work Period begins following the close of legislative business on Thursday, May 27. And the House will return on Monday, June 7, with votes after 6 p.m.

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the majority leader for the schedule. If I might just ask one or two questions about the schedule for next week.

Does my colleague know what days the Social Security Lock Box bill and the appropriations bills will be called up?

Mr. ARMEY. Madam Speaker, if the gentlewoman would continue to yield, I thank the gentlewoman for asking.

On Tuesday, we expect to do the Lock Box and the Agriculture Appropriations bill. It is our expectation that on Wednesday we will be able to do Legislative Branch Appropriations, the Education Land Grant, and USTR-Customs. On Thursday, we would begin work on DOD authorization.

If the gentlewoman would continue to yield, I should encourage Members to anticipate that we may be working later into the evenings on these evenings next week. As our past experience tells us, when we enter appropriations season and we begin to consider these bills under the 5-minute rule, they may oftentimes take longer days than other legislative business under more time-constrained rules.

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, the majority leader anticipated my question in wanting to know if there were going to be any late nights next week. So we should anticipate late nights next week.

And a final question: I do not see on the agenda listed out for next week anything about campaign finance reform on the schedule. Does the gentleman from Texas know when we might be able to expect any action on that issue?

Mr. ARMEY. Madam Speaker, again, I thank the gentlewoman for her inquiry. And if the gentlewoman would continue to yield, we have had several discussions with different Members that have interest in this matter.

As the gentlewoman knows, we are going into the appropriations season. The appropriations season is very important in terms of its early conclusion in order to get into the final end-of-the-year appropriations conference reports.

It is our anticipation that, while we expect this important issue to be addressed before the year is over, that we would like to get this appropriations work behind us so that we would have time to address that during which period they are in their conference committees. So I would guess that she should have an anticipation that it would be sometime later in the year.

Ms. DELAURO. Sometime later in the year.

Mr. ARMEY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House join me in wishing my son, Scott, happy birthday tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY MONTH

(Mr. DOGGETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DOGGETT. Madam Speaker, occupational therapy is a health and rehabilitation profession that helps people regain development and build skills that are important for independent functioning, health, well-being, and happiness. Occupational therapy employs purposeful occupational tasks, the kind of thing that we do in our everyday life, to return individuals with disability to function.

The American Occupational Therapy Association has a motto that expresses it so very well. ''Occupational Therapy: Skills for the Job of Living.''

In Texas and across the Nation, we recently recognized contributions of this important profession with an official designation of Occupational Therapy Month. Our therapists help those whose lives are dramatically impacted by injury or stroke. They help people return to work and resume their place in the community. They work in the aid and development of children. They assist parents in developing and improving the skills necessary to participate in school, work, play, or leisure activities.

My wife, Libby, has had an opportunity to see firsthand the incredible work that our occupational therapists perform to improve the quality of life for individuals with disabilities. I join in recognizing the significant benefits of occupational therapy for Americans from childhood to old age and salute the efforts of our occupational therapists across the country.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, MAY 24, 1999

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Monday next for morning hour debates.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

INTRODUCTION OF THE BORDER PATROL RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION ACT OF 1999

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, today I rise with my colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SILVESTRE REYES), to stand up for the men and women who guard our Nation's borders and risk their lives every day.

Today, with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES), I will introduce the Border Patrol Recruitment and Retention Act of 1999. The legislation will

provide incentives and support for recruiting and retaining Border Patrol agents. This legislation would increase the compensation of Border Patrol agents, and allow the Border Patrol agency to recruit its own agents without relying on personnel officers of the Department of Justice or the INS.

The United States is in dire need of more Border Patrol agents to enforce policies against illegal immigration and drug smuggling. Under current law, the INS is authorized to add a total of 5,000 additional border agents at a rate of 1,000 per fiscal year from 1997 to 2001.

We have not met our goals. The INS has only recruited between 200 and 400 new agents because salaries and the recruitment skills have not been up to par.

My legislation will increase the salaries and work harder at retention, and salute those men and women who serve us very ably at the border. It is time now to give more respect to our border agents.

Madam Speaker, I rise to the floor of the House today to stand up for a group of men and women who guard our nation's borders and risk their very lives everyday. The group of men and women whom I am referring to are the United States Border Patrol. Today, along with my colleague from Texas, Mr. REYES, I introduce the ''Border Patrol Recruitment and Retention Act of 1999.''

This legislation will provide incentives and support for recruiting and retaining Border Patrol agents. This legislation would increase the compensation for Border Patrol agents and allow the Border Patrol agency to recruit its own agents without relying on personnel offices of the Department of Justice or INS.

The United States is in dire need of more Border Patrol agents to enforce policies against illegal immigration and drug smuggling. Under current law, the INS is authorized to add a total of five thousand additional border patrol agents, at a rate of five thousand additional border patrol agents, at a rate of one thousand per fiscal year from 1997 to 2001. However, INS did not request any additional agents in its FY 2000 budget due in large part to the lucrative job market and the low unemployment rate.

According to Commissioner Meissner of the INS, only 200 to 400 new agents will be hired this year. Arizona had been slated to receive approximately 400 of the full complement but will not likely receive between 100–150, and my home state of Texas, which would have received approximately 500 new agents this year, could see that number cut by more than half.

The ''Border Patrol Recruitment and Retention Enhancement Act'' would move Border Patrol agents with one year's agency experience from the federal government's GS–9 pay level (approximately $34,000 annually) to GS–11 (approximately $41,000 annually) next year. We need better recruitment and better retention. We cannot play with the nation's borders, and right now in the Immigration and Claims subcommittee in which I am a Ranking Member, we listen to testimony hearing after hearing about how the Border Patrol agents need more money, and the INS needs to be given the resources to be able to do it. This legislation is the step in that direction.

Madam Speaker, we are a nation of immigrants and a nation of laws. The ''Border Patrol Recruitment and Retention Act of 1999,'' will give us the ability to control our borders and uphold the law. I urge my colleagues to join me and Mr. REYES, who is our resident expert on Border Patrol matters due to his service as a Border Patrol Sector Chief to support this much needed measure.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

REGARDING LATEST SHOOTING IN ATLANTA

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

Mr. HASTERT. Madam Speaker, the latest shooting in an Atlanta school is deeply troubling. My wife is a teacher in a public school. My kids have gone to a public school. I taught for a lot of years in a public school.

I fervently believe that every child deserves to learn in a good school and in a safe environment. But how can we create such an environment if it is the children themselves who make the schools unsafe?

Clearly, we need to tighten current laws to make it more difficult for kids to get guns. We will take a look at the measure passed by the Senate to make sure that it is a reasonable and common sense approach.

We also need to more effectively enforce the laws that are already on the books and to prosecute those who break the laws. But these measures will fall short if we do not effectively address the deeper problems that face our society and our children.

Our children need to learn the differences between right and wrong. They need moral instruction. They need a culture that reinforces positive values that help create a safer and more secure society.

It is more difficult to be a parent today. We feel the need to work harder just to keep pace with the neighbors. All too often, parents are forced to worry first about their jobs and then about their kids. And it is becoming more and more difficult for parents to monitor what their kids are watching, hearing, and learning.

I support free expression, but there is a point where unbridled free expression undermines a free society. I challenge the entertainment industry, the Internet industry, the video game industry, and the media to become good corporate citizens. Monitor the material that flows to our kids.

I applaud the Disney Company for taking some steps in the right direction, but the whole industry must join in the cause. Keep casual gunplay out of the movies. Keep hate music out of the music stores. Keep bomb-making web sites off the Internet. Do not make video games so violent that they warp young minds.

Free expression does not necessarily have to lead to moral chaos. Let us join together in finding ways to help parents raise their children to be good productive citizens.

GOD BLESS AMERICA'S VETERANS

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

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I have the privilege of representing the Third District of North Carolina. The Third District covers most of the eastern part of the State, including five military bases: Cherry Point Marine Corps Air Station, New River Marine Corps Air Station, Seymour Johnson Air Force Base, Elizabeth City Coast Guard Station, and Camp Lejeune Marine Corps Base.

In eastern North Carolina we are also proud to be the home of 77,000 thousand of our Nation's 25 million living veterans. Madam Speaker, these are the men and women who courageously served to protect this country and preserve the principles that it was founded upon.

Out of respect and appreciation, we must ensure the sacrifice these brave soldiers made is something we never forget and that the vital role they play in this country's history remains as unmistakable as our commitment to their continued well-being.

As President Abraham Lincoln said in his Second Inaugural Address: ''Let us care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and his orphan.''

This statement is said to reveal the government's promise to provide lifetime health care for our veterans and their families, a promise that many of my colleagues in Congress and I continue fighting to fulfill.

Madam Speaker, today I am here to share with my colleagues good news, to tell them of two successful efforts by the government to provide our Nation's veterans with the health care that they need and deserve.

Two weeks ago I had the pleasure of attending the dedication of a new community-based outpatient clinic in Jacksonville, North Carolina. For the veterans of Onslow County, this is a tremendous victory and the result of a great deal of work and determination.

It has been a priority of mine for some time to find a way to see that a satellite facility was built in eastern North Carolina. For too long, many veterans were forced to travel to Fayetteville, North Carolina or Durham, North Carolina to reach the closest VA hospital.

Madam Speaker, as my colleagues can see, we were in desperate need of health care services that were more accessible to the veterans of eastern

North Carolina. The journey was long, but we now have two reasons to celebrate.

The Jacksonville facility marks the second outpatient clinic in eastern North Carolina. It has just been joined by a third. Earlier this week, an additional VA clinic opened in Greenville, North Carolina. They both serve as tributes of the commitment to duty, God, and country that each of our soldiers accept.

Madam Speaker, I am proud of the efforts of the Department of Veterans Affairs to reach out to veterans across this country, especially considering the drastic cuts they have suffered. Since the end of 1994, the Department of Veterans Affairs has cut 20,000 medical care employees, eliminated half of its acute-care hospital beds, and merged many neighboring hospitals. Following such extreme fiscal cutbacks, the Administration's budget request for Fiscal Year 2000 was worth little more than the paper it was printed on.

Fortunately, I am proud to stand here today to report that a Republican Congress has increased the VA budget $1.7 billion over the President's recommendation. And I only wish that it could be more.

Madam Speaker, today I came to the floor to reaffirm my commitment to the men and women who answered their call to duty and protected the freedom my colleagues and I enjoy today. I urge my colleagues to join me in fighting to make sure our Nation's veterans have access to quality, accessible health care, a promise made to them by the government they pledged to protect.

Again, I want to quote Abraham Lincoln when he said it, and he said it best: ''Let us care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and his orphan.''

Madam Speaker, it is the least we can do to thank our Nation's heroes, our United States veterans. God bless America, and God bless those who have served and those who are serving America today.

□ 1615

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

(Mr. PALLONE 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 Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

CALLING FOR END TO FAILED POLICY IN YUGOSLAVIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, how long must the bombing of Yugoslavia continue? I have asked that question repeatedly on this floor over the last week, and no one seems to have an answer. Where is the President leading us?

Today, the New York Times, which is generally supportive of the President, contained an article written by Michael Gordon entitled, NATO's Battle Within: Is Leadership Missing? In the article, Mr. Gordon wrote that NATO strategy for bringing the war to a successful close is starting to unravel. Without clear direction from Washington, Britain, Germany and Italy have begun to promote publicly their separate and conflicting plans. Britain wants ground troops in Kosovo and Yugoslavia. Germany is opposed to ground troops. Italy wants to stop the bombing. In the article, they quoted the former Director of European Affairs at the National Security Council who was quoted as saying, there is a lack of direction because no one is leading the way.

Mr. President, why do you not lead the way and stop the bombing? Mr. President, Italy today has urged NATO to impose a 48-hour bombing pause to pursue a diplomatic settlement. I urge you to stop the bombing.

Just last night, NATO launched its strongest air attack in 2 weeks against the Belgrade area. Our bombs hit a hospital and at least three civilians were killed. Furthermore, an operating room was demolished, an intensive care unit was leveled, and rescuers were evacuating women and children from the maternity ward, just last night in Belgrade, because of our bombings. In addition, the Swedish ambassador's residence was damaged when an exploding bomb blew out windows and a door.

Mr. President, your policy is not working. Not only are we losing the support of our allies but bombing has exacerbated the refugee problem among the Kosovar Albanians and now, because of the bombings, the Serbian people themselves. From a policy point, it is difficult to imagine how the situation could be much worse. Our bombs have killed innocent people, destroyed hospitals, leveled the embassy of China, damaged the infrastructure, and now even damaged the residence of the Swedish ambassador to Yugoslavia. The incessant bombing has transformed what was a Balkan crisis into a worldwide crisis. In fact, the New York Times Sunday reported how demonstrations are erupting all over the world against the bombing.

So I would say to the President, what do you want? The Yugoslavian government is beginning to remove forces from Kosovo. They have expressed a willingness to negotiate. How many more bombs must be dropped? How many more deaths must occur before you stop this failed policy and give diplomacy an opportunity to work?

ON H.R. 644, PRESCRIPTION DRUG FAIRNESS FOR SENIORS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, I rise to put an end to a national disgrace. Plainly speaking, I am talking about price gouging, price gouging some of the most vulnerable members of our community, our seniors.

Americans widely support programs to ensure the health and welfare of older Americans. We have Social Security, we have Medicare, as well as housing programs, nutrition programs and programs that really protect our low-income seniors. Seniors today have less fear of being taken advantage of because of consumer laws and senior abuse laws that protect them. But there is one area where we clearly have failed, and that is to ensure that prescription drugs are affordable, affordable to the people who need them the most, our seniors.

The latest surveys indicate that 86 percent of Medicare beneficiaries take prescription drugs and that the elderly in the United States, who make up only 12 percent of our population, use one-third of the prescription drugs sold in this Nation. The need for prescription drugs to treat such diseases as arthritis, diabetes, high blood pressure, heart disease, is simply a fact of life for seniors, or a fact of death. A few years ago, a survey of seniors reported that 13 percent of older Americans had to choose between eating or buying medicine.

In Sonoma and Marin Counties, the district I represent, the two counties north of the Golden Gate bridge, two individuals that I have come to know, Roy and Ivera Cobbs of Sebastopol, have had to make some very difficult decisions around their prescription drugs. What they decided was, she would take her prescription drugs and he would not because they could not afford both. That is not the way we are supposed to be treating our seniors.

Also in Sonoma and Marin County, the area Agencies on Aging and Green Thumb have told me some other stories. They tell me about cases where seniors just do not buy food because they have to have prescription drugs, or they take part of their prescription every other day instead of every day or once a day instead of twice a day, as prescribed by their doctors, because they cannot afford to pay for the whole dosage. And for the reason some seniors cannot pay for them keeps our seniors from having the best health care they can. This reason, I believe, is solely on the shoulders of the Nation's largest drug companies, because they engage in discriminatory pricing. If you are a favored customer, like an HMO, like a large insurance company, you pay less, much less for prescription drugs. But if you are an older person, on Medicare, you pay a premium price for your drugs.

In the district I represent, Sonoma County seniors pay on the average of 145 percent more for the most commonly used drugs than favored customers pay for the same drugs. For one drug, they pay 242 percent more than favored customers. I know this, because I asked the minority staff of the Committee on Government Reform to look into prescription drug pricing in Sonoma and Marin Counties. I released the results to that report to my community and its central conclusion can be summed up in the report subtitle, Drug Companies Profit at the Expense of Older Americans. As Members can see by these charts, for Sonoma County alone, the study looked into five commonly used prescription drugs, charted their price at local pharmacies and compared those prices to what the Federal Government pays for the same drugs. The Federal negotiated price is nearly the same, you must know, as that charged to favored private customers, large insurance companies and HMOs. Senior citizens and other individuals who pay for their own drugs pay more than twice as much for these drugs than do the drug companies' most favored customers. For some drugs listed in the report, the price is even more outrageous. Synthroid, for example, a hormone treatment, costs Sonoma County seniors 1,738 percent more than it cost the manufacturer's favored customers. By looking at these charts, we can see that for Medicare patients, those who need the cholesterol drug Zocor, their costs are significantly greater than the favored customers. This comes out to $115 for Medicare patients and $34 for the favored customers. That is 231 percent different. The difference is not in price because the HMOs, the large insurance companies and government buyers are able to negotiate and buy in bulk. The difference is because they are charging seniors to make up the difference for what they cut for their most favored customers.

INTRODUCING LEGISLATION TO HELP AMERICA'S FARMERS

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

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Madam Speaker, American agriculture today and rural communities today face an extraordinary challenge, the challenge of having farm policy change in 1996 with the consent and approval of this Congress and the consent and approval of the President of the United States for the good, to have an opportunity to have less farming for the government and more farming for the market. Overall, combined with the freedom that this new agriculture policy provides and the additional expenditure of taxpayer dollars for agriculture research with the movement toward reduction of Federal regulations that hampered the farmer's freedom to do what the farmer does best, and that is farm for the market and other changes that were made in the 1996 farm bill, it has overall been a good thing. What the American farmer faces today is low prices and lack of markets. Our farmers do not have the ability to market overseas the products that we grow so well in this country.

My State of Washington is a perfect example, and the Fifth Congressional District is a more narrow example of a perfect example. That is, our farmers in the Fifth District grow wheat and barley and oats and peas and lentils and potatoes and apples, the best in the world. But yet most of our products, on our grain products and commodities, are exported overseas. My farmers are limited in those exports because of unilateral American sanctions on countries that used to be wonderful trading partners of Washington State farmers and agriculture in the West.

I have introduced legislation, H.R. 212, earlier in this Congress as a priority matter for not only the farmers of the Pacific Northwest but the farmers of the country. What that bill does is lift the unilateral sanctions that are currently in place by our government that prevent our farmers from selling to countries that other farmers around the world can sell to. We used to have a fine market in wheat sales to Iran and Iraq and the Sudan and other places that are currently sanctioned. The sanctions are imposed because of our disagreements with the terrorist policies and the enemy policies of these governments.

I disagree with those policies of those rogue nations that have used terror in the world and oppression in the world. But yet selling agriculture and medicine to those countries does not in my judgment pose a national security threat on our country. What it does as we unilaterally impose those sanctions is hurt our farmers. So H.R. 212 does two things. It lifts the sanctions that are currently in place for food and medicine only, and it gives the President the opportunity in the event that the President feels that lifting those sanctions poses a national security threat, the President has the ability to reimpose those sanctions on that basis. But in the meantime, it allows our farmers, then, to seek to reclaim those markets that we have lost by virtue of the sanctions.

In 1980, President Carter imposed a sanction on the Soviet Union for political purposes. Who did that hurt? It hurt the Olympics, and the American interest in the Olympics, and it hurt American farmers, a market that was a prime market for my farmers in the West. We have yet to get that agriculture market back by virtue of those sanctions back in 1980.

□ 1630

Yesterday in the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies on which I serve as a subcommittee member I introduced a narrower version of H.R. 212 which would lift of the sanctions on food and medicine for these countries that are currently sanctioned, but it would not allow any government spending in connection with the lifting of those sanctions. In other words, the taxpayer would not bear any of the burden for allowing our farmers to deal directly with those countries and make sales. It is a $6 billion plus market for our farmers in commodities as diverse as rice and corn and peas and wheat and barley. It is a great market that is exposed to our farmers.

Unfortunately, Madam Speaker, my friends on the appropriations subcommittee defeated this amendment by a vote of 28 to 24. It was a very close vote, but it was a great debate, and we ought to have that debate again on H.R. 212 and on this next version of this amendment that went into the appropriation bill yesterday.

So, I urge my colleagues to study H.R. 212, study the concept of lifting sanctions on food and medicine. It is a humanitarian basis that is good policy for our country, and it will absolutely help our agriculture markets who are struggling to find markets overseas.

One final point: In the event that we lift these sanctions and allow farmer-to-country correspondence and sales, it prevents the agriculture community that is in straits from coming to the Congress and seeking Federal tax dollars. It is the free market approach to agriculture success.

INTRODUCTION OF THE BROADCASTERS FAIRNESS IN ADVERTISING ACT OF 1999

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

Mr. RUSH. Madam Speaker, today I am here to introduce the Broadcasters Fairness in Advertising Act of 1999. There is a silent and pervasive trend among ad agencies and the companies they represent to engage in discriminatory practices which are called, quote, ''no urban/Spanish dictates'' end of quote, and they are called, quote, ''minority discounts,'' end of quote. The term: ''No urban slash Spanish dictates'' means not advertising products on stations that cater to minorities. ''Minority discounts'' means paying minority-owned stations far less for advertising the same product that is paid to nonminority-owned stations. These policies have no business rationale and are purely discriminatory.

Madam Speaker, year in and year out minority broadcasters lose millions of dollars in revenues, however the advertising companies would have us believe otherwise. They will contend that they do not advertise in these stations because minorities do not buy their products.

For example, in a study conducted by the FCC, a major mayonnaise manufacturer told a station manager that, quote, black people do not eat mayonnaise, end of quote. Or worse, one minority station salesperson was told that, and I quote again, black people do not eat beef, end of quote. Such a blatantly absurd statement demonstrates the openly racist obstacles minority broadcasters face from the advertising industry.

My bill will prohibit discrimination against minority formatted stations by directing the FCC to adopt regulations to prevent such discrimination. It would also allow private right of action by any minority broadcaster who has been subjected to advertising discrimination. And finally, my bill will prohibit Federal agencies from contracting with ad agencies that utilize these discriminatory practices.

Madam Speaker, I sincerely hope that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will join me in supporting this very, very important initiative.

ON THE OCCASION OF THE INAUGURATION OF THE NATIONAL CONGRESS OF KURDISTAN

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

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak about democracy, a form of government which was invented in the 5th century B.C. by the Greeks in Athens, great city of Athens. The British honor democracy through their parliament, the Japanese have their Diet, the Duma serves the Russians, and of course here in the United States democracy is exercised right here on the floor of Congress. Democracy still remains the best hope for troubled humanity throughout the world.

With the end of the Cold War, Madam Speaker, we have seen a great expansion of the boundaries of democracy. The world is a better place today because many former Soviet republics now enjoy self determination and are given their rightful seats in the Hall of Nations. But auspicious as has been the forward march of liberty, the world remains far from being free. Nations remain in captivity. The color of one's skin still bars some from feeling our common humanity. But the hope that we can rise to the challenge of total equality is enduring. People of goodwill are risking their lives against great odds. They know the rewards are worth the risks.

Madam Speaker, on May 24, 1999, just a few days from now, a nation whose voice has been silenced for too long will convene its first congress, unfortunately not in its own land but in Brussels, Belgium, and 150 delegates from around the world representing the Kurdish people of Turkey, Syria, Iraq, Iran and the former Soviet republics will assemble for the purpose of raising their voice for their brothers and sisters who are denied a voice in Kurdistan. I salute the birth of this congress that represents a people as old as the dawn of history.

Madam Speaker, the Kurds are natives of the Middle East who inhabit a mountainous region as large as the State of Texas. They speak Kurdish, which is distinct from Turkish and Arabic but is closely linked with Persian. Having survived in mountain strongholds and ancient empires, they are now persecuted, denied their identity and forced to become Turks or Arabs or Persian by the states that were born in the early 20th century. Thirty million strong, they are viewed as beasts of burden or as cannon fodder, but never as Kurds who should enjoy human rights that we take for granted in this country.

It is a crime to be a Kurd in Turkey, Madam Speaker. Saddam Hussein has used chemical and biological weapons against them in Iraq. The theocracy in Tehran often machine guns the Kurdish dissidents in the city squares. The poignancy of the Kurdish situation hits closer to home when we realize that our own government is sometimes involved in their misery. Turkey boosts of American F–16 fighter planes, Sikorsky attack helicopters and M–60 battle tanks. Saddam Hussein, according to some declassified U.N. documents, had the support of 24 European companies to produce his deadly chemical fumes and biological fumes. Tehran's opposition to the Kurds has gone beyond Iran with the assassination of Kurdish leaders in Vienna and Berlin.

We all revere the words of Thomas Jefferson when he wrote in the Declaration of Independence: ''When in the course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bonds which have connected them with another, and to assume among the Powers of the earth the separate and equal station to which the Laws of Nature and of Nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation.''

Madam Speaker, given the lot of the Kurds, it is more than understandable that they set up their own Congress and take charge of their own destiny. They have the people, the resources and the political understanding to succeed in their dream of statehood.

Madam Speaker, I need also at this time to address the situation of Abdullah Ocalan, the Kurdish leader who, according to a recent New York Times article, was handed over to the Turks with the help of our intelligence services. As you may recall, he had ventured to Europe from his home base in the Middle East to seek a political solution to the enduring Kurdish struggle for basic human rights. I spoke on this floor welcoming his declaration of cease-fire and hoped, it now seems against hope, to see the debate on the Kurdish question change from war to peace and from confrontation to dialogue.

Mr. Ocalan, denied a refuge in Rome, was promised the safe passage through Greece to the Hague where he intended to sue the Government of Turkey at the International Court of Justice for its crimes against the Kurds. But the laws of granting asylum to political figures, as old as the time of prophets, were suspended in this case. Abdullah Ocalan, the most popular Kurdish figure of the day, was arrested. Through a deal that smacks of political venality at its worst, he was handed over to the Turks and now awaits his most likely execution as the sole inmate in the Imrali Island prison in the Sea of Marmara.

Madam Speaker, it is unbecoming of this great power to aid and abet dictatorships which are merely disguised as democracies. Those who imprison duly elected representatives such as Layla Zana in Turkey for testifying before a standing committee of this Congress cannot and should not enjoy our support. Leaders such as Abdullah Ocalan, despite his violent past, still hold the promise of peace and reconciliation for the Kurds with their neighbors. The euphoria that we all felt for the freedom of captive nations in the former Soviet Union now must extend to our allies and their subjects as well.

So we welcome the convening of the National Congress of Kurdistan. They are dreaming what to many may seem an impossible dream, the dream of a united Kurdish people in the Nation of Kurdistan.

TAIWAN CONGRATULATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Madam Speaker, 3 years ago President Lee won a landslide victory in the first presidential election in the history of China. As a democratic elected president, he demonstrated to the world that democracy could indeed thrive in Taiwan. During the last 3 years President Lee continued to implement his program for the Republic of China. As a result, Taiwan presently has free elections in every level of government, a free press, and holds respect for human rights in the highest regard.

As a believer in increasing cooperation between Taiwan and mainland China, President Lee continued to emphasize that it is necessary for Taiwan and the mainland to work together to conduct further discussions on the issue of reunification. Many close to the president maintain that his one true dream is to witness a unified China under the principle of democracy rules, free enterprise and the distribution of wealth.

A few years ago I had the privilege of being President Lee's guest on a visit to Taiwan. Since that time I perceive him as a world class statesman and

hope that he will be able to influence mainland China to democratize and reunify with Taiwan on the basis of democratic principles. As a faithful friend of the United States, we must give him our wholehearted support as his presence on the island is symbolic of the economy and a politically stable Asia.

GUNS AND CHILDREN—THEY DO NOT MIX

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. Madam Speaker, I thought it was important to come to the floor of the House to address again the crisis that we are facing in this Nation, and that crisis is that of the safety of our children.

Today unfortunately as the sun rose another youngster took weapons to school and shot children. I am most grateful, as most mothers and fathers, families, that this tragedy did not result in death. I cannot imagine what people in Littleton, Colorado, are thinking, or Jonesboro, or the State of Pennsylvania, or my own State of Texas, and rather than be political and politicize this, I am simply begging with all of the intellect in this Congress that we have the courage to admit that there are many concerns.

□ 1645

There is the entertainment industry, violence in videos. There is the issue of intergenerational conflict or disconnect because maybe adults and children are not talking the way they should.

There is the concern that I have raised and will be presenting in legislation, Give a Child a Chance Omnibus Mental Health Services bill for 1999 where we can focus on the fact that children need mental health services, both children who can afford it and those who cannot.

I think right now, in light of the Senate's actions today, we realize that gun legislation is not political. Over 89 percent of the American public are waking up and saying we must have safety locks. It is important to keep from children, or young people under 21, guns. We must close the loopholes in pawn shops and in gun shows so that there are no more opportunities for people to randomly walk in and get guns, as a young lady did on behalf of Eric Harris in Littleton, Colorado.

Parents are in pain. Children are in fear. Our children can talk about guns and their feeling of being unsafe. They can talk about the fact that they do not know whether their graduation will be safe or whether large gatherings will be safe.

Many of us as women Members of Congress have gathered. We gathered before Mother's Day and asked Speaker HASTERT to ensure that we pass gun legislation before Father's Day. I want to go a step further. We have next week. We should not leave here until we say not only to the American people but the world that we pride ourselves, as loving our children greater than our guns, and in fact this is not taking away guns from people who use them for sports and legally. This is saying that we have a proliferation of guns and our children are asking or crying out for us to be restrained and to restrain them; 250 million Americans, 260 million guns on the street.

Why cannot we find common ground on legislation that I passed in my city holding parents responsible, adults, for allowing guns to be in children's hands and thereby causing an injury? It was unanimously supported and then passed in the State of Texas, certainly a State that has its share of guns.

Safety locks, as has been said eloquently by my colleagues, there are regulations of diaper bags and regulations of parks and schools and equipment that children use. Why not guns? Why can we not keep guns out of the hands of those under 21? Why can we not do instant check at gun shows where all kinds of people come and, believe me, they use that method to get guns. Why can we not have tracing so that felons who are now dealing with the black market can be found? Why can we not have an amendment that deals with gun running?

It is very important, Madam Speaker, that the women in this House stand up. I demand that we collectively raise our voices to the Speaker, and I guess I demand of him, to not shy away from the responsibility.

Put the NRA aside. It has its own agenda, and anyone who says it does not is not reading all of their PR, their public relations. I did not come here to point the finger. I have mentioned the entertainment industry. They know what they can do.

This is a pyramid. We are building blocks. I have mentioned the need for more mental health services from K to 12, intervention risk assessment in every piece of legislation, that I can. In addition to the omnibus bill, I am going to be raising my voice for mental health services. It is too long and too late where it is a stigma, so that is why children have stopped taking their medication because there is a stigma all around. So if the parent does not tell them they certainly do not get reinforced in school, and troubled children are in our schools without medication.

So, Madam Speaker, I am not pointing the finger. I am speaking out of anguish and I am speaking out of pain. I cannot go another day without us doing something about these guns. We must pass legislation this week as we come back.

While I am home in the district this weekend, whoever will hear me, I will be talking about are we going to stand up for our children? Tomorrow at a press conference on Head Start I will be talking about our children and guns.

Madam Speaker, I hope that we can collectively indicate to the American people we have heard them. This is a crisis and we know their pain.

The Federal Government does not want to take over education of their children. We just want to take over the fact that we want our children to survive and we are going to help them with legislation and money.

Madam Speaker, I hope that we will all stand together next week as we return to this Congress.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1141) ''An Act making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes.''

The message also announced that pursuant to sections 276d–276g, of title 11, United States Code, as amended, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints the following Senators as members of the Senate Delegation to the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group during the First Session of the One Hundred Sixth Congress, to be held in Quebec City, Canada, May 20–24, 1999——

the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY);

the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE);

the Senator from Ohio (Mr. DEWINE);

the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. GRAMS);

the Senator from Ohio (Mr. VOINOVICH); and

the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. AKAKA).

HISTORY OF YUGOSLAVIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Madam Speaker, I come tonight to give maybe a little different perspective on the war in Kosovo than most people have seen from the spin from NATO and the White House. I would like to give some information that has not been widely disseminated but I think is important before any solution in the Balkans is possible.

First of all, Rambouillet, which was an attempt at an agreement which was not an agreement, to bring the Muslim and Serbian Yugoslavs together. Let me go back first with Rambouillet and explain where Rambouillet was a very failed foreign policy effort.

I use the quotes of both Larry Eagleburger and Henry Kissinger in

saying that Rambouillet was a failed foreign policy from the start.

Look at history, and I met with the Reverend Jesse Jackson, who I disagree with probably more than I agree, but one thing I respected about Reverend Jackson was not necessarily that he brought our prisoners back, that was good, but his ability to place himself in the shoes of either side of an argument. Even if he disagrees with one side or another, he understands that before someone can ever have a solution that they have to understand the feelings and what is in the mind and the heart of both sides, or there is no choice whatsoever.

Part of that understanding is the history of greater Yugoslavia. On April 5, 1941, just last month the anniversary, Germany bombed Belgrade. They put over 700,000 Nazis into Kosovo in the area. The Nazis were supported by a half a million Croatians, and about a quarter of that number of Muslims. One in three Serbs died in Kosovo fighting the Nazis, the Croatians and the Muslims.

The civilians in Kosovo had to flee across the Danube River for their lives, while the forces under a General Miholevic, not Milosevic but Miholevic, supported both the partisans and the loyalists. The Chetniks were more of a guerilla warfare.

In the three-year period of over a million Nazis, the Chetniks, the partisans and the loyalists either killed or pushed out every Croatian, Muslim and Nazi out of Kosovo.

In 1387, the Serbs celebrate still Kosovo and the founding of their Orthodox Catholic church at 1,600 different churches and shrines.

So Rambouillet, I would ask after that kind of history, would a person if they were in any of the United States, if they were in Texas, if they were in California and say Mexico populated either one of those States by 90 percent and all of a sudden they wanted California or Texas to go to Mexico, does anyone think the United States would allow that to happen? I do not, absolutely.

The second part of Rambouillet said that, oh, by the way, you cannot have any of your police force in Kosovo; that even though Kosovo is part of greater Serbia or Yugoslavia, none of your laws apply; only the laws of the majority which are the Albanians, and in 3 years there will be a vote as to whether Albania remains part of Serbia.

Not Milosevic but the Serbian people, and the understanding of what Kosovo means to the Serbs, was a great, great failure of this administration and the President to recognize. Either the President recognized it and wanted us to go to war or he did not recognize the importance of Kosovo to the Serbian people. Either way, it is why we are at the position we are today.

To say that diplomatic efforts were exhausted is far from the truth, and there are still ways for us to get out of this particular nightmare.

I fought in Vietnam. I spent 20 years of my life in the military as a senior commander, responsible both for a Navy fighter weapons top gun and at Naval staff on the planning, the invasion of Southeast Asia and European countries, and my friends from the Pentagon have told me that they told the President not to conduct air strikes into Kosovo.

Why? They said, first of all, air strikes alone would not achieve a single goal that the President wanted. Secondly, that every one of the problems that existed then would be exacerbated, would be increased. They told the President that it is highly probable and most likely that the Serb forces would force evacuation of Albanians, since that had been, in their eyes, a big problem over the last two decades.

Madam Speaker, take a look at the children's eyes that are refugees today, a million refugees walking through the snow. I have two daughters and I looked as if my own daughters had to go through this, and we need to thank God every day that we live in a country where that does not happen. In my view, there are two people that have caused that mass evacuation and forced the refugees. One is Milosevic and the other is the President of the United States by forcing the bombing.

Most people do not realize the hysteria: This is another Nazi, this is another Holocaust. Most people do not realize the total number, the total number of people killed in Kosovo in a 1-year period prior to the United States and NATO bombing was 2,012 people killed. We kill more people than that in New York City and Washington, D.C. every year. Now, each individual is important, but it is also important to realize that one-third of those 2,000 people were Serbs that were killed by the KLA.

Did they have a fight? Yes. Were there atrocities? Yes, on both sides. Until one puts themselves in the shoes of either side and both sides in the eyes of what is important to them, what are their fears? The Serbs fear the Germans. They did not want NATO troops with Germans in there. They fear that Kosovo will be taken away from them, much like if California or Texas was taken away from the United States.

The Albanians want some kind of participation in the government. They have about 90 percent of the population, but most people do not realize 60 percent of that 90 percent of the Albanians are there illegally. They are not citizens of Kosovo. They have come across the border from Albania illegally.

□ 1700

And that, in itself, is a problem.

Listen to the briefs. Watch the television, Madam Speaker, and listen to the Albanians talk about how they were forced out of their homes by the Serbs. Were they forced prior? No. There are 300,000 Albanians that live in Belgrade and not a single one has left because they live there peacefully. They live there peacefully together.

But listen to the debriefs from Kosovo. They were forced out of their homes. They were not fleeing prior to the bombing, but like the military told the President, upon NATO's strikes, the Serbs started forcing the Albanians out of Kosovo. They knew that the KLA on the ground was a threat to them. Is it right? No, I am not saying it is right, but I am saying we have to look at the total picture.

Well, Mr. President, if you are trying to change your legacy with a war or be nominated for the Nobel Peace Prize, one is not nominated for the Nobel Peace Prize by killing more civilians in these strikes than the Serbs killed in the one-year period prior. One does not get nominated for the Nobel Peace Prize for forcing millions of people to evacuate and then claiming it is a Holocaust, which it was not.

I spoke to General Clark face-to-face in Brussels a month ago, and I asked General Clark, I said, how many of the sorties, how many of the flights is the United States participating in? There are 19 nations in NATO, 18 other nations. The United States, part of NATO in a European problem, is flying 75 percent of the strike missions. The United States, 75 percent.

Tony Blair gets up and says, put in ground troops, put in ground troops. He only has 18 airplanes in Kosovo in those strikes, but yet he beats on his chest and says put in ground troops.

Madam Speaker, 75 percent of the strikes does not include the B–2 strikes out of the United States; it does not include the C–17s, it does not include the tanking and the logistics flights, which puts the United States' flights in Kosovo at over 86 percent, Madam Speaker. Ninety percent of the weapons dropped are from the United States, and yet there are 18 nations, other nations in this.

I asked General Clark, I said, well, why are we flying all of these missions? He said, Duke, most of the NATO nations do not have these stand-off weapons. They do not have these stand-off weapons, and the weather is bad. You think they might have checked the weather to know that there was a two-week forecasted bad weather over Kosovo before they ever started air strikes. No, they did not.

Ninety percent of the weapons. Our next supplemental should be a check from those nations. If they cannot fly the strikes, if they cannot support NATO, if they cannot supply the ordnance, then they ought to be at least burden-sharing and paying the United States for it.

This ad hoc war, ground troops, in all of the tactical experience that I had in the military, working with all services and most of our friendly allies, not once would I ever tell an enemy that I was not going to use a certain type of force like ground troops. It is lunacy. It is idiotic in a tactical environment to tell your enemy that you want to

change his heart and mind, but you are only going to use air strikes, to allow him to focus on one phase and not have to prepare for ground troops, not have to station his troops and deploy his weapons.

Do my colleagues think that the President might have told Russia, Chernomyrdin, knowing how Russia feels, do you think they might have told the Russians that they were going to bomb Kosovo when Chernomyrdin was on his way to the United States and actually turned his airplane around and went back? Is that acceptable foreign policy? I do not think so.

This ad hoc war. People said well, Duke, how can they possibly look at a map and bomb an embassy like China's? Well, when one is doing something so fast, so ad hoc, and one rips maps off without any prior planning, it is very easy to see. When one is scrambling to find targets, when one is scrambling because one's missions are not being successful, then it is easy. And they took the wrong map. Even today, they hit two other embassies and they hit a hospital, killing hundreds of civilians. Again I say, the United States and NATO has killed more civilians in Kosovo than the Serbs killed in the entire year prior to the bombing. And that is wrong.

Madam Speaker, if one comes from the 1970s and one was a left-wing antiwar protestor or belonged to a protest group, and one is in leadership and one attempts to use a vehicle like the military that one neither understands or supports and even loathes, most of one's decisions, in my opinion, are going to be inept, they are going to be incorrect, because one does not have the gut feelings of what it should take.

A classic example of that was in Vietnam with the President we had then that controlled every single strike, and that was Lyndon Johnson. I lost a lot of my close friends in air-to-air. I was shot down on May 10, 1972 over North Vietnam, and many of my friends died because of inept decisions by a left-wing person that neither accepted, supported or understood the military.

When the President, knowing that he has surrounded himself with the Tony Lakes, with the Ira Magaziners, with the Strobe Talbotts, and he disavows, does not accept the advice of the military warfighters, that is even more of a problem, and it has been disastrous.

We had a briefing from a source which I am not allowed to say, but it is a very important governmental source, and the KLA is supported by the Mujahedin and Hamas from Iran, Iraq and Afghanistan. Are they in large numbers? Are they entire armies? No. But they have evidence of those individuals infiltrating the KLA units.

I will say that if I was an Albanian citizen and put myself in their shoes, I would be a member of the KLA, fighting for what I believed in. But on the other hand, if I was a Serb, I would be a Serbian soldier fighting for what I believed in. And until the President recognizes that, there is no solution. The Mujahedin and Hamas have a small influence, but it is there and it has to be removed.

They said, is it likely Osama bin Laden, like the Washington Times reported, has influenced and is supporting the KLA? Well, I will let my colleagues draw the inference. Osama bin Laden has organizations in over 150 areas, and everywhere there is a Muslim issue, he is involved. They said there is no direct evidence, but it is likely.

It was also reported in all of the European press and the United States in The New York Times that the number one heroin dealer, the number one heroin dealers were the Albanian Kosovars. And yes, the source said that that money is going in to support the KLA. They will take money from anybody they can. They consider it their survival.

General Clark, when I was in Brussels, I looked at him and besides asking him how many sorties were flying, he said, Duke, at the beginning of this NATO only wanted to fly one day and quit, because of all of these other things. They did not have their hearts and minds into this. General Clark said the President called Tony Blair from England, the German Chancellor, and they pushed this, that it is a must, it is a must. What that agenda is I do not know. All I know is that this ad hoc war has been disastrous not only for the American people, but for the Albanians and for the Serbs.

Madam Speaker, I think it is improper to say that all Germans were Nazis in World War II. There were a lot of innocent people. A lot of people did not support the Nazis. There are a lot of people that are not Mujahedin and Hamas, that are fighting for their lives, and if we look into the eyes of those children, we should have as much sympathy for those children and the innocent civilians on the Albanian side and the Serb side of the innocent people that are being killed because of war. That is important also.

Madam Speaker, I remember Madeleine Albright saying that if we allowed Czechoslovakia, Poland and Hungary into NATO, the United States would not have to participate in any European war. Well, guess what? They are all three part of NATO. And during the conflict Czechoslovakia, Poland and Hungary would not even let us fly over their airspace, and it took some serious arm-twisting by Madeleine Albright and others, the President, to use their airspace or even their bases and deploy.

They had a NATO summit here, anniversary, and the President says that all NATO is speaking with one voice. Well, Mr. President, if that is true, why is Hungary, why is France, why is Greece, why is Russia still shipping oil to Serbs in the greater Yugoslavia? They are not speaking with one voice, and the spin that NATO and the White House places on this is atrocious, in my opinion.

Take a look, Madam Speaker, at what NATO is today. We no longer have Ronald Reagan or Margaret Thatcher types. I ask my colleagues to look at the Germans. It is a green socialist government. Look at France. France has a socialist, communist coalition in their government. They threw out the conservatives. If we look at England with Tony Blair, labor left. Israel just yesterday, labor left. Germany, as I mentioned. Italy, Communist.

So NATO is made up today of not Ronald Reagan and Margaret Thatcher, but people that are socialist and Communist and left. And it is difficult to make decisions using the military when those individuals historically have fought against the military itself.

Another little-known fact, Madam Speaker, briefed again by a source, the same source as I quoted a minute ago, said 70 percent of the Russian military support the overthrow of the Yeltsin government. We have seen just this week and last week an attempt of an impeachment of President Yeltsin.

Seventy percent of the Russian military who support their leadership are the hard-line communists that support Milosevic. They want us to go in with ground troops. It would give them the catalyst that they need to return the former Soviet Union back to communism. And it is a very difficult problem.

Look at Greece. Greece has ties to the Serbs because when the Serbs kicked out the 1 million Nazis, look at Thessalonica in northern Greece, where millions of Greeks and Jews and Serbs were annihilated by the Nazis, and Greece with its orthodox church, along with the Serbian orthodox church and their tie-in with World War II, makes them an ally.

And look at what we have done with China and Russia and Greece, people that we have been working with through trade with China, through trying to start a democracy going and light the fires of a young democracy in Russia, and even working with the Greeks has been disastrous foreign policy for the United States.

□ 1715

All of this, and they say, DUKE, you are a hawk. I am not a hawk, Madam Speaker. I am a dove, but I like to be a well-armed dove. And those that have fought in war and held, like in Private Ryan, held our friends and watched them die, maybe we are a little more reluctant to get our people involved in a conflict to where we know there is going to be a lot of loss of human life, and where we also know that diplomacy would work.

The President talks about wanting to save social security with a surplus, to save Medicare with a surplus, education from the surplus. I would like to see medical research, because it is exciting, what NIH is doing today as far

as the cure and the elimination of disease. We would like to double that.

I was in a group yesterday that wants to increase prostate cancer research by $100 million total. Madam Speaker, we cannot do that by spending $50 billion in Kosovo. We spent $16 billion thus far in Bosnia and we are only supposed to be there 1 year, $16 billion.

Do Members know that we still spend $25 million a year building roads in Haiti? And Haiti had no national security to the United States. The extension of Somalia, which most of us opposed, we got 22 Rangers killed and we got our butts kicked out of there. We had to run out of Somalia.

Every time the President had a personal political tragedy, we went into Iraq four different times. Let us not forget the hasty decision to go into the Sudan and bomb an aspirin factory. They just asked for $45 million to pay back the Sudanese, and the President said, okay, $45 million. Who is responsible? Has anybody been held accountable? Absolutely not.

Let me tell the Members, besides taking up the surplus, our military today, we are retaining only about 23 percent of our military, of our enlisted. We are retaining only about 33 percent of our aviators, our pilots. Why?

When I talk to these young men and young women who are flying and the people who are servicing those aircraft and that equipment, they say, Duke, I am away from my family 8 months out of a year. I am worried about my family, because their benefits are eroding. Our equipment is 1970s technology.

I had a briefing last Friday from a very classified source, which I will not go into, but there is an asset that Russia has in the air that if our pilots would engage it, we lose the dogfight and the intercept 90 percent of the time because we have shut down our research and development and we have not been able to compete.

I am alive today, and the airplanes I shot down in Vietnam, because I had better equipment and better training. Today our troops are getting less training, and the equipment is 1970s technology. Fortunately, this asset has not been deployed to Kosovo, but it is to North Korea, it is to many of our other potential enemies in this world. That is scary.

Our ships are going out with thousands of sailors short. We are $3 billion short in ship repair for our military ships. I could go on and on.

Madam Speaker, they say, Duke, you have told us all the problems, but what would you do if you were president? And no, I am not running for the presidency, Madam Speaker. My daughter would like me to because then she could have two dogs, but I do not plan ever on running for the presidency. I have my hands full right here.

Let me give some ideas. I stated from the day that we went in to Kosovo, and I would start it off first, Madam Speaker, by saying, some of the people can remember a movie called the Jazz Singer. I am old enough to remember Al Jolson playing in that part. Later on Neal Diamond played in the movie Al Jolson.

The whole movie is based on a Jewish proverb. It is about a jazz singer, a gentleman that is the son of a cantor, and the father wants his son to be a Jewish cantor. The son, of course, wants to be a jazz singer. There is so much hurt by the father that he rips his jacket in the Jewish fashion and denies that he has a son, and there is great consternation between the two.

The father, after a while, is so distraught at losing his son, not to death but from an argument, and the Jewish proverb goes like this. The father cries out, and I have two daughters, so I think you can do the same with a daughter, but he says, son, come home. We have argued too long. And the son replies, father, I cannot, because there is too much between us. And the father replies, son, come as far as you can, and I will come the rest of the way.

Sometimes that bridge is too far. If you do not understand and put yourself in the shoes, like Jesse Jackson did, and understand, even though you may disagree with the perceptions of an individual group, you still have to understand that before you can ever come the rest of the way.

The President of the United States has not recognized that. So I think that is the first step into any diplomacy. First of all, we have to halt the strikes, leave our force in place in case it does not work.

Let us, instead of having the Russians as a problem and a threat, and maybe even going back to communism, let us help the Russians. Let us let them be part of the solution, not only in Kosovo but in their own political world back in Russia. Let us have Russian and Greek and Scandinavian and Italian troops go in and act as the peacekeepers.

Again, we have to recognize, the Serbs fear the Germans, they fear the United States, and they fear Great Britain. We have become an enemy to a once ally. Let us let them be the solution. The Greeks the same way. They have supported the Serbs. Let us let them be part of the solution.

Milosevic must withdraw his armor prior to Rambouillet, but we have to have a different kind of Rambouillet, one that is achievable and realistic, with options and realistic and achievable goals, unlike Rambouillet I.

There is going to have to be an international body, Madam Speaker. There are nearly 1 million Albanians that have been thrust out of their homes. A large portion of those are illegal. They are not citizens of Kosovo. But the Serbs have caused part of their own problem by tearing up many of those papers that identify who is a citizen and who is not a citizen. It is going to take an international body to repatriate the Albanians.

When I was 15 years old I worked on a farm in Shelbina, Missouri, population 2,113 folks. Rather than work for my dad, who was a store owner, I would go out in the hayfields and put up hay.

Well, there was a lady named Ms. Featherall that always took care of the young boys and fed us probably 10 times the amount that we needed. And during the noon hour, we sat on a rocking chair up on her porch to get cool. She was afraid we would work too hard, and we loved that lady.

A Siamese cat came around the corner and jumped up in my lap. I petted that cat, Madam Speaker. A few minutes later around the corner came a Persian cat, a barn cat. I picked up the Persian cat, and immediately the two cats tensed and they started hissing, as you can imagine.

I petted them both and they calmed down, and I was going to make those cats friends. I moved them a little closer and I moved them a little closer. Each time they would tense up and I would pet them. I did not have a shirt on, Madam Speaker, and in a split-second, those two cats hit each other, and I was blood from head to toe from the claws.

We cannot repatriate Albanians and Serbians together who want to kill each other. If you killed my children or my wife or my mother or my father or my in-laws, it would take a long time and a whole lot of psychologists to sit me down next to the people that I felt had done that. It is going to take a long time of work to make that happen.

Then when you bring them back, are you going to have them stay in tents, for those that do not have homes? You have to establish some type of security. That is where the peacekeepers of the Russians, the Greeks, the Scandinavians, the Italians, are; not NATO.

The President and Tony Blair are all bent, it has to be NATO, it has to be NATO or nothing, it has to be NATO. The ego and prestige of NATO is not the issue here, it is people that have been thrown out of their homes. It is people that feel that they have been persecuted. That is the issue, Madam Speaker; not NATO, not the prestige and ego of Tony Blair or the President of the United States.

That inner body is going to have a difficult time and a long time to repatriate those citizens from Albania. The President has to look the Albanian president in the eyes and Izetbegovich, the head of the Muslims in Sarajevo, and demand that all Middle East fundamentalists be deported within 30 days.

Why? Because if they do not, these mujahedeen and Hamas from Iran and Afghanistan and Syria are the ones that want a worldwide Jihad. They want to kill all Americans. They are going to stir the pot, they are going to cause problems over the next decades. If we allow and the President allows them to stay there, even a small number, it is going to be a problem.

I have talked to the Orthodox Catholic Church both of the Serbs and the

Greek Orthodox Church. I have talked to groups of about 200,000 Serbian Americans. They support Kosovo remaining a part of greater Yugoslavia. But at the same time, they realize there may have to be a cantonization of the area, much like the Scandinavian nations do, where you might have a separate area where the speech and schools are French or German or Swiss. They support that initiative. That may be the first start for a new Rambouillet. But in my opinion, if you try and take Kosovo away from greater Serbia, it is a no win policy.

NATO in Europe has to rebuild Kosovo, France, Germany, England, Italy, not the United States. We have already spent $14 billion in 6 weeks. This is a European issue. The United States is part of NATO and should have leadership, but we should not pay more than the lion's share.

The United States can use its intelligence services and the number of CIA that we have. George Tenet told me that our assets around the world that monitor terrorism are extremely limited; that because of Kosovo, we have had to pull those assets into Kosovo, which leaves us vulnerable in the United States.

So I feel that our intelligence assets have to be increased greatly, and the support that this Congress gives them is necessary.

□ 1730

The United Nations, who has become part of the problem in this, votes against the United States 90 percent of the time. We only have one vote in the United Nations. They vote against this 90 percent of the time, and we pay the lion's share of the United Nations again. Until those reforms are done, the President should say, ''No more money, United Nations.'' In my opinion, I would like to do away with them permanently.

There needs to be an international body. If my colleagues expect Milosevic to negotiate, knowing that he is going to go before a war tribunal for war crimes, do my colleagues think he is going to ever stop? No. But I think an independent body should be established to look at Tudjman, the head of the Croatians, that murdered 10,000 Serbs in 1995 and forced ethnic cleansing out of Croatia of 750,000 Serbs.

When we talk about Holocaust, that comes much closer to a Holocaust than Kosovo. The gentlewoman just before and the gentleman was talking about, look at the Kurds. Look at 25 different areas around the world that are far worse than this. Are they despicable? Yes. Are they Holocaust? No. The spin will not gain the President the Nobel Peace Prize.

Our United States military, we have got to rebuild it. I believe that peace does come through strength. Our 300-ship Navy that was established by the QDR, which is a report that says this is what we need to fight two wars. The bottoms up review for the services, our service chief said we cannot fight two wars. Is that why we have left the no-fly zone in Iraq? I do not guess Saddam Hussein is a problem anymore, because he is left unattended to do his will.

We need to build up our military, to replace the benefits of our military, and give them the strength so that we can walk softly and carry a big stick, instead of the President walking softly and carrying a big stick of candy for everybody.

I read this week where the President plans on paying the Albanians who house Albanian refugees, paying for that. Are we establishing a welfare system in Albania while we cannot support Social Security and Medicare and education and medical research in our own country? I think that is wrong.

The President has got to look at the President of Albania and demand that, since in 1850 the Albanians have wanted to take over through expansionism, Macedonia, Montenegro, parts of Greece and Kosovo, and he has got to say no more. We have got to recognize the borders that have been formed and stay within them.

I think that we also need to take a look, and the President, to get very tough on the foreign policy of Russia and China. We know that Russia today still, even though they say they are not, ships chemical and biological weapons and nuclear components to Iran, Iraq, Afghanistan, and we let it happen, and to North Korea.

The President in 1996 was briefed that there was espionage at our laboratories here in the United States and did nothing until 1999, where the Secretary of Energy has just started to do some things with Mike Richardson. He is doing what should have been done back in 1996.

The President was briefed in 1996 that the Chinese had stole our W–88 nuclear warhead, which is a small nuclear warhead, which took us billions of dollars, billions of dollars to develop and years.

We have an asset, but I cannot tell my colleagues what it is, where we reverse-engineered, that we were going to use that asset. We were building a system to combat the asset. Our system would not have worked, but we had that asset, so it saved us billions of dollars by having that asset and seeing how it worked so that we did not go the wrong direction.

Now the Chinese have got not only the W–88 warhead, but they have got secondary and tertiary missile boosts, which they did not have the capability to do.

George Tennet told us that Korea was 10 years away from being able to hit the United States with a missile, a nuclear missile. Guess what. They have it today with a Taepo Dong 1 and Taepo Dong 2 that China gave to them that we gave to the Chinese and they are exporting.

If that is not bad enough, the capability to MIRV, to put several of those W–88, and the President knew that China had these, the White House gave them the capability to use the MIRVing techniques that, again, took us billions of dollars to engineer.

If that is not bad, the targeting methods to use those missiles to make them accurate within a meter, a nuclear weapon. That was done after $1 million was donated by Loral and $1 million from Hughes and $300,000 from Liu Cheng Ying, who is the daughter of General Ying, head of technology in the PLA, to the Clinton-Gore campaign.

So, Madam Speaker, we have a monumental foreign policy problem. It is not just Kosovo. It is Russia. It is Greece. It is Libya. It is Kosovo. I feel that we need to chase the Turks out of Northern Cyprus, which they have held illegally for 25 years, and we have done nothing, because we need the Turk's support. But, yet, we let them stay in Northern Cyprus against international law.

Madam Speaker, it grieves me to see our Nation at war, especially when I think that we do not have to be there. From all of my military experience, to see a war run ad hoc and so desperately misused, it has cost human life, it has cost human suffering, and it is going to prevent many of us on both sides of the aisle from doing some of the things that we want with our domestic issues here in the United States such as Social Security, Medicare, education, medical research and defense.

It is not a pretty time, Madam Speaker. The President has got to get off his pulpit, whatever his agenda is, and he has got to recognize and put himself, as Jesse Jackson recommended to the President, to see both sides of this issue, to come, whether he has to admit defeat or have a small victory and declare a victory, I do not care, but we cannot put ground troops in, because even if we put ground troops into Kosovo, we are going to lose people.

The Chetnik type individuals, the guerillas will kill our people. I feel that the KLA, Mujahedin and Hamas will kill our people and blame it on somebody just to keep the pot going. Then if we do, we have just bought Kosovo for $3 billion to $5 billion a year, when we are already in Bosnia at $16 billion and Haiti. We are still in Korea for 25 years.

It is time to get out, Madam Speaker. It is time to build up the United States, to pay down our debt, and to take care of some of our domestic problems here.

COLUMBINE HIGH SCHOOL

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, today is the 1-month anniversary of the tragedy at Littleton, Colorado. I hoped to come to the floor today to speak on what we as a Nation need to begin to

do to solve this epidemic of youth violence. I did not expect that we would have had another shooting at another high school, serving as another alarm, as if we needed one, prompting us to act.

During the memorial service in Littleton, a singer, Phil Driscoll, sang a song that he wrote for the occasion. In the song, he sang a line that I cannot get out of my mind. The line was, ''This is a wake-up call. How many innocent have to fall.''

Today we received another wake-up call coming from Conyers, Georgia. What a wake-up call it was. But what can be done to solve the problem? What can we do to address the concerns of students and parents?

I think there is a lot we must do and a lot that we can do. I refuse to accept the defeatist attitude which says this is a complex problem, and, therefore, there is nothing that Congress can do about it. That is wrong, and that is unacceptable.

We have a national security crisis in our schools. We have lost more American children in our schools than American soldiers in Kosovo. This is a national security crisis which requires the same kind of mobilization that we apply to any military threat abroad.

Obviously attention must be paid to the accessibility of guns in our society and the frequent and intense images of violence in our mass media. Clearly, we can make guns less accessible to kids. We can try to give parents better tools to supervise what their children are watching or playing on the TV or the Internet.

Legislation has been debated and passed on the floor of the Senate over the past week that tried to make progress on limiting the access of kids to guns. I favor effective legislation to keep guns out of the hands of kids and hope the House will take up this legislation before we leave for Memorial Day.

This makes sense and should have no impact on law-abiding citizens who want to purchase and own guns for sporting use and their own protection. We are talking about passing commonsense, child-safety legislation to make sure that children cannot get easy access to guns.

I hope the House can follow the Senate's lead and move this kind of legislation forward without loopholes.

But child-related gun legislation is only one part of the puzzle. There is a lot we must do to make sure that our children are not exposed to inappropriate violent material in the media.

The Vice President has begun a discussion with Internet companies to publish the same ratings for on-line gaming that most TV shows have already. The President has called on the movie theaters to better enforce the rating process that is already in place there. Newspapers must also do a better job of making the rating systems clear to parents.

Even if we are able to make the progress we hope for in these two areas, we know that these steps alone will not solve the problem. We need to address the broader issue of the quality of our children's education and how to give them the attention they need to grow up to be healthy in both mind and body.

At the President's meeting on school violence at the White House, various experts on violence repeatedly made the point that this problem of school violence is a problem with many layers. They also said that such a complicated problem demanded more than single simple solutions.

One cause of the problem is that parents spend nearly one-third less time with children than they did a generation ago. With more single-parent families and more parents working more jobs and more hours and spending more time in traffic, there is just a lot less time for parents to be with and communicate with and raise their children.

□ 1745

In many families today, the kids are left alone most of the time. And as we all know, kids do not raise themselves.

When parents are home, they often do not spend as much time talking with their children. With television, the Internet, pagers, and other distractions, parents communicate less with kids even when they are able to be home. Before television, time around the dinner table was a time for family communication. Now if a family has time for dinner together, many families have the television on during dinner and nobody really talks to one another.

Another factor that was mentioned was the amount of domestic violence and child abuse that some young people are exposed to today. We have always had these problems, but the problem is far worse now than it has ever been. It is obvious that children exposed to abuse are much more prone to resort to violence in their own lives.

Another factor is the size of high schools. Most of our schools were built after World War II when we were trying to accommodate the baby boom. The schools were built large for economic reasons, and the size did not matter when families were intact and parents could spend more time with children. However, in today's world, it is unwise to have anonymous children in large schools.

Another problem is the increasing diagnosis of mental illness among children. One of the experts at the summit said that mental illness is more prevalent than ever but health insurance covers these problems less than ever. Consequently, many kids have problems but cannot get the professional mental help that they need.

One expert said that our problems stem from what adults do to children or do not do for children. The answers to our problems lie with adults and what we can do to raise children properly.

We spend so much of our debate and our time addressing the symptoms of violence but not the causes of violence. We talk about guns or conflict resolution or school violence programs. And it is right that we do so. But we spend far too little time discussing how we can prevent these problems in the first place.

It is obvious that the modern family needs help in filling the time holes that exist. The only institution, in my view, that can possibly fill these holes are our public schools. Schools have complained about the need to fill all these holes. But the truth is that only through the public schools can we achieve the scale that we need to solve these problems with all the children of our country.

We need nothing short of a revolution in our public schools to deal with the modern problems that children face in the modern world. Nostalgia for the past, criticism of other institutions for not meeting these challenges, or finger pointing at institutions that are not doing enough will not get us to a solution of these problems.

We must really begin to build the public will to do what is necessary to really solve these problems. Raising and educating children correctly is a huge task and will not happen without human will to achieve that goal.

In World War II, everyone thought America was way behind and would not win. What critics misunderstood was the will of the American people. Once every American internalized the goal of winning the war, each one of them did what was necessary on a daily basis and the war was won. The same can be achieved with our children, but a similar effort to what took place in World War II must be achieved.

All of us, whether we have children or not, has a responsibility to enter into this effort to educate and raise our children. It is in our deep self-interest to do this. Government at all levels must help, and local government has the major responsibility. I hope in the days ahead we will work together to find answers to this crisis.

Before the memorial service in Littleton, I went with Colin Powell and Vice President GORE and the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE), other members of the Colorado delegation, to meet with the parents of the dead children. We met with them for an hour and a half before the memorial service. We hugged them. We cried with them. I told them that the whole country was there with us standing with them at this time of terror and sorrow.

One of the mothers, after sobbing uncontrollably and shaking in my arms, pulled back with a picture of her child and she said, ''Congressman, I hope you will lead in the Congress to make sure that my child did not die in vain.'' I will never get her face out of my mind.

And now we have more fathers and mothers in Georgia who today are saying, ''I hope my child was not injured in vain.''

How many more children have to go down for all of us to accept the responsibility that we have to see that children are cared for and loved and respected and disciplined so that this does not happen again?

We may not be able to agree on much here, but we owe every parent who has lost a child to violence our best, honest efforts to work together as a Congress to solve some of these problems.

I am not so arrogant to think that we have the power to single-handedly solve these problems. But we need to start the process of reaching out to one another for comprehensive, meaningful, effective solutions. We need an honest discussion of the profound changes that are happening in our society and what we can agree will begin to change our culture so that all of our children, every one of them, is raised to be a productive, law-abiding, contributing citizen in this great society. If we cannot somehow do that, we will be consigned to more and more Littletons and more and more Conyers, Georgia.

Every day in our country we lose 13 young people to suicide and violence. Every day there is a Littleton. And it has to come to an end. If we cannot act on something as important as our families and our futures, then we will fail in our most basic duty to promote the safety and well-being of all of our people.

We must do it now, not a month from now. We must do it before the next breaking news on CNN about another school shooting. We must do it before we see the pictures of children running across the lawns of schools trying to find safety. We must do it before we get another wake-up call and another specter of death among our young people in our schools.

We have already waited too long. We have overslept. It is time to wake up. It is time to hear the wake-up call and to say, this must stop, this must end.

And as another parent at Littleton told me, ''Surely,'' as tears rolled down his face, ''we can do better.''

This is the greatest country that has ever existed on Earth. We have a national crisis. The crisis is among our young people and it is in our schools. And surely we can summon the goodness and the greatness of our people and all of us to face down this death and to bring it to a final and lasting conclusion.

CRISIS IN OUR SCHOOLS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. STUPAK. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), the Democratic leader, for those words. And I would also like the RECORD to note that earlier today, when we finished business, that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT) also came down and spoke about recent shootings and tragedies facing this country.

I want to speak tonight, as the Speaker's designee in our special order, about what we Democrats as a party have been trying to do here to address this very, very serious national crisis, as the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), our Democratic leader, stated.

But what we say here tonight, I want everyone to understand, is not a Democratic or Republican issue. We want to work with both sides to try to bring some consensus if we can on things that we should take as a Nation. But I think it is important for us to understand where some of us see as where we are going.

And things I say here tonight are my beliefs as the convening chair of the Crime and Drug Task Force for the Democrats, not just this Congress but the past Congress, and does not necessarily reflect the views of everybody in our caucus. And I am sure they do not reflect the views of my Republican friends.

But some of us are beginning to sit back and try to meet individually and bipartisan; and, as a Democratic caucus, we have been convening the chairs of the Education Task Force, the Health and Human Services Task Force, of the Crime and Drug Task Force and we have been meeting.

We were meeting before the tragedy of a month ago out in Colorado and really since the first of the year really. We had numerous meetings. In fact, today we had another one that we convened and tried to kick around more and more ideas and bounce ideas off people. I know many of us, both Democrats and Republicans, have been in schools and talking with teachers and parents and what can we could.

As the convening chair, my qualifications before I came into the U.S. Congress was I was a police officer for 12 years as a city police officer and as a Michigan State police trooper and worked with juveniles, worked in juvenile crime areas, and taught criminal investigations at the academies and constitutional law and everything else. And the school violence issue that has swept across the Nation the last 18 months, it is hard to put into words how it has torn at so many of us and how do we best address it.

What we have found through all of the meetings, through everything that has happened, even with the shootings today in Conyers, Georgia, I think the only thing we can see say is this is a very complex issue and there is no single solution, there is no magic program that we can pass that would solve this. And we have got to get past blame games.

I know the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), the Democratic leader, again has asked the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT) to try to put together a bipartisan group. And I hope we can do that.

As we looked at what has happened, many of us see America has become alienated from each other. We see increases in hate crimes. For our children, we see and the experts tell us that we spend over the last 15 years one-third less time with our children than we did 15 years ago. So there is maybe less structure, maybe less discipline there, less guidance for our children.

For our children, the alienation that we see is now surfacing in schools. Society's problems are beginning to surface in schools. And even from our own leadership, I think when we have disputes on the floor which end in harsh words amongst each other does not speak well of the House as a whole or elected leaders and contributes to that alienation.

It is time for people to come together to try to reconcile our differences, the ill will that exists not only on the House floor of the U.S. Congress but the ill will that may exist in our families, our homes, our schools, our communities, our leaders, and even within ourselves.

So how do we end alienation and begin reconciliation to end the school and personal violence that we see that is gripping the headlines every night? How we do it is probably as varied as America. What works in North Carolina may not work in Michigan. Or we know the program that may work in North Carolina, character education, as they tell me, we may know it by a different name in Michigan where I represent. But what works in my northern rural district certainly will not work in the inner cities of our great cities.

☐ 1800

But what we understand is this. We understand that 100,000 weapons, be it guns or knives, come to school each day. We know that there are four times more guns out there, handguns, than there are children going to school, so there is access to guns readily available. We know as the Democratic leader said, there are 13 deaths per day of young people in America. We know that school psychologists tell us that probably 20 percent of the kids, students from K through 12 probably 20 percent of them need some help in dealing with problems at home, call it mental health problems, if you will. They also tell us that 3 to 6 percent of the students in our schools have severe mental health problems.

So when children lash out with those statistics, with the ready availability of weapons coming to and from school, you can see how the violence erupts and comes out and we see the headlines we see each and every day. We ask the statisticians and others in our meetings, is there a large enough sample of violence with the shootings that have occurred in the last 18 months, enough of a sample to say, are there similar characteristics of school violence in America? They have told us, no, the

sample is not large enough, that any kind of conclusions you may draw from the incidents may very well be skewed because they have been small.

Let us hope the sample does not get any larger. But we should not wait until there is enough violence in our schools to say, ''Okay, now we have enough sample, what can we do?'' I think there is enough for us to work together as Democrats and Republicans to come together and start to look at what can we do.

There have been many ideas kicked around. I would just like to share some of them tonight, not that any one of these ideas would be a solution but at least I want the Congress and the American people to know we are thinking, we are looking, we are probing, we are asking the questions and we need your input. Many of us feel that maybe there should be a national commission to examine not just the short-term but what are the long-term impacts, what is the long-term approach that we want to take here?

It seems like violence in America is constantly shifting. Maybe we need a national focus, much like maybe the Carter Commission we had in the late 1960s to address the problems facing the country then that actually put forth some proposals and some solutions. How do schools and communities access what may work or may not work? What ideas are out there? How do they reach out? You have so many programs going on in the Federal and State governments and Department of Education and Department of Justice and the Health and Human Services and public health, can we not somehow put these programs under an umbrella so schools can easily access to learn what is working in northern Michigan that may work in southern California. Can we have a national clearinghouse? Can we be under a commission and an agency? Can we do a one-stop shopping area, if you will, so we know what is working?

We have plenty of studies out there across this country that says this works up here in Boston, Massachusetts, or character education based on this model will work in North Carolina, or school resource officers work in Michigan. How do we allow everyone to access it? New Jersey has a program called crisis intervention officers. Is that different from a school resource officer which is really community policing where parents and teachers and students work together in a partnership to keep down crime and violence in the schools.

We have met with former pro football star Jim Brown. His program AmeriCan is a great program that may help us and is being used in 14 different States right now to address after-school problems and self-esteem that young people need. His program looks like one that may work. It may not work again in my northern Michigan area but it certainly is one we should look at. Each community, each State is unique unto themselves, but as we have seen in the last 18 months, we are all subject to the same violence in families and in schools and communities.

From the victims families, from all the folks we have had a chance to talk to, it seems there is a lot of confusion and hopelessness and despair out there. As I said, there is no simple solution. There is no political quick fix. We need vision. That is why I was so pleased today to see both the Democratic leader and the Speaker speaking of a willingness to work together and a need of a vision in this country, an action and a long-term commitment. Unfortunately in the United States Congress, we authorize and pass programs that will last for 1 year or we do a pilot program for a year or two. Then if it looks pretty good, we will use a 3-year program or a 5-year program. But I think we need a long-term commitment here. We need at least a commitment of a generation. I think it is incumbent upon this generation to start putting forth and thinking long-term so we can save not only this but also future generations.

As I said earlier, the family situations, the situations that we see in school are reflective of so many families that are surfacing in the schools. So you cannot say it is a State issue. You cannot say it is a local issue. I think the Federal Government must show some resolve. By that, we in the Democratic Party believe that it is not just something that we pass a program and then block grant it to the States. We at the Federal level must show the resolve. We cannot shirk from this responsibility. We just cannot block grant away another national problem.

This is a national problem and it is begging for a national solution. But if you are going to get at the root of the problem, I think you have to strike at maybe four main elements we have seen, we have looked at, we have studied, we have discussed in our many meetings and discussions with experts. It is what is happening in our communities, what is happening in our homes, what is happening in schools and yes, what is even happening with the proliferation of guns when we have four handguns for every student going to school floating around these communities, the easy accessibility of them. Do you address all four of them? I think you have to address all four because all are interrelated. They are interconnected. All are branches, if you will, on a tree that combine to form a trunk or the base but underneath there lie the roots and the roots which anchor the tree, the forbidden tree, if you will, the anchor of school violence and death that we have unfortunately seen once again here today. The branches on this tree, be it guns, schools and communities or the home, look remarkably similar, and it probably should, because it is us. It is really America. It is what we teach. It is what we teach the baby roots, our children, if you will. So when they grow, they become the anchor of the tree of school violence and death.

So let us not fail to see the forest but for the trees and let us not fail to see America for the violence we are experiencing because America is the greatest country there has ever been. We have an opportunity here now to stop and look at what is going on in this country, in our communities, in our schools, in our homes, and what can we do as a Nation? The violence, we just cannot look at it in other people. We have to look within ourselves. Because the violence is ingrained. It is not just what we do or what we say, but I think we also have to go beyond that and the violence or the signals we send can also be caused by what we do not do or what we do not say. By what we do, like reconcile differences within our homes, our families and our schools and our communities would be a start. So where do we start? If we focus with the schools, as I said earlier, I believe society's problems are surfacing here, for all to see, to place our sons and daughters and children in with the schools, let us focus on the schools and what should we be advocating, what should we be doing? Again, there is no simple program to pass, if the Congress would pass it and fund it, it would go away. Congress cannot reconcile America's alienation within the family or within each of us, but we certainly can encourage you, support you and assist you. And here are some of the ways some of us believe we should start. The Federal Head Start program. Can we not expand that program? Many of us for years have said, look, at 3 to 5 years old, they should be in Head Start. We should fully fund it. But if we expand that program, can we not teach mandatory in the curriculum violence prevention and conflict resolution? Why can we not take that one and expand it? It has been interesting as we have had the Law Enforcement Caucus, we have had experts in many times and it has been interesting that the larger cities have noticed the problems they were having in their schools and part of their curriculum is violence prevention and conflict resolution. It is interesting to note it has not been the larger school districts that we see that are having the violence that we have been witnessing lately. Maybe there is something there that we should teach and why not start it at the Federal Head Start program? We have the healthy child program. It is a program that coupled aspects of it, last year in the balanced budget agreement, we put in CHIPs, Children's Health Initiative Program, CHIPs as we call it for short. That was to help young people who do not have health insurance have health insurance. In the State of Michigan, we are like 20,000 applications behind. People are waiting 6 months to access this program. They are either going to be in the Medicaid program or the CHIPs program. Why do they have to wait 6 months? Why are we 20,000 applications behind, when I was bringing it up with

the governors representatives and then we really do not have a good idea or a good answer on why they cannot expedite the program and provide it to these people, to the young people who are uninsured, especially when we talk about the mental health provisions that 20 percent of the students are coming to school with mental health problems or difficulties or need someone to talk to and 3 to 6 percent of them have severe mental health, how come we are not addressing that? Why are we not expanding these programs to address these needs? If you take the K through 12, we have heard from school counselors and probably everybody across America says, ''Yeah, I know a school counselor,'' but when you talk to the counselors, we say what are you doing, are you there to counsel, are you there to help, are you there to be there for the students, to interact with them. Basically they tell us, ''Well, we really don't have time because we're busy with the busing schedule,'' or ''We're busy doing the curriculum,'' or ''We're busy preparing the students for the next round of testing going on by this group or that group or the State,'' or ''We just really are helping the students who want to go on to college with their college applications and things like this.'' The counseling that we envisioned or we saw when we were in school just is not there anymore. So if the counseling, be it nurses, psychologists, school resource officers, crisis intervention officers, counselors, cops in the schools, should we not make sure that if they are going to do this, they have the opportunity to do it and not get bogged down and not be utilized for busing or for curriculum development or testing or college applications? Should they not really have it, should there not be a professional staff that could help there? And should that not in order to protect them from the budget cuts that occur all the time as local taxpayers struggle to keep their millage rates low to provide a quality education? If they are the first people who are cut every time there is a budget cut, is there a place then for the Federal Government to step forward and say, look, if there are going to be professional staff, should the Federal Government not at least put forth the majority of their salary so they are not subject to these cutbacks, so they can be there to interact?

And what about before and after school programs? Everyone tells us that the juvenile crime rate is the highest between 4 o'clock and 8 p.m. at night when the students are out of school and they have idle time on their hands. Can we not have programs? I have often wondered why these so-called after-school programs are only run during school but when young people are out and about the most during the summer, there is no program. Should there not really be a year-round program for them? Should cities or schools not do sponsorship? Like in our city we have the summer recreation program but after school starts, what about those who are no longer in sports, what is for them? In my hometown after that?

Again can we use these professional Federal staff people to assist there? That is something I think we should take a look at. We talked a lot about school hot lines. School hot lines, ones that have been used out East here quite a bit with some success. Those were the school hot lines we talked about the student using if they have a concern, be it safety or just a concern, they can use the hotline to call in and someone would get back with them, be it one of those counselors or nurses or crisis intervention people or school resource officers.

With the recent incidents from Colorado and now too in Georgia, the superintendents are telling us and even in my district, even last Monday we had another bomb threat, how do you crack down on that if you have a hotline? Does that become the hotline for the bomb threats or the assaults or alleged assaults on the school? Then do you put in the caller ID? Can you crew the trap lines? Can you backtrack it, to cut down on these? And why could the hotline not be a parent's link to the school to see what is going on in the school, what events are going on, what is the drama club doing, what is their next event? Also why can the homework assignments not be there so the parents know if there is homework assignments, so they can take an active role in there?

Another suggestion we have heard in our many, many meetings is why can we not do hold and safe rooms? Hold and safe rooms is, I mentioned earlier, 100,000 weapons come to school every day with young people. If you are with a weapon in school, what happens? Do you hopefully not like what happened in one school shooting incident where the student came with a weapon in school, was sent home, got more weapons and unfortunately violence erupted.

□ 1815

So holding safe rooms, should each district have one, have one designated, that is a program that does not even cost anything, but what it tells us is a student comes here with a weapon, we are just not going to release them back into the community without holding them and making sure they are safe and making sure all precautions are taken to protect that student, other students and the community itself.

And what if the student is removed from school? I have heard governors say throughout this great Nation of ours, that first student that comes to a class with a weapon, just throw them out of school, no questions asked. Then where does it go? Where does the student go? Back into our communities? Do they work? Where do they go?

There is nothing to help them, and just letting them loose back into the community does not seem to be the answer of all we have seen in these recent months, in the last 2 years. So some States have what they call alternative schools. Some of us like to call them reentry schools.

And if you are going to be suspended for whatever, be it weapons or whatever it may be, why not, before you come back into your school, there is a reentry which must address the reasons for your suspension, and especially if it had something to do with weapons or drugs or alcohol. Let us answer, let us answer those questions before you reenter.

I indicated earlier that guns unfortunately are readily accessible and four guns for every one student we have, and 100,000 weapons come to school a day, and we have 13 deaths a day of young people. How do you begin to address that? If you are going to start addressing legislation such as that, I think not only you have to address what is happening in communities but also in our homes.

And in the last week you have seen many dramatic votes in the Senate on it, everything from 21 years old to purchase hand guns to closing the Brady loophole on checks at gun shows and pawn shops and child safety locks and liability and storage, and these are things I think that we have to address and at least talk about. Whether you are a Democrat or Republican, conservative, liberal, it is something we have to have a discussion about, and hopefully it can be a meaningful discussion.

We have talked, many of us, and I know even today the Speaker mentioned about ratings on games and Internet access and things like that; and besides all the meetings we have been having, we have been hearing articles and experts talk about are we really training our children to kill, and they talk about the desensitization which is going on with children.

And many experts have said, and if I can quote from one or two articles, children do not naturally kill, they learn it from violence in the home, and most pervasively from violence as entertainment and television, movies and interactive video games. And they go on to say that every time a child plays an interactive video game, he is learning the exact same conditioned reflex skills as a soldier or a police officer in training.

Mr. Speaker, every parent in America desperately wants to be warned of the impact of TV and other violent media on children, but unfortunately we have seen, I said on the Committee on Commerce, unfortunately we have seen a lot of our TV networks sort of stonewall what it really means in our key means of public education in America, and I hope we are not stonewalling them.

These are all issues that we have been trying to address, and there have been again many, many articles that we have looked at, we have argued about, we have debated, and we continue to look for answers. As I said,

there is no one single program, there is no one single solution, there is no Democratic or Republican solution here. We must work together on this.

As we talked about the counselors, there are about 90,000 counselors right now in America, and they are in the public schools from middle to high school. We have 90,000 counselors for 19.4 million students. That comes out to about 1 counselor for every 450 students.

But as we spoke to those counselors and their representatives, they said, ''We do not get a chance to counsel anymore like we used to. We actually spend time,'' as I said earlier, ''helping on developing core curriculum, helping on the busing schedule, helping out with kids wanting to go on to college,'' and how do we help them out there, ''and just basically doing testing, testing, testing so our school scores well on the test so we can hopefully get more resources.'' But the kids are lost in the whole shuffle.

So is it feasible to put in 100,000 more counselors, much as we did 100,000 cops on the street, to stop this violence that we see in our schools? And if you looked at it, that would add about 100,000 more counselors, would bring it down to 1 to 250 students. But then we got to make sure those counselors are not bogged down doing busing, or testing, or core curriculum development, or college preparation.

And what about after school programs? We think there are many of them, good programs that can work, whether it is Amer-I-Can or Boys and Girls Clubs or whatever, why can we not do those things?

As my colleagues know, we just did an emergency supplemental appropriations that the President asked for $6 billion, ended up being $15 billion, and we passed that. Can we not put forth an emergency school supplemental appropriation?

And what about family, school and teacher initiatives? Why can we not have these hot lines? Why can we not expand the family medical leave that we tried to do, to make it available so parents can go to school to spend some time with their children, whether or not, not just at report card time but other times? Why can we not expand that?

These are just some of the ideas I said that have come out of the Democratic Caucus. We have been working on it since the first of the year. It has taken on new urgency with the situation in Colorado and again here today in Conyers, Georgia, but I want you to know that we have been working and thinking and trying to take your suggestions and ideas that have come from the American people and from the psychologists and National Education Association and American Federation of Teachers and everyone we met with, and as House Members we have even met with Senate Members. And again, we are all trying to pull together, and unfortunately today's incident once again leads me to come to the floor tonight to join with the Democratic leaders and others to try to talk about what we are doing, what we are doing.

And I notice one of the leaders in this area, Mr. ROEMER from Indiana, is here, and at this time I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to thank my good friend, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK), from the Midwest, right next to Indiana, my home State, for having this special order on a very, very important topic in America today. I want to commend our leader, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT) for taking the time to come to the floor to address this very, very important issue for all Americans in facing, and not only are we facing trying to come up with creative and bold and innovative solutions to make our schools better, we need to make our schools safer.

I was sitting in my office just minutes ago making phone calls back home to Indiana to talk to and listen to farmers, and our farmers are going through a very difficult time in small town communities with the price of beans and corn and hogs being so low. And I was speaking with some of them, and some of them were saying, well, we are in danger of going out of business and we are having all kinds of problems in our small town communities, but we have our family and we have our children, and we will get through this.

Imagine, imagine what some families in America are going through today in Paducah, in Jonesboro, in Springfield, in Littleton, in Georgia today, that had their children shot at school, have children injured and sent to the hospital, are scared about sending their children to a public school or a private school to get an education in America today. That is a compelling issue for this Congress to address and address in a bipartisan way, address in a thoughtful way, address in maybe a short term way but in also a long term way, with vision, with perspective, with a lot of thought and with, hopefully, a lot of answers.

I cannot imagine, as a parent of three children, being in the shoes of some of the parents that are in these cities across America, in these suburbs across America, in these situations across America where their children are in danger, where their children are being harmed, where their children might be shot. And just on CNN tonight in a Gallup poll, they did a Gallup poll to 13 and 17-year-olds, asking our 13 and 17-year-old children in schools today, ''Do you feel safe?'' Asking them what some of the biggest problems are in our schools: peer pressure and the cliques and standing up for what you think is right and against somebody putting down other students in very harmful and mean ways.

But we have to get back, and I think my colleague from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) understands this, we have to get back in Congress to helping try to have a national dialogue, as education is the number one issue across America. Every single union hall I go into, it is the number one issue, every single business I go into it is the number one issue, every single home I knock on in Indiana it the number one issue.

And now not only are we concerned with better schools, innovative schools, creative schools, helping with charter schools, helping with this Ed-Flex program that we just passed, but we must be concerned with safer schools. We cannot let this happen over and over and over again, from Arkansas to Mississippi to Kentucky to Colorado to Oregon to Georgia. We do not want this happening in Indiana, and I know in my good friend's home State of Michigan and Port Huron the other day we had another instance of potential violence.

So I would hope that the Speaker and the Leader could get together, I would hope Democrats and Republicans could join together to discuss in a national way, with national dialogue and input from a lot of different sources, teachers and parents and principals and counselors, people that think that families are the number one concern and the number one answer, people that think that media violence is the number one concern and the number one answer, people that think that metal detectors and safety and security measures in schools are the number one concern and number one answer, people that think that there are too many guns in society.

Mr. Speaker, let us have these debates. I do not necessarily think that we can legislate everything here to answer this compelling problem on the House floor, but we can talk about the importance of family and the role of bringing up our children, we can talk about how parents must be at that kitchen table and talking and listening to our children. We can talk about how this has to be done more in America. We can talk, and hopefully talk and respect the First Amendment about the number of media games, of games on the Internet that companies are putting out there for our children, that do not need to be sold to our children, that escalate the number of violent activities on the programs, that reward kids for the more people that they harm on these video games, the more points they get and the more harm they can do. We do not need to be selling those products to our children.

And we can talk about some, yes, some answers that maybe Congress can come up with. We can talk about maybe some ways to put some programs together to allow our local schools to pick from a host of different answers, whether those answers be that the school picks from looking at putting more metal detectors in the schools, to having more counselors in the schools, to having more mental and psychiatric resources available in the schools, to more D.A.R.E. officers in the schools, to other proven research

methods that make our schools safer, allow our local schools to pick and choose as they should, as the local schools should do, from a host of different measures.

□ 1830

Let us in this great Chamber, where George Washington peers down on us and godly trust is above us, where we have had so many historic debates in this great place, let us discuss the issues of the day. Let us bring education front and forward to improve schools, to make them better and to use more creative approaches to do that, but also look at the safety issues, to look at what we need to do to give more assurances to our parents and our families, that our schools and the United States of America are going to be safe places for our children.

We can do an emergency supplemental. If we can make that a priority in this country, and I voted for it, to make sure our troops have the resources overseas to be successful in battle, we should make sure that our families are talking about the right things. Where we can help, where we cannot, where we cannot legislate this, we can have a national dialogue, but we can talk about many of these other things here in this body, with Republicans and Democrats together, sharing in some of the answers, disagreeing maybe on some of the answers but at least proposing some solutions to these problems, with safety in our schools, with better schools in all of our neighborhoods across this great land.

So I really want to say that there cannot be anything more important that we as a Congress can deal with in this session of Congress. There cannot be anything more important to parents than better schools and safer schools. There cannot be anything more important in the history of the country as we move into this new millennium than better and safer schools and Congress working together to improve those schools.

So I just want to say, in just the few minutes that the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) has the special order tonight, that I share in his concern; that I applaud his leadership on drawing many people together in the Democratic Caucus to look at a wide variety of answers, whether they be long-term answers, such as I think fully funding Head Start programs and preschool programs, long-term answers like helping our families, encouraging our families to stay together and not implode, looking at counselors and metal detectors and letting local schools pick from a host of solutions, but we need to draw people together in our caucus, we need to draw people together across both lines of our parties. We need to come together to discuss and debate these issues today, in America, at our kitchen tables, in our great halls for debate and help solve some of these problems.

Again, I want to thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) for having this special order. I again want to thank the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT) for taking the time to come to the floor to talk about these issues, and I want to commend the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) for trying to put some packages together on the crime side, on the juvenile justice side, to also look at some solutions to these vexing and very important problems.

Mr. STUPAK. I thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) for joining us tonight and thanks for coming down and joining us. As one of the leaders in the education field, as the gentleman has been, with a new Democratic coalition and others, we really appreciate the insight he has given us as to what works in Indiana, in his district, as I said earlier. What works in New Jersey or Michigan or wherever it might be, it may work in that community or that State unique unto itself but all of our communities in this country right now are basically subject to violence in families, in schools and communities. No matter how one cuts it, no matter where one stands on the issues, there just seem to be so many weapons available and so much alienation out there and so many opportunities for violence. I am sure if the gentleman looks closer in his polling results that he has seen, he will see there is sort of like this hopelessness out there, confusion and despair on what we should do, and the gentleman is absolutely right, there is no simple solution. There is no quick political fix to this vexing problem.

We need vision, we need action, and we need long-term commitment, and again not just for 1 year or 3 years or 5 years, but at least a generation.

I know that the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) has always worked in a bipartisan way with Democrats and Republicans and that is what we are asking here. As the Democratic Caucus, we have been reaching out and we will continue not just to our colleagues on the other side of the aisle but also over in the Senate to try to find some kind of solutions.

All these things, whether it is the community, the schools, the homes or guns, they are all interrelated, interconnected. We have to be prepared to start addressing all parts of the problem.

I wish we could but the Federal Government just cannot pass a law, the Federal Government just cannot reconcile America, or alienation within the family or even within each other, but we certainly can encourage; we would support and do anything we can to assist.

So I certainly appreciate the gentleman's time and effort in coming down here tonight to speak with us.

There is another issue, of course, that is on the minds of all Americans and that is, of course, Kosovo. One of our colleagues, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL), wanted to take a few moments, so I am going to yield him some time to talk about that situation.

So while we talk about school violence or what is happening, we still have other matters that we must address again hopefully in a bipartisan way, and I would yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) for yielding. Let me just say that I certainly endorse everything that he has said about violence and about the terrible tragedies taking place in our country, in our schools today. As the father of three children, I know that every parent grieves when we hear of these tragedies at our schools. We obviously need to put our heads together, Democrats, Republicans, Americans all. There are no easy solutions, and none of us has the magic answer.

We certainly cannot legislate these things. I think as leaders of our great country we need to have a dialogue and we need to put our heads together and come up with something with which all Americans can identify. So I thank my friend from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) for his leadership in this regard.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to speak a bit about violence that is happening on the other side of the world in Europe, and that is the situation in Kosova. I had not intended to speak but I earlier heard the remarks of our colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), and I just felt that some of the things he said really should not be left unchallenged.

I believe what the United States is doing in Kosova is noble, and I believe what the President has attempted to do is noble. We could have easily stood by and let the genocide and ethnic cleansing continue and not done a thing and that would have been the easier thing for us to do, but I think to the President's credit and to our great country's credit we decided that we just could not stand idly by 55 and 60 years after the Holocaust and see another tragedy going on on the continent of Europe.

To those people who say, well, why is the United States involved when there is genocide going on all over the world, obviously we are involved with our NATO allies. NATO is the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and so NATO is primarily concerned with what goes on in Europe, and this has a terrible destabilizing effect in the Balkans and indeed on the whole continent of Europe.

So we, as one of the lead nations in NATO, as the lead nation in NATO, I believe we need to be very responsive to genocide and ethnic cleansing.

Mr. Speaker, there seems to be a tendency in some quarters to unfortunately equate the victims of genocide with the oppressors who are carrying out the genocide. We cannot equate those two. It is very, very clear what is going on in Kosova today. The ethnic Albanians are the victims and Mr. Milosevic and his Serbian government are the oppressors. That is clear.

There were two million ethnic Albanians routed from their homes. I think when we get into Kosova we are going to see 100,000 or more people in mass graves ethnically cleansed. There are already at least 100,000 missing, and we get reports day in and day out of mass graves. We cannot allow that to happen.

There are some people that say, well, this did not happen until the bombing started. That is nonsense. This has been going on for years. We have called it slow ethnic cleansing. It is true that the pace has accelerated since the NATO bombing but ethnic cleansing has been going on against the Kosovar Albanians for many, many months and years, a systematic campaign and every negotiated attempt was made to try to get Milosevic to come to his senses, and only when that failed did the bombing start.

I went to Rambouillet during the negotiations in France to speak with our American officials and to try to help convince the Kosovar Albanians to accept Rambouillet. They accepted the Rambouillet Accords. Even though it was far short of what they would like, they believe and I believe that they are entitled to independence and to self-determination. When the former Yugoslavia broke up, and it broke up because of Milosevic, every other group in the former Yugoslavia was given the right to independence and self-determination.

The Croatians, the Bosnians, the Macedonians, the Slovanians all were given that option and opted for independent nations. Why are the Kosovar Albanians not given the same option? Why do they have to live in second class status? I think it is very, very clear that Serbia has lost any moral authority ever again to govern the people of Kosova. They have no right to it. The people of Kosova have the right to independence and self-determination.

Ethnic cleansing cannot be tolerated, and I think the principles with which we lay down to stop the bombing remain firm and must remain firm. There should be no erosion of those principles.

Milosevic knows what he needs to do. In order for the bombing to stop, the Kosovar Albanians need to return to their homes and they need to be protected by international armed forces led by NATO and they ought to have the right of independence and self-determination.

We ought to, in my estimation, be arming and training the KLA, the Kosova Liberation Army. They are the only counterbalance to the Serbs on the ground. If we do not want American troops on the ground, and many people do not, then they are the only counterbalance to the Serbs.

I have introduced a bill along with my colleague the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD) that says that we ought to be arming and training the KLA. In the long-term and in the short-term, we ought to be airlifting and air dropping anti-tank weaponry to them because they want to turn to us. The KLA wants to work with the west. The KLA wants to work with NATO. If we continue to rebuff them, they are going to go elsewhere for their arms. They may go elsewhere, Iran and other places that we do not like, and then if they do that we cannot then point and say, aha, because it will have been a self-fulfilling prophecy.

They want to be pro-west. They want to work with us. They want to defeat the Serbs. They want to aid NATO and we have been rebuffing them. It is ashame. It is wrong. It is morally wrong, and it is wrong in terms of what we should be planning.

I also believe, Mr. Speaker, that if we are going to fight this war, all options ought to be on the table, including the possible option of ground troops. I do not say this lightly, but I think we cannot tell Milosevic in advance what we will do and what we will not do, because if we tell him what our game plan is he can plan accordingly. That is why he has dispersed his military, he has dispersed his armaments because he does not fear a ground evasion. If we keep him guessing, we will take away a number of options from him.

Let me say this about Milosevic: We continue to treat him as if he is somehow the solution, we are going to negotiate with him, we are going to deal with him. I read reports where Milosevic supposedly is ready for a deal as long as we state first and foremost that Kosova will remain part of Serbia. That would be a disgrace to give him that. That would be a disgrace to say that we are somehow pretending that since Rambouillet nothing has happened, when we know there are tens of thousands, if not hundreds of thousands, of people executed and ethnically cleansed.

So we should not give in to Milosevic's demands. We should hold firm and adhere to those principles.

Again, all options should be on the table. We have Apache helicopters in Albania. In my estimation, we ought to be utilizing them. We ought to be doing humanitarian air drops, dropping food to half a million starving Kosovar refugees who are trapped in Kosova, who are in the mountains and do not have enough food.

I was at Kennedy Airport last week, welcoming the first round of Kosovar refugees coming home to the United States, to be with their families, and they were tears streaming down people's eyes, hugging and kissing. It was something really to behold. These people are suffering. Milosevic is a war criminal who ought to be indicted by the International Tribunal in the Hague. We should not be giving in to him, capitulating to him or in my estimation even negotiating with him.

We need to win this war. We need to guarantee that those people come back to their homes and we need to put those responsible for genocide on trial, and we need to be very, very firm and, again, I believe that we need to arm and train the KLA.

I want to enter into the RECORD two letters. One is from the Veterans of Foreign Wars, which states that the veterans of foreign wars of the United States is resolved that in order to bring this conflict to a rapid and successful conclusion on terms favorable to NATO we will support the United States acting as part of the NATO alliance, taking decisive action with the full range of overwhelming military power to eject, remove or otherwise force the withdrawal of Serbian military and paramilitary forces and to restore Kosovars to their homes.

☐ 1845

Mr. Speaker, I would like to enter into the RECORD the Kosova Coalition, which is signed by many, many people, Christians, Muslims, Jews, all kinds of ethnic groups in this country to Members of Congress urging our support for NATO's efforts to stop the ethnic cleansing in Kosovo. One paragraph says, ''We, therefore, call on Congress to request that it take all necessary steps to end Serbia's campaign of ethnic cleansing, force the withdrawal of all Serb forces, create a secure environment for the return of Albanians to their homes, and allow them to govern themselves and to rebuild Kosovo.''

Finally, I want to say that the smears that have been leveled in some quarters against the KLA talking about them using drug money and whatever have no basis in fact. Intelligence reports and everybody else say that it is nothing but a political smear campaign, and again today in the Wall Street Journal it says, The U.S. Drug Enforcement Agency says claims that the KLA raises money from drugs quote, ''have not been corroborated and may be politically motivated.''

So I am tired of the smears. This country is doing the right thing, the noble thing. We are to make sure that the Kosovar Albanians get their legitimate rights. We are to stay the course; we are to be firm, and I am proud of the United States of America standing up at this very important point in time.

I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

APRIL 20, 1999.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Veterans of Foreign Wars of the Untied States is gravely concerned about the worsening situation in the Balkans. As the combat veterans who for the last 100 years have fought all of our country's wars, we have until now opposed the deployment of U.S. forces to the former Yugoslavia. Our opposition was based on our concern for the safety of our servicemen and women in the midst of the Yugoslav civil war. Also, we have been uncertain what vital U.S. national security interests were at stake in that country's conflict.

Since we took that position, however, the situation has changed. In the past few weeks Serbian leaders have used their military and

paramilitary forces to overrun Kosovo, destroy the social and economic fabric of the province and terrorize the populace into flight.

Despite, and in defiance of NATO's diplomatic efforts and its air campaign, Serbia now has achieved its objectives in Kosovo. By doing so it has raised the stakes in this conflict. Having waged unrestricted war on the people and province of Kosovo, NATO's credibility and U.S. leadership have been directly challenged by Serbia. NATO will neither continue as a credible, unified alliance, nor will the U.S. retain its world leadership role if the Serbian challenge goes unmet and Serb aggression is not stopped.

Many of our members are deeply troubled by the situation we face. Some realize the long history of this conflict, the skill of our adversaries, the inhospitable weather and terrain and the political difficulty of maintaining alliance unity are important factors that will affect our actions and their outcomes. Others are mindful of the lessons of past wars. The gradual applications of force that allow adversaries to seize objectives before our power peaks and the limits placed on the use of our military power which can prolong conflicts, increase casualties and erode public support are lessons that seem to some to apply equally to today as to yesterday.

Nonetheless, in consideration of the current situation, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States is resolved that in order to bring this conflict to a rapid and successful conclusion on terms favorable to NATO, we will support the United States acting as part of the NATO alliance, taking decisive action with the full range of overwhelming military power to eject, remove or otherwise force the withdrawal of Serbian military and paramilitary forces and to restore Kosovars to their homes.

We also believe that careful consideration should be given to the formation of a NATO peacekeeping force to guarantee Kosovars' freedom from further oppression and the right to its self-determination.

Finally, Mr. President, with such important questions before us we believe and urge you to ensure first that the American people are behind this effort and then to take this issue to the United States Congress for its advice and consent.

Sincerely,

THOMAS A. POULIOT,
Commander-in-Chief, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

KOSOVA COALITION,
Washington, DC, May 19, 1999.

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: We are writing to urge your support for NATO's efforts to stop the ethnic cleansing of Kosova.

We are horrified by the atrocities, including mass murder, systematic rape, and widespread expulsions, committed by Serb forces against the civilian population of Kosova. We strongly support NATO's military campaign in Kosova, but are concerned that our efforts thus far have not been enough to stop the atrocities there. In fact, the State Department recently reported that Serbia has forced nearly 90 percent of the Kosovar Albanians from their homes and is continuing its effort to cleanse Kosova of its Albanian population. We cannot allow Serbia to succeed.

We, therefore, call on Congress to request that NATO take all necessary steps to end Serbia's campaign of ethnic cleansing, force the withdrawal of all Serb forces, create a secure environment for the return of the Albanians to their homes, and allow them to govern themselves and rebuild Kosova.

We also support the efforts of the UN War Crimes Tribunal. We strongly believe that those individuals who committed or ordered others to commit crimes against humanity must be brought to justice.

Lastly, we believe that the international community should continue to help alleviate the circumstances facing the Kosovar refugees. To the extent possible, the refugees should be able to remain in the Balkans to better enable their eventual return to their homes. All countries bordering Kosova should keep their borders open to refugees and treat them with dignity and respect.

Although we are disheartened by the events unfolding in Kosova, we are supportive of NATO's mission there. But the ethnic cleansing must stop. NATO can help achieve that goal by expanding its mission in Kosova.

Sincerely,

Ilir Zherka, National Albanian American Council; Bruce Morrison, Former Member of Congress; Richard D. Heidman, B'nai B'rith International; Glenn Ruga, Friends of Bosnia; John Cavelli, Conference of Presidents of Major Italian American Organizations; Hisham Reda, Muslim Public Affairs Committee; Marilyn Piurek, Polish American Leadership Council; Jess N. Hordes, Anti-Defamation League; Steve Rukavina, National Federation of Croatian Americans; Bob Blancato, Italian American Democratic Leadership Council; Mark Lazar, Federation of Polish Americans; Abdulrahman Alamoudi, American Muslim Council Foundation, John Pikarski,* Gordon and Pikarski; Rabbi David Saperstein, Religious Action Center of Reform Judiasm; Dr. Jim Zogby,* Arab American Institute; Steven Schwarz, Jewish Council for Public Affairs; Tolga Cubukcu, Assembly of Turkish American Associations; Phil Baum, American Jewish Congress; Peter Ujvagi, Hungarian American National Democratic Leadership Caucus; Jason Isaacson, American Jewish Committee.

*These individuals are signing the letter in their own names. Organizations they represent are included for information purposes only.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for coming down and sharing his concerns.

I know the gentleman from Virginia would like to speak on school violence, and I would like to yield to him at this point in time.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding to me. I also want to say a word about the comments of the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL), my friend and colleague. He is absolutely right. Mr. Milosevic is a war criminal and he is a bully, and we cannot yield to him. We must not let him prevail, nor can we as a society ever become apathetic to the suffering, the murder, the genocidal campaign that has gone on in the Balkans. We must stand firm; we must stand with NATO, and that means whether it is politically popular, or whether it is not the popular will, it is up to us to show leadership. The President is showing leadership. Most of the leaders of NATO are showing leadership, particularly in the United Kingdom, and we applaud them for doing that. History will give them credit if they do not get it from their electorate today.

As we approach the dawn of a new millennium, we as a people, individually and collectively, must stand up for a civil society, a society under the rule of law, a society where democracy determines leadership, a society where people are rewarded for their effort within a capitalist economy.

So we have a major role internationally. But we must also set a standard domestically, and there is an area where this society falls short of meeting that standard, and that is in the area of gun control. Because the statistics will show that that is one area where we trailed the rest of the industrialized nations. In fact, there are more children killed by firearms in the United States than all 25 other industrialized nations combined.

Now, when we stand for principle internationally, it would seem that it is incumbent upon us to do the right thing domestically, and it is not right that 13 young people every day lose their lives due to firearms, whether it be through homicides, suicides, or unintentional shooting.

Mr. Speaker, there are events such as happened today, such as happened recently in Littleton, Colorado where that enters the radar screen of our mind. But it should be an objective every day, particularly in this House, to bring us in line with the other civilized nations and to stop the proliferation of handguns and assault weapons.

The last year for which we have statistics, we know that about 3,000 children and teenagers were murdered with guns, over 1,300 committed suicide with guns, and about 500 died in unintentional shootings, just in one year. A total of nearly 5,000 young people were killed by firearms, and that is a relatively typical year. In fact, in a typical year, we have over 20,000 people, adults and children alike, killed by firearms. That is way out of sync with the rest of the civilized world. There is no country that even registers on the same radar screen as the United States. They do not reach 100 deaths by firearms in a year, and we have 23,000.

Mr. Speaker, two in 25 high school students, so we are talking about tens and tens of thousands of high school students, report having carried a gun in the last month. Where are they getting these guns? Why are they getting these guns? They are getting these guns because we have lax laws, because of our gun control policy which is too determined by politics and by political campaign contributions.

I speak particularly of the gun lobby and of contributions from the National Rifle Association. If the Republican Party does not want this to be a campaign issue, if they do not want this to be a partisan issue, then they should not be accepting the millions of dollars of campaign contributions from the National Rifle Association. Because it is going to be a campaign issue when 85 percent of those campaign contributions are going to Republicans, when one can go right down the line of the people who lead the fight against gun

control, and look at the campaign contributions, and most of them have gotten $9,900 a year. Some have gotten as much as $14,000. I do not know how they do that, because they are supposed to be limited to $10,000 a year, maximum. But we have the numbers. The numbers are available. People should look at it. People should compare those to votes. People should also respect the fact that an important vote was cast today. It was a deadlock, it was decided by the Vice President of the United States, and it was the right thing to do.

I hope that this will not continue to be a partisan issue, that we will do the right thing in the House of Representatives. That, in fact, we will be able to add the same amendments to the Juvenile Justice Authorization, and lacking those amendments, that we will be able to at least add them to the appropriations bill on Treasury and Postal Operations.

It is long past time. Thousands of people have died because we have not been willing to stand up to the kind of political bullying that comes from many in the gun lobby.

Mr. Speaker, we should not miss this opportunity to focus on this very serious problem in our society. We must start to do the right thing legislatively. We must stop this violence. I am not suggesting that to take away guns is a magic bullet. But I am suggesting that when we went to school, we had the same kind of psychological problems with peers and girlfriends and so on, but we did not have dead victims as a result. We might have done silly things, but gosh, we did not have access to guns; we did not shoot people, we did not leave people dead in a pool of blood. And that is happening because guns are much to easily accessible to our young people who do not have the maturity to be able to use them. We ought to increase the age of accessibility to guns, we ought to put safety locks on guns, and we ought to reduce the proliferation of them, whether it be through pawnshops or through gun shows or retail or wholesale or whatever. The time has long since passed for us to take the lead in this very serious issue and restore a civil society and reduce the violence that is prevalent throughout this American Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Michigan taking this time to speak about school violence. School violence is a reflection of society. This is an important issue. We ought to be addressing it today.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, realizing my time has expired, I once again would just like to thank the Speaker for his courtesies here tonight and understand that of course that as we address this issue, it is more than just guns, but things are happening in communities, in schools and in homes, and we invite Democrats and Republicans to come together and address this in a bipartisan manner

A GREATER QUALITY OF LIFE FOR AMERICA'S DEFENDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentlewoman from Idaho (Mrs. CHENOWETH) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I found it interesting, the comments tonight on Kosovo. It is my firm belief that we are involved in an illegal war. We speak glowingly about the rule of law, and yet the Constitution requires that the Congress raise up armies and declare war. The War Powers Act clearly defines the limits within which the President may engage in war-like activities such as we have become involved in in Kosovo. The U.N. charter requires that no Nation see this kind of violent activity in a sovereign manner when there is internal conflict. So I do not care where one looks, whether it is international law, constitutional law, or statutory authority, this is an illegal war.

As we think about the war in Kosovo, Mr. Speaker, I want us today, as we begin to approach the time when we remember the veterans, the men and women who have served so bravely overseas, as we begin to enter into that season in our year, I want us to think about them and not forget them. Because in today's military, a young enlisted person serving out his or her first contract can expect to make only $1,075.80 a month. Over a 40-hour work week, this averages to $6.70 an hour. But most of our military personnel do not work 40-hour work weeks. We all remember the famous army slogan: We do more before 9 o'clock a.m. than most people do all day. Well, Mr. Speaker, it is true. These young enlisted personnel can expect to be at work before first light and not home again until long after dark.

□ 1900

Mr. Speaker, we do not pay them overtime. These young people train for weeks at a time away from home. They keep themselves in a state of top physical readiness, and they live their personal lives according to the high standards of integrity and honor we mandate for them. These young servicemen and women must uproot their families on a moment's notice, moving to a new duty station across the country or across the globe. A lot of them do it for as little as $6.70 an hour.

For members of the military with families, the situation is even worse. Despite a modest living allowance, 12,000 families currently serving our armed forces are dependent upon food stamps, food stamps. We have government employees living off of government subsidies. Mr. Speaker, why do we not skip the intermediary step and just pay them properly in the first place?

During the holidays at the Mountain Home Air Force Base in Idaho, a network of military spouses work together to collect donations of money and toys for the enlisted families who cannot afford to give their young ones Christmas or Thanksgiving.

Last November and December, the Mountain Home Warm Heart organization, run by the spouses of servicemen, distributed over $18,000 worth of food and toys and cash to needy military families.

Where did this money come from, Mr. Speaker? From the pockets of servicemen who already had very little to give. If this were not bad enough, many military families have more serious concerns than just Christmas and Thanksgiving.

At the Mountain Home Air Force Base, 459 women and children are receiving regular food assistance. That is not a proud record for us. One hundred and seven of those are infants. The Mountain Home Air Force Aid Society made $131,000 in emergency assistance loans to military families. I am very concerned about what will happen to these families when the money runs out and they still have to make monthly payments on their loans.

In the 18th century, citizen soldiers won our independence and secured our liberties. We hailed them as heroes, and revered the courage and commitment they demonstrated in defense of our Nation. Today that Nation is protected by citizen soldiers with the same integrity and that same sense of duty. Only in 20th century America, we do not even pay them a living wage. We should be ashamed of ourselves.

From 1988 to today, there have been 32 deployments of our military. In the previous 60 years, there were only 10 deployments. Put another way, Mr. Speaker, prior to this administration, the military was deployed an average of once every 6 years. During the Clinton administration, the military has been deployed an average of four times every year.

Furthermore, since 1987 we have depleted our ranks by 800,000 servicemen, 800,000 servicemen. In practical terms, that translates into more frequent deployments and dangerously long hours. It is illegal in this country for truck drivers to be on the road longer than 8 consecutive hours without rest. We have pilots now patrolling the Mediterranean in 14-hour shifts.

In short, this administration is expecting our servicemen and women to do 100 times as much and place their lives at risk 100 times as often with 800,000 fewer people for as little as $6.70 an hour.

Mr. Speaker, I recently paid a plumber $90 an hour to unplug my garbage disposal. An auto mechanic can expect $50 an hour. A teenage person working as a bagger in a grocery store can earn up to $12 an hour. None of these jobs requires 24-hour dedication to duty and a constant threat to their lives.

Mr. Speaker, one young Marine I know of has taken a second job to supplement his income. Every night this Lance Corporal goes home and trades his Marine uniform for a blue and red

tee shirt and matching hat from Dominoes. This young Marine, this hard-working father of two, delivers pizza because he is too proud to accept welfare.

He is not alone in this endeavor, but it is nearly impossible to know how many young servicemen are in this position, because most of them hide it from their commanders.

A young Lance Corporal serving in the Marine Corps today can anticipate being combat-deployed at least once in a 4-year enlistment. I wonder what this Lance Corporal's family will do when he is away and they have to make do without the supplemental income from Dominoes? I am humbled by this young Marine, and many others like him who work so hard to protect us. I am ashamed that we do not do right by them.

I urge this body to seriously consider the ethics of our government's continued overextension of our military in light of our complete lack of gratitude for their service.

Mr. Speaker, I have a request to make of the Members of this body. Tonight, when they go home to their families and when we go to the security and comfort of our own homes, when we tuck our young children in bed and say a prayer, we need to say a prayer for the men and women of our armed forces.

As we sleep, approximately 100,000 of them stand watch away from their own loved ones, ready to give their very lives to protect us, for as little as $6.70 an hour.

Mr. Speaker, I think this Congress must begin to understand that there is a direct correlation between the effectiveness of active duty military today and the treatment of the veterans of yesterday's service. Retention, morale, readiness, these words are euphemisms used to disguise the real problem our military faces: A complete lack of faith that their government will take good care of them.

Why should our active duty servicemen believe us? Veterans in my district are feeling the effects of cuts in the veterans budgets. Veterans hospitals in Salt Lake City and Spokane are suffering from cutbacks and layoffs which impact patient care, as well as those hospitals, veterans hospitals, in Boise, Idaho. There are waiting lists for surgery and fewer options for long-term care. We have broken our promises.

A sign in front of the Boise Veterans' Medical Center reads ''The price of freedom is visible here.'' But indeed, it is. Unfortunately, in our society, a select few pay that price. They are our veterans. They are our heroes, and they must fight for the health care benefits that we promised them.

We expected our veterans to fight for us abroad, but it breaks my heart when they have to come home and fight for their privileges that were promised them at home.

Mr. Speaker, veterans are forced into one final choice between their home and their patriotism. No Idaho veteran may be laid to rest in his home State in a dedicated field of honor. That is because my home State is the only State in the Union which does not have a veterans cemetery.

Veterans represent approximately 10 percent of Idaho's population. There are nearly 100,000 combat veterans in Idaho, about a third of whom served our Nation in World War II. Our average World War II veteran is 76 years old. These heroes are now passing away. This summer when veterans organizations call the roll of those who have died in the last year, they will read 3,500 names in Idaho, and not one will be able to be buried in an Idaho veterans cemetery. There is not an Idaho veterans cemetery.

That is why I am introducing legislation which will provide Idaho with a veterans cemetery. This bill answers a critical need Idaho faces. In pressing for a veterans' cemetery, I have the support of the entire Idaho congressional delegation, the State veterans organizations, our Governor, the Idaho legislature, and the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STUMP).

In fact, last month, the Idaho legislature passed Joint Memorial No. 1, which urgently requested a veterans cemetery, stating, and I quote, ''It is fitting and proper that a grateful Nation should provide a burial site within a reasonable distance from the homes of those Idahoans and others residing in the northwestern States who honorably served their country in a time of emergency.''

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe this case can be overstated. We in this body must begin to take very seriously our commitment to the armed forces. We cannot just try to make piecemeal repairs. We must begin to demonstrate a genuine commitment to improve the quality of life for our veterans and our active duty servicemen and women.

Mr. Speaker, earlier this week I was forced to vote no on the Kosovo emergency supplemental. That was a very painful and difficult vote for me. On the one hand, I hate to pass up a chance to rectify the wrongs brought down on our military in the past 6 years.

I always welcome the chance to give something back to our servicemen, but I cannot fund an illegal war. I cannot condone this military action, this terrible descent into a protracted conflict in which the American people have no stake whatsoever. I care about our troops too much to remain silent as they are led to this battlefield.

Mr. Speaker, last month this body had the opportunity to fulfill its constitutional role and declare war on the people of Kosovo. All but two, all but two 2 Members balked from that final act. It seems that the only thing this body can agree on in this matter is that the people of Kosovo are not our enemies. Why, then, are we bombing them? Why are we destroying their capital?

I do not understand the answer to this question, Mr. Speaker, and I cannot let the temptation to provide our servicemen their due at this time dissuade me from my obligation to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution.

Had I voted to fund the war I had voted against declaring, I would have compromised the very principles these young people have fought for in the past. I would have voted to violate the Constitution. Worse, Mr. Speaker, this supplemental amounted to nothing less than blackmail. The Members of this body were offered a choice: Support the troops and the beluga whale and the House pages and the University of the District of Columbia and Washington Metropolitan Air Traffic and whatever other random provision was added, or do not support the troops at all. It is a shameful situation, what was added to the so-called emergency supplemental. It is a testament to the way the military has been constantly used by us, improperly used.

The fact is our military is being attacked by its most dangerous opponent, our own civilian command. This Kosovo supplemental was proof that we are not committed enough as a government or powerful enough as a Congress to undo the damage that already has been done. It is time to move from piecemeal repairs after the fact to proper recognition, support, and honor throughout.

In a time when we were threatened, they defended us. In a time when we were afraid, they kept their courage. In a time when we have discarded patriotism, they still salute their flag, honor their Commander in Chief, and serve the ideals of American freedom.

Mr. Speaker, we must show them, our heroes of past conflict and those who stand guard as we speak, that we care, that we are grateful, that we will not fail them.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DEUTSCH (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for after 3:00 p.m. today on account of personal reasons.

Mr. NAPOLITANO (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of official business in the district.

Mr. STARK (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for after 1:00 p.m. today on account of official business.

Mr. FOLEY (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for after 1:00 p.m. today on account of receiving an honorary doctorate degree from Northwood University.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FILNER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GEPHARDT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BLUMENAUER, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RUSH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FILNER, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. BROWN of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SANDERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DOGGETT, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JONES of North Carolina) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HASTERT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. NETHERCUTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WHITFIELD, for 5 minutes, today.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1141. Making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 13 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 24, 1999, at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour debates.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2252. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Avocados Grown in South Florida; Increased Assessment Rate [Docket No. FV99–915–1 FR] received May 19, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2253. A letter from the Administrator, Farm Service Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Noninsured Crop Disaster Assistance Program (RIN: 0560–AF46) received April 16, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2254. A letter from the Acting Associate Chief, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Landownership Adjustments: Land Exchanges—received May 11, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2255. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Mepiquat Chloride; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions, Correction [OPP–300719A; FRL–6075–7] (RIN: 2070–AB78) received April 16, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2256. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Dimethyl phosphate of 3-hydroxy-N-methyl-cis-crotonamide (monocrotophos) Final rule; Tolerance Revocations [OPP–300836; FRL–6074–4] (RIN: 2070–AB78) received April 16, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2257. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Sulfosulfuron; Pesticide Tolerance [OPP–300853; FRL–6078–4] (RIN: 2070–AB78) received May 11, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2258. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Methacrylic Copolymer; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [OPP–300848; FRL–6077–7] (RIN: 2070–AB78) received May 11, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2259. A letter from the Under Secretary, Rural Development, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Processing Requests for Farm Labor Housing (LH) Loans and Grants (RIN: 0575–AC19) received April 30, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

2260. A letter from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule—Establishing and Maintaining a Facility Representative Program at DOE Facilities [DOE STD 1063–97] received May 11, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

2261. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Notice of Availability of Grants and Selection Criteria for PrintSTEP Pilots [OPPTS–00267; FRL–6066–8] received April 16, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

2262. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants Phosphoric Acid Manufacturing and Phosphate Fertilizers Production [IL–64–2–5807; FRL–6329–5] (RIN: 2060–AE40 and 2060–AE44) received April 16, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

2263. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans for Arizona and California; General Conformity Rules [CA126–0129a; FRL–6233–1] received April 16, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

2264. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Hazardous Air Pollutants: Regulations Governing Equivalent Emission Limitations By Permit [AD–FRL–6343–1] (RIN: 2060–A128) received May 11, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

2265. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Hazardous Air Pollutants: Amendment to Regulations Governing Equivalent Emission Limitations by Permit [AD–FRL–6343–2] received May 11, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

2266. A letter from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Deregistration of Certain Registered Investment Companies [Release No. IC–23786; File No. S7–31–98] (RIN: 3235–AG29) received April 16, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

2267. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule—Implementation of the Chemical Weapons Convention; Revisions to the Export Administration Regulations [Docket No. 990416098–9098–01] (RIN: 0694–AB67) received May 19, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

2268. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Land and Minerals Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Appeals of MMS Orders (RIN: 1010–AC21) received May 6, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

2269. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Financial Disclosure [Docket No. 970728182–8272–02; I.D. 071697A] (RIN: 0648–AG16] received May 7, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

2270. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries off West Coast States and in the Western Pacific; West Coast Salmon Fisheries; Amendment 13 [Docket No. 990219053–9114–02; I.D. 011999B] (RIN: 0648–AK83) received May 17, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

2271. A letter from the Acting Chief, Office of Regulations & Administrative Law, Coast Guard Headquarters, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Connecticut River, CT [CGD01–99–032] received May 10, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2272. A letter from the Acting Chief, Office of Regulations & Administrative Law, Coast Guard Headquarters, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Drawbridge Operation Regulations: Hutchinson River, NY [CGD01–99–031] received May 10, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2273. A letter from the Acting Chief, Office of Regulations & Administrative Law, Coast Guard Headquarters, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Security Zone: Dignitary Arrival/Departure New York, NY [CGD01–98–006] (RIN: 2121–AA97) received May 10, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2274. A letter from the Acting Chief, Office of Regulations & Administrative Law, Coast Guard Headquarters, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone; Port of New York/New Jersey Fleet Week [CGD01–98–170] (RIN: 2121–AA97) received May 10, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2275. A letter from the Acting Chief, Office of Regulations & Administrative Law, Coast

Guard Headquarters, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone: Ellis Island Medals of Honor Fireworks, New York Harbor, Upper Bay [CGD01–99–034] (RIN: 2115–AA97) received May 10, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2276. A letter from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Raytheon Aircraft Corporation Model Beech 2000 Airplanes [Docket No. 99–CE–17–AD; Amendment 39–11160; AD 99–10–06] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 10, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2277. A letter from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives: Boeing Model 767 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 97–NM–53–AD; Amendment 39–11161; AD 99–10–08] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 10, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2278. A letter from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747–100, 747–200, and 747–SP Series Airplanes [Docket No. 97–NM–100–AD; Amendment 39–11162; AD 99–10–09] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 10, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2279. A letter from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747–200, –300, and –400 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 98–NM–286–AD; Amendment 39–11163; AD 99–10–10] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 10, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2280. A letter from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Model AS332L2 [Docket No. 99–SW–09–AD; Amendment 39–11168; AD 99–10–15] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 10, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2281. A letter from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Pilatus Aircraft Ltd. Models PC–12 and PC–12/45 Airplanes [Docket No. 99–CE–03–AD; Amendment 39–11081; AD 99–06–17] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 10, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2282. A letter from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment of Class E Airspace; Thomson, GA [Airspace Docket No. 99–ASO–4] received May 17, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2283. A letter from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Empresa Brasileira de Aeronautica S.A. (EMBRAER) Model EMB–145 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99–NM–104–AD; Amendment 39–11172; AD 99–11–01] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 17, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2284. A letter from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier Model CL–600–2B19 (Regional Jet Series 100) and CL–600–2B16 (CL–601–3R and CL–604) Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99–NM–99–AD; Amendment 39–11170; AD 99–09–52] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 17, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2285. A letter from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney R–1340 Series Reciprocating Engines [Docket No. 97–ANE–58–AD; Amendment 39–11173; AD 99–11–02] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 17, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2286. A letter from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Mitsubishi Model YS–11 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 97–NM–92–AD; Amendment 39–11169; AD 99–10–16] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 17, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2287. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Tax Relief for Those Affected by Operation Allied Force [Notice 99–30] received May 19, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2288. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Section 467 Rental Agreements; Treatment of Rent and Interest Under Certain Agreements for the Lease of Tangible Property [TD 8820] (RIN: 1545–AU11) received May 19, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2289. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Public Disclosure of Material Relating to Tax-Exempt Organizations [TD 8818] (RIN: 1545–AV13) received April 9, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2290. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Low-Income Housing Credit [Revenue Ruling 99–18] received April 9, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2291. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Closing agreements [Rev. Proc. 99–27] received May 19, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2292. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Low-Income Housing Credit [Revenue Ruling 99–18] received April 16, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GOODLING: Committee on Education and the Workforce. H.R. 905. A bill to provide funding for the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, to reauthorize the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 106–152). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BLILEY: Committee on Commerce. H.R. 1378. A bill to authorize appropriations for carrying out pipeline safety activities under chapter 601 of title 49, United States Code; with an amendment (Rept. 106–153, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. COMBEST: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 17. A bill to amend the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 to require the President to report to Congress on any selective embargo on agricultural commodities, to provide a termination date for the embargo, to provide greater assurance for contract sanctity, and for other purposes (Rept. 106–154, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule X, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure discharged from further consideration of H.R. 45.

REPORTED BILL SEQUENTIALLY REFERRED

Under clause 5 of the rule X, bills and reports were delivered to the Clerk for printing, and bills referred as follows:

Mr. BLILEY: Committee on Commerce. H.R. 45. A bill to amend the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982, with an amendment; referred to the Committee on the Budget for a period ending not later than June 2, 1999, for consideration of such provisions of the bill and amendment as fall within the jurisdiction of that committee pursuant to clause 1(e), rule X (Rept. 106–155, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule X the following action was taken by the Speaker.

H.R. 17. Referral to the Committee on International Relations extended for a period ending not later than June 11, 1999.

H.R. 45. Referral to the Committee on Resources extended for a period ending not later than June 2, 1999.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. CALVERT:

H.R. 1880. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to require candidates for election for the House of Representatives or the Senate to raise at least 50 percent of their contributions from individuals residing in the district or State involved, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas (for herself and Mr. REYES):

H.R. 1881. A bill to modify the rate of basic pay and the classification of positions for certain United States Border Patrol agents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TALENT (for himself, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, and Mr. EWING):

H.R. 1882. A bill to amend provisions of law enacted by the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996 to ensure full analysis of potential impacts on small entities of rules proposed by certain agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Small Business, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GILMAN (for himself, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. BERMAN):

H.R. 1883. A bill to provide for the application of measures to foreign persons who transfer to Iran certain goods, services, or technology, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations, and in addition to the Committee on Science, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FORD (for himself, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. UNDERWOOD, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi):

H.R. 1884. A bill to provide for the disclosure of the readiness of certain Federal and non-Federal computer systems for the year 2000 computer problem; to the Committee on Science.

By Mr. BERRY (for himself, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia):

H.R. 1885. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide for facilitating the importation into the United States of certain drugs that have been approved by the Food and Drug Administration; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. CANADY of Florida (for himself, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. GARY MILLER of California, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. BOYD, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HERGER, Mr. GOODE, Mr. SANFORD, and Mr. PAUL):

H.R. 1886. A bill to amend the Migrant and Seasonal Agricultural Worker Protection Act to clarify the application of such Act; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GALLEGLY (for himself, Mr. SHAYS, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. BROWN of California, and Mr. LIPINSKI):

H.R. 1887. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to punish the depiction of animal cruelty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODLING:

H.R. 1888. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide a mandatory minimum prison sentence for certain wiretapping or electronic surveillance offenses by Federal officers or employees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1889. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to impose stiffer penalties on persons convicted of lesser drug offenses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINCHEY (for himself, Mr. FILNER, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. FROST, Ms. PELOSI, and Ms. KILPATRICK):

H.R. 1890. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage of qualified acupuncturist services under part B of the Medicare Program, and to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for coverage of such services under the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HULSHOF (for himself, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. HERGER, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. WELLER, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. TALENT, Mr. KOLBE, and Mr. FORBES):

H.R. 1891. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a partial exclusion from gross income for dividends and interest received by individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JEFFERSON (for himself, Mr. BAKER, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. JOHN, Mr. COOKSEY, and Mrs. MEEK of Florida):

H.R. 1892. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide assistance to homeowners and small businesses to repair Formosan termite damage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANTOS (for himself and Ms. ESHOO):

H.R. 1893. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide that certain individuals who would be eligible for military retired pay for nonregular service but for the fact that they did not serve on active duty during a period of conflict may be paid such retired pay if they served in the United States merchant marine during or immediately after World War II; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LEACH:

H.R. 1894. A bill to provide that a plaque be placed at the diplomatic entrance of the Department of State; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. FROST, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. WISE, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. CARSON, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. REYES, Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. WYNN, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. LEE, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. WEYGAND, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. DAVIS of Florida):

H.R. 1895. A bill to develop programs that enhance school safety for our children; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GARY MILLER of California (for himself, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. EHRLICH, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H.R. 1896. A bill to designate the Republic of Korea as a visa waiver pilot program country for one year under the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETRI:

H.R. 1897. A bill to provide for the establishment and maintenance of personal Social Security investment accounts under the Social Security system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. STABENOW:

H.R. 1898. A bill to provide for school safety, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. STARK (for himself, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. ANDREWS):

H.R. 1899. A bill to require the Secretary of Labor to issue regulations to eliminate or minimize the significant risk of needlestick injury to health care workers; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on Commerce, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. STARK (for himself and Mr. MCDERMOTT):

H.R. 1900. A bill to expand the use of competitive bidding under the Medicare Program; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TRAFICANT:

H.R. 1901. A bill to designate the United States border station located in Pharr, Texas, as the ''Kika de la Garza United States Border Station''; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. WOOLSEY (for herself, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Ms. PELOSI):

H.R. 1902. A bill to require the Secretary of Education to correct poverty data to account for cost of living differences; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BLAGOJEVICH:

H.R. 1903. A bill to regulate the sale of firearms at gun shows; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.J. Res. 55. A joint resolution to disapprove a rule relating to delivery of mail to a commercial mail receiving agency, issued by the United States Postal Service; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H. Con. Res. 110. A concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the July 20, 1999, 30th Anniversary of the first lunar landing should be a day of celebration and reflection on the Apollo-11 mission to the Moon and the accomplishments of the Apollo program throughout the 1960's and 1970's; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD (for herself, Ms. NORTON, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. PAYNE, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. FROST, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. WYNN, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. HINOJOSA):

H. Res. 184. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding Federal Government procurement access for minority-owned businesses; to the Committee on Government Reform.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 7: Mr. BACHUS.
H.R. 8: Mr. JONES of North Carolina.
H.R. 19: Mr. LEWIS of California and Ms. PRYCE of Ohio.
H.R. 25: Mr. OWENS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 49: Mr. HINCHEY.
H.R. 85: Mr. WEYGAND, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 175: Ms. CARSON, Mr. WU, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. ROEMER, and Mr. DOOLITTLE.
H.R. 323: Mr. MOAKLEY.
H.R. 325: Mr. BECERRA and Mr. LAMPSON.
H.R. 330: Mrs. CHENOWETH and Mr. RADANOVICH.
H.R. 353: Mr. CLAY, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
H.R. 363: Mr. WU.
H.R. 425: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. WEYGAND.
H.R. 443: Ms. NORTON and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
H.R. 483: Mr. JONES of North Carolina.
H.R. 486: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, and Mr. KIND.
H.R. 531: Mr. CLYBURN, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. COOK.
H.R. 534: Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin.
H.R. 555: Ms. CARSON and Mr. SCOTT.
H.R. 557: Mr. GOODE and Mr. PAUL.
H.R. 561: Mr. BERMAN.
H.R. 570: Mr. HOBSON.
H.R. 591: Mr. FORBES.
H.R. 629: Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 655: Mr. OLVER, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. DIXON, Mr. KILDEE, and Ms. STABENOW.
H.R. 697: Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. HALL of Texas, and Mr. ROYCE.
H.R. 698: Mr. FORD.
H.R. 735: Mr. FORBES.
H.R. 764: Mr. ARMEY, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. WYNN, Ms. KILPATRICK, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RUSH, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mrs. CLAYTON, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. BISHOP, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Ms. LEE,, Ms. CARSON, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. CLYBURN.
H.R. 772: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.
H.R. 789: Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 815: Mr. WAMP and Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 826: Mr. BACHUS.
H.R. 828: Mr. WISE.
H.R. 835: Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. ROTHMAN.
H.R. 838: Mr. TAUZIN.
H.R. 840: Ms. LOFGREN and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 859: Mr. WATKINS.
H.R. 864: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. WISE, Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, Mr. CRANE, Mr. HALL of Texas, Ms. CARSON, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. MCINTOSH, and Mr. KIND.
H.R. 868: Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. BONIOR, and Mr. SAWYER.
H.R. 876: Mr. SCARBOROUGH.
H.R. 896: Mrs. KELLY.
H.R. 902: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 939: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 941: Mr. QUINN, Mr. BAIRD, and Mr. HINCHEY.
H.R. 953: Mr. WEINER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BOSWELL, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. BORSKI, and Mr. WAXMAN.
H.R. 957: Mr. GEKAS, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. UDALL of Colorado.
H.R. 976: Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. RIVERS, and Mr. DUNCAN.
H.R. 984: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN and Mr. DAVIS of Florida.
H.R. 989: Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 1001: Mr. SHAW, Mr. GOODE, Mr. HILL of Montana, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
H.R. 102: Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 1044: Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. HOSTETTLER, and Mr. PHELPS.
H.R. 1070: Mr. MINGE, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 1079: Mr. THUNE, Mr. LAFALCE, and Mr. KING.
H.R. 1080: Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey.
H.R. 1082: Mr. FOLEY and Mr. KLECZKA.
H.R. 1083: Mr. JONES of North Carolina.
H.R. 1090: Mr. QUINN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. KILPATRICK, and Mr. STRICKLAND.
H.R. 1092: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 1093: Mr. VISCLOSKY and Mr. HILL of Indiana.
H.R. 1105: Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. CONDIT, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 1111: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York and Mr. EVERETT.
H.R. 1177: Mr. HOEKSTRA.
H.R. 1180: Mrs. BONO, Mr. ROTHMAN, and Mr. SOUDER.
H.R. 1182: Mr. PICKETT.
H.R. 1187: Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. DIXON.
H.R. 1193: Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Mr. MOAKLEY.
H.R. 1214: Mr. BENTSEN.
H.R. 1219: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.
H.R. 1221: Mr. MARKEY.
H.R. 1244: Mr. BACHUS and Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 1248: Mr. TALENT, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. WISE, and Mrs. THURMAN.
H.R. 1259: Mr. TOOMEY and Mr. STUMP.
H.R. 1260: Mr. KUYKENDALL.
H.R. 1276: Mr. KUCINICH.
H.R. 1278: Mr. PHELPS.
H.R. 1300: Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. FOLEY, and Mrs. EMERSON.
H.R. 1317: Mr. TRAFICANT and Mr. MORAN of Kansas.
H.R. 1323: Mr. CUMMINGS and Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.R. 1324: Mr. WOLF, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. NEY, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. COYNE, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. FILNER, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. OLVER, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, and Mr. BAIRD.
H.R. 1326: Mr. PHELPS, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. PETRI, and Mr. GONZALEZ.
H.R. 1344: Mr. POMEROY and Mr. EVANS.
H.R. 1355: Mr. CAPUANO and Mr. DAVIS of Florida.
H.R. 1358: Mr. COOK
H.R. 1360: Mr. LAFALCE and Mr. QUINN.
H.R. 1388: Ms. DELAURO, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. CAPUANO.
H.R. 1399: Ms. PELOSI, Mr. PAYNE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, and Mr. CROWLEY.
H.R. 1414: Mr. OLVER.
H.R. 1421: Mr. LUTHER and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 1429: Mr. WAXMAN.
H.R. 1432: Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. ROTHMAN.
H.R. 1456: Mr. FARR of California, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. LEACH, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. BOUCHER.
H.R. 1463: Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. WEINER, Mr. PALLONE.
H.R. 1476: Mr. BENTSEN.
H.R. 1484: Ms. CARSON and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 1485: Ms. WOOLSEY and Mr. BERMAN.
H.R. 1494: Mr. GALLEGLY.
H.R. 1507: Mr. RADANOVICH.
H.R. 1514: Mr. STRICKLAND.
H.R. 1516: Mr. PASTOR.
H.R. 1546: Ms. PRYCE of Ohio.
H.R. 1567: Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 1579: Ms. PELOSI, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FROST, and Mr. DEAL of Georgia.
H.R. 1606: Mr. HORN.
H.R. 1620: Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. SUNUNU, and Mr. TERRY.
H.R. 1621: Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. LUTHER, and Mr. KUCINICH.
H.R. 1629: Ms. WATERS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. HILL of Indiana, Mr. BONIOR, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, and Mr. HINCHEY.
H.R. 1644: Ms. ESHOO, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mrs. THURMAN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. MOLLOHAN, and Mr. PHELPS.
H.R. 1645: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 1658: Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. ENGLISH, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. GARY MILLER of California, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, and Mr. STARK.
H.R. 1671: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 1676: Mr. JEFFERSON and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 1694: Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut.
H.R. 1706: Mr. LARGENT.
H.R. 1710: Mr. ARMEY and Mr. REGULA.
H.R. 1732: Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. MOORE, and Mr. WU.
H.R. 1734: Mr. FORD.
H.R. 1736: Mr. FROST, Ms. LEE, and Ms. KAPTUR.
H.R. 1764: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 1765: Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 1776: Mr. WEYGAND, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. WELLER, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. BACHUS, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. METCALF, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. COOK, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. ADERHOLT, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. SANDLIN, and Mr. NEY.
H.R. 1777: Mr. SANDERS and Mr. RAHALL.
H.R. 1786: Mr. FROST.
H.R. 1791: Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 1824: Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. ARMEY, and Mr. DOYLE.
H.R. 1837: Mr. FOLEY, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. BERRY, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. BAKER, Mr. HILL of Montana, Mr. UPTON, and Ms. BROWN of Florida.
H.R. 1839: Mr. LOBIONDO.
H.R. 1857: Mr. MOAKLEY and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.J. Res. 7: Mr. BAKER.
H.J. Res. 33: Mr. BOSWELL.
H.J. Res. 53: Mr. BLUNT, Mr. METCALF, and Mrs. MYRICK.
H. Con. Res. 31: Mr. ENGEL.
H. Con. Res. 51: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H. Con. Res. 79: Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, Mr. TAUZIN, Mrs. ROUKEMA, and Mr. HINCHEY.
H. Con. Res. 106: Mr. CUMMINGS.
H. Con. Res. 107: Mr. ARMEY.
H. Con. Res. 109: Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. OWENS, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. MCNULTY, and Mr. RAHALL.
H. Res. 41: Ms. CARSON and Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H. Res. 60: Mr. GEJDENSON.
H. Res. 90: Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. BROWN of California, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

H. Res. 95: Mr. PACKARD.

H. Res. 144: Mr. UNDERWOOD.

H. Res. 146: Mr. LUTHER and Mr. WU.

H. Res. 178: Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. DOYLE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mr. MCNULTY.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS—ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS

The following Members added their names to the following discharge petition:

Petition 1 by Mr. TURNER on House Resolution 122: BENNIE G. THOMPSON and MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ.

Petition 2 by Mr. CAMPBELL on House Resolution 126: DAVID D. PHELPS.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY: MR. TRAFICANT

Amendment No. 1. At the end of title II (Page __, after line __), insert the following new section:

Sec. __ . TEST AND EVALUATION OF MOBILE EXPEDITIONARY ACCURATE NIGHT VISION COMPATIBLE PORTABLE AIRFIELD LIGHTING SYSTEM.

(a) TEST AND EVALUATION REQUIRED.—The Secretary of Defense shall provide for the test and evaluation by the Armed Forces of the Mobile Expeditionary Accurate Night Vision Compatible Portable Airfield Lighting System, which is known as ''MEANPALS'' and is designed to use enhanced vision technologies, such as laser guidance systems, to provide accurate runway centerline lineup cues and approach information for up to 10,000 foot runways at both improved and unimproved aircraft landing sites.

(b) ELEMENTS OF TEST AND EVALUATION.—The test and evaluation of MEANPALS shall include the following components:

(1) Use by the Army of two MEANPALS at a location that serves both fixed wing aircraft and helicopters.

(2) Use by the Marine Corps of one MEANPALS at a location that could serve Marine Corps aircraft as well as direct amphibious landing craft and ground vehicles.

(3) Use by the Air Force Reserve or the Air National Guard of three MEANPALS at three separate locations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mrs. CLAYTON introduced A bill (H.R. 1904) for the relief of Abimbola Oyebade-Balogun; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.