when contracts could be denied. These include complaints filed by:

The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission involving ''alleged employment discrimination.''

The National Labor Relations Board for ''an alleged unfair labor practice.''

The Labor Department ''in a matter involving alleged violations of OSHA (Occupational Safety and Health Administration)'' rules.

Because the government could deny contracts based on suspicion and allegations, rather than proven charges, critics call this the ''blacklisting regulation.''

This could drive a wedge between Gore and one industry he claims to champion—the high-tech sector.

Nancy Saucier, manager of domestic policy for the [American Electronics Association], high tech's biggest trade group, said fighting this regulation is one of the [AEA]'s ''top three'' issues this year.

The Defense Department ''is the largest purchaser in the world of high-tech products,'' Saucier said. ''If (companies suddenly) found that they're winning only 50% of the contracts that they won before, due to these arbitrary determinations, it's going to affect their bottom lines incredibly.'' The rule will probably affect companies' share prices as well, she adds.

Saucier and others worry the rule will give perverse incentives for companies to dig up dirt on their rivals. Coxson notes that consumer and environmental groups and disgruntled employees could also present complaints to agencies in order to deny companies contracts.

Former OFPP head Kelman, now a professor of public management at Harvard, said he thinks the power to bar companies for suspected violations will only be used in ''extremely egregious'' cases.

He confidently predicted that ''a contracting officer, given his lack of expertise, is going to be extremely reluctant to make a determination that's not based on a final adjudication.'' He also notes that companies can sue if they feel they've been wrongly denied a contract.

Attorney Karen Hastie Williams, head of OFPP under President Carter, strongly disagrees. The rule ''can be the camel's nose under the tent in terms of coming up with arbitrary criteria to be used (against contractors),'' she said.

A company unfairly denied a contract would have to go through costly lawsuits and still couldn't win back its bid, Williams says. These delays would end up costing companies and taxpayers.

Williams, who now represents companies that have contracts with the government, says contracting officers already have the power to review a company's legal history if it's relevant to the contract.

But this rule would open the door to punishing technical violations of complex rules, Williams says. In labor law, companies are often found guilty when they haven't followed procedures correctly. ''Often there hasn't been any harm to anybody,'' she said.

The White House and Kelman call this rule a clarification of existing law. Williams and Coxson believe ti does much more. They say the rule substantially amends procurement law and other statutes by adding a new penalty—denying contracts.

Coxson notes that in the 1970s and 1980s, lawmakers couldn't get provisions banning contracts for labor law violations through a Democratic Congress.

Prospects for getting this through a Republican Congress are even lees likely. Rep. Charlie Norwood, R-Ga., who heads a subcommittee of the House Education and Workforce Committee, strongly opposes the rule.

An aide says Norwood may try to get lawmakers to overturn the rule.

Coxson says it may be unconstitutional, because Congress hasn't delegated this power to the White House. He and other lawyers also say it could violate the Constitution's ''due process'' provisions.

Business groups also worry about a part of the rule saying that contractors must have the ''necessary workplace practices'' addressing ''worker retention.'' They say this could bar contracts to companies that lay off workers or hire striker replacements.

''Gore promised this,'' the Chamber's Johnson said. ''He can tell organized labor he went forward, and then, if it dies, he can blame the Republicans.''

TRIBUTE TO FORMER LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR BOB BULLOCK

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1999

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Former Lieutenant Governor Bob Bullock. The man I speak of today is so deeply entrenched in the political framework of Texas, that he has often been regarded as a legend in my home state.

Bob passed away on June 18th 1999, and the entire State of Texas mourns his death. But I stand before you today to salute his life. I am proud to say that Bob Bullock was a friend of mine, in both the personal and political arena. This man was renowned for having an explosive temper and striking fear into his opponents. Yes, he did have an iron fist, but a heart of gold as well. Mr. Bullock will be remembered as a man whose dedication to the state of Texas stood above all political agendas.

Bob Bullock began his career as a public servant in 1956, winning a seat in the Texas Legislature. I had the opportunity to serve with Bob when I began my service in the Texas House of Representatives in 1972, and the foresight to endorse him as a candidate for statewide Comptroller in 1974. Mr. Bullock held the office of Comptroller for 16 years, before being elected to the office of Lieutenant Governor in 1990.

He served the State of Texas as Lieutenant Governor until he chose not to seek re-election in 1998. As Comptroller and Lieutenant Governor, Bob Bullock influenced so much of the major legislation passed in Texas over the past two decades, that he has been considered a political giant. In fact, Governor George W. Bush paid tribute to Bob Bullock by calling him ''the largest Texan of our time.'' Bob Bullock has reached legendary status because his political savvy allowed him to have a hand in nearly every major piece of legislation in Texas since the 1970's. Among Mr. Bullock's greatest accomplishments as Comptroller and Lieutenant Governor, were public education reform, water conservation, and performance reviews of state programs.

Bob Bullock has had to overcome nearly as many struggles in his personal life as in his professional life. Mr. Bullock had been plagued by health problems, fighting as vigorously against illness as he had against political opposition.

He won battles against depression, and alcoholism. He survived a heart attack and heart bypass surgery. Bob was an inspiration to all, sustaining his vibrance in the political realm though in less then the best of health. Unfortunately, Bob Bullock's health problems eventually caught up with him. In his final days Bob lost the battle to lung cancer and heart disease.

Loved by some, but respected by all. He was one of the greatest legislators in the history of the State of Texas. The Lone Star will be forever indebted to this man or his vision, and his determination as a lawmaker. A longtime top aide of the former Lieutenant Governor affirmed that ''he never forgets anything'' and Texas will never forget Bob Bullock.

A GREAT MAN WHO CONTINUES TO OFFER EACH OF US INSIGHT FOR THE FUTURE

HON. JENNIFER DUNN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1999

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to notify the House of Representatives of a speech recently given by the former Speaker of the House, Newt Gingrich. In May, with the other Republican women Members of Congress I invited women from around the country to attend the second annual Republican Women Leaders Forum.

At the forum there were many speeches given, but one of the highlights was a speech given by Newt Gingrich on the morning of May 12, 1999. His speech was heard by over 1,000 women and received ten standing ovations. The speech moved me and many of my colleagues who were in attendance.

As the man who led us in capturing and holding a Republican majority in Congress for the first time since 1928, his comments continue to offer each of us insight for the future.

SPEECH OF NEWT GINGRICH, REPUBLICAN WOMEN'S LEADERSHIP FORUM, RONALD REAGAN INTERNATIONAL TRADE CENTER, WASHINGTON, DC, MAY 12, 1999

Thank you very, very much, and thank you Sue, [Myrick] and thank you Jennifer [Dunn] for inviting me and I also want to mention Mac Collins a colleague from Georgia who came by a few minutes ago. It was great to see him. This is actually the first serious policy speech I've made since stepping down as Speaker.

And I want to say, first of all, how grateful I am to be here. I had many offers, obviously, but what Jennifer Dunn has done in bringing together women leaders from all over the country is so important, and when she called me a couple of months ago, I said this was a date I would circle and be here.

And I'm honored to be here with all of you. And remember, those of you who were here last year, I revealed that—just as many of you are soccer moms. I was a ballet dad. [laughter] And so I think our concern for children our concern for how they grow up, we share a lot of that.

I also couldn't help but think as Sue was talking about the fact that the first two women to be officers of the House were under the Republicans. The Democrats had never had a woman as officer of the House. The first women to chair full committees were Republicans; the first time we had three women in the leadership was under the Republicans.

And I noticed something that has not yet been reported in Washington, but I think will, by next spring, be a serious gender-gap issue nationwide, and I just want to be clear about this as a starting point for this speech: I don't know why there is no Democratic woman who feels confident enough to run for president, but I am proud that it is the Republicans who have produced the first serious, nationwide woman candidate for president. [applause]

And maybe the Democrat women are too intimidated by the White House style of leadership, [laughter] maybe the Democratic women are too shy, maybe they are too busy waiting for Hillary to make up her mind, but I am proud that Elizabeth Dole is making a serious campaign, in a serious way, and frankly I would so much prefer her to either Gore or Bradley, that I am proud that she is out there campaigning across this country. [applause]

And for all of our friends who may watch this later on C-SPAN, I am not endorsing anybody, but I think that it is exciting for the Republican Party to have that caliber of leadership.

Let me also thank you for your help. Sue also made the point, which is exactly right, that with your help, in 1994, we ran an entirely positive campaign. We outlined a Contract With America. With the help of the National Committee, our biggest single ad was in TV Guide, it was small print, no pictures, didn't mention the Democrats or Bill Clinton. It said, ''if you hire us, this is our contract, this is what we'll do.'' When we elected a new generation, and Sue was one of the leaders, a brand new team came to Washington and much to the shock of people, we actually kept our word.

We passed welfare reform three times. Twice the president vetoed it, the third time it was very popular, we were close to the election, he announced he had invented it in Arkansas, was sorry it took so long, and took full credit and signed it.

But the fact is, for the Republicans who fought for it, today 43% fewer people are on welfare, and 43% more folks are working, and that is a key reason we have a better economy, not Bill Clinton's malarkey. [applause]

The fact is, with Jennifer Dunn, and Sue Myrick, and another presidential candidate, John Kasich, who had the sheer courage as Budget Committee Chairman to produce the first balanced budget in a generation, [applause] you are now at a point where if you don't elect another liberal congress, and you don't elect another liberal president, we will have a generation of balanced budgets for the first time in 70 years. And that has lowered interest rates, and that has been a factor in this economy, not Bill Clinton's malarkey. [applause]

And let's be clear: Bill Clinton was for a balanced budget after the 300th focus group. He fought us every step of the way until he decided he had no choice, and for him to take credit is just a sign that he is the man we know he is. [laughter] [applause]

Finally, with your help, we passed tax cuts. A pro-family five-hundred-dollar tax credit, against liberal opposition. A capital gains tax cut to create more jobs, against liberal opposition. A cut in the death tax to strengthen family ties, against liberal opposition. And that helped the economy grow, with zero help from Bill Clinton and Al Gore, except they caved in at the end and signed the bill they opposed. [applause] So let's be clear about why this economy's healthy.

But it happened because of your help. It happened because you were willing to work hard, elect a Republican Congress, stand by us and make us—not only were we the first Republican majority in 40 years in the House, we were the first Republican majority re-elected in the House since 1928. And because of your help, we were also the first Republican majority in the House elected to a third term since 1926.

Now, I made a very difficult decision three days after the election. Because I talked with my colleagues, and I reached a conclusion that I'd been trying to do two jobs. One to be a visionary, a strategist and a teacher, to tell the truth as I saw it. And the other to manage the House on a daily basis. And the two jobs weren't the same job.

One job required patience, endurance, willingness to listen, a willingness to get every day the best you could get and move on. That's the Speaker of the House. It's a tough, tough job, and my heart goes out to Denny Hastert. He's a great American, and I think as he learns the job he's going to be better and better, and you're going to be very proud by next year. And compared to Dick Gephardt, Denny Hastert is absolutely the Speaker we need, and Denny Hastert was the person I backed strongly personally, because he has the instincts to be a good legislative leader. Which means, he's not always going to look good in the press. That's not the job of a Speaker. Tim O'Neil didn't always look great in the press, but he was a very effective Speaker for the Democrats. But he will get the job done. He passed a budget this year, which I couldn't get done last year. And he'll keep getting things done, because that's the job of the Speaker.

But it meant that for two years, I have been drowning. I couldn't do what I did differently, which is to tell the truth as I understand it. It's not the ''truth;'' the ''truth'' is known by God and the rest of us seek it. But to try every day to tell where we have to go. The way we developed the Contract.

The last five months I've had a chance to be out around the country. To be beyond the beltway, to not watch the Sunday shows, to ignore all the babble that his city mistakes for dialogue. [laughter] [applause]

And, I've had a chance to really think about where we are, and where we've going. And I decided that what I want to do today, is share with you some thoughts about Littleton, and about Kosovo. I haven't talked on either one, and I probably won't do it again for a good while. But if I'm going to come here and be with you, I'm going to try to be who I've always been, which is a person who tried to described what he really believed.

Let me start by saying that the thing that most clearly hits you, when you get beyond the elite media, is that this is a great country, filled with good people, and many of them achieve amazing things.

For every child who ends up on the cover of a magazine because they killed somebody, there are literally a million children going to school, trying to understand their role in life, trying to be decent to their fellow citizens.

For every child who ends up in a way that is tragic, there are hundreds of thousands of children who are trying very hard to learn to be American citizens. To be the kind of person their family can be proud of.

And I think we need to start by placing in perspective both Littleton and Kosovo.

We are the greatest society of freedom in the history of the human race. More people pursue happiness, of more racial backgrounds, with greater religious diversity than in any country in the history of the world, and we should be proud that for most of the time, America works, despite the news media mis-coverage of this country. [applause]

And if my friends in the press think I'm tough on them, they're right. The truth is, if Thomas Edison invented the electric light bulb today, it would be reported tonight on the networks with a story which began, ''the candle making industry was threatened today.'' [laughter] [applause]

But, we are also not only a remarkable country, we are the only global superpower in the history of the human race. No other country has ever had the potential power that we have. And yet, as a great country, and a good society of decent people, we have Littleton. As the most powerful nation in the history of the world, we have Kosovo.

And every Sunday you hear all the local self-appointed experts babble on with whatever trivia they heard that week.

I want to give you my honest, personal thoughts on both those topics. Some of this may be a little controversial. And it should be.

And I want to do it in a spirit, as a history teacher, of Emile Zola, who wrote J'Accuse, ''I accuse.'' A Jewish officer in the French army had been framed, largely because of anti-Semitism. The elite culture had covered up the framing they were all going to go along with destroying him, and Emile Zola wrote a public letter saying, ''this is wrong.''

And because of the moral courage of his letter, French society talked to itself, there was a great crisis, and it changed. Captain Dreyfuss was exonerated, and the people who had framed him were punished.

So in the tradition J'Accuse, and Emile Zola, I want to say to the elite of this country, the elite news media, the liberal academic elite, the liberal political elite: I accuse you in Littleton, and I accuse you in Kosovo, of being afraid to talk about the mess you have made, and being afraid to take responsibility for the things that you have done, and instead foisting on the rest of us pathetic banalities because you don't have the courage to look at the world you have created. [applause]

Let me talk first about Littleton. A great tragedy. A tragedy that should frighten every one of us. Both for those who were killed, and for the killers. Because it means that any of us, in any school, no matter how good, could lose our children. And it means any of us, in any home, could lose our child.

And we should have a national, open discussion about ''how did we get here?'' How did this great country, filled with good people who do amazing things allow it to degenerate to a point where young boys could think such weird, perverse thoughts and then act on them. Where the innocent could die for no reason.

Let me give you my answer. One which I'm sure I'll be castigated for, and I'm sure my usual critics will write harsh columns about. But it is the truth, and it makes them very guilty and very uncomfortable, and they reflect that in their attacks.

We have had a thirty-five year experiment, in a unionized, bureaucratic, credentialed, secular assault on the core values of this country. And we should not be surprised that they eventually yield bad fruit, because they are bad seeds. They make no sense as a society.

For thirty-five years, God has been driven out of the classroom, and we have seen it result in a secular, atheistic system [applause] in which God is not allowed to exist. [applause]

For thirty-five years the political and intellectual elites of political correctness have undermined the core values of American history, so that young people may not know who George Washington is, or they may not know who Abraham Lincoln is, but they do know what MTV is, and that is not progress, that is decadence, and we should say it bluntly. [applause]

For thirty-five years, bureaucratic, credentialed unions have driven knowledge out of the classroom, so today you can have a certified teacher who can't speak a foreign

language try to teach it, while the person who can speak it can't teach it because they either don't pay the union dues or haven't gotten credentialed, and that is madness. [applause]

We keep looking at our physics scores and say ''why do they decline?'' And then you find that in the inner city we have people who don't know any physics teaching physics. And you have a student who sits there and knows their teacher doesn't know.

You can't have authority unless you earn it. And you can't have a bureaucratic, unionized, credentialed system that has any authority left, because it drives out the very skills and the very capacities that are necessary.

And most teachers are decent, and most teachers are hard working, and most teachers are trying. And I am a product of the public schools, and I actually care about them enough to try and change them, not just have a mantra of paying off the unions while doing nothing to save the schools. [applause]

Let me say his very clearly. And it will be very controversial. For a generation, Hollywood and computerized games have undermined the core values of civility and it is time they were stopped by a society that values free speech enough to protect it. [applause]

One of the great founders of CBS News, Edward R. Murrow's producer, had a wonderful saying, ''Just because you have the right to say it, doesn't mean it is the right thing to say.'' And let us say to Hollywood, and let us say to the Nintendos and the other games, if you are going to be sick, we are going to find a way to protect this country from you, and whether that means exposing movies to liability litigation, whether that means exposing computerized games to litigation, whether it means challenging the Democrats to cut off the fund-raising in a verse. Don't tell us you care about children, and then have the people corrupting their lives raise your money, while you tell us you care about traditional values. [applause]

So, if Al Gore and Bill Bradley really want to help America, they can lay a standard down. They won't raise a penny in Hollywood from anybody who doesn't sign a standard that says they will make movies of voluntary decency.

You don't have to allow the most corrupt, the most depraved, the most violent, just because you personally don't have the guts for your career to say ''I won't do it.'' And they could set a standard and say, ''we're only going to do fund-raisers with producers and stars who do decent films,'' and you would suddenly see a crisis of identity in both the Democratic party and Hollywood. [applause]

And I'm not using that just to make a partisan point, I'm trying to make a deeper point. Don't tell us the Constitution blocks us from civility. Don't tell us that freedom of speech means the freedom to be so depraved, so violent, so disgusting that our children grow up in a world where they think that killing someone else is a reasonable behavior. And it's true on television, it's true in the movies, it's true in these games.

And I would challenge the lawyers of America: Don't tell me how cleverly you can protect those who are bad, tell me how well you can find some solution to bring Hollywood to its senses and to bring the game people to their senses.

And I'm not for censorship. But I am for the society setting standards and shaming those who refuse to have a standard that makes sense. [applause]

And for two generations we have raised the taxes on working families so that the second spouse has no choice except to go to work, almost entirely to pay the family's taxes. Then we talk about ''latch-key kids,'' when it is the very liberal politicians who raised the taxes who created the latch-keys. [applause]

But about Littleton, liberal politicians and the elite media yell ''gun-control'' because they can't talk about their values, and the effect they have had.

Let me set some simple standards. When Al Gore talks God and Faith, is he for voluntary school prayer, or isn't he? Does he want to bring God back in, or does he want to give us psychobabble? Yes or no? Don't tell me why you're ''sort of for it,'' and ''Littleton is certainly a tragedy,'' and I certainly ''feel.'' We've had eight years of that.

Let's be serious. This was a mistake to take God out of the classroom. [applause] It was a mistake to take the right to pray out of the classroom. Now, are you for changing the mistake, or not changing the mistake? [applause]

But don't tell us you're really worried about the consequences, but you don't want to change the cause.

When politicians talk about families, is Bill Bradley for more tax cuts, so families have more time with their children, or is he against tax cuts? Does he want to abolish the death tax so we strengthen family bonds, or is he for the death tax, even though it clearly makes no sense as a society to punish grandparents and parents for saving for their children and grandchildren. It is the socially dumbest tax we have. [applause]

When a liberal talks about values, would he or she actually like us to teach American history? Would they actually like young children to learn that George Washington was an ethical man? A man of standards? A man who earned the right to be father of this country? Would they actually like us to learn that Lincoln agonized, or is discussing those kind of moral values culturally inappropriate? Because we have to be a multicultural society, where you get to pick and invent your own culture? Something which historically no civilization has ever successfully done because it means you've got thirteen to fifteen year olds in total confusion, and they're being asked to invent a reasonable civilization?

It takes thousands of years to create a civilization, and then we learn it, and we stand on the shoulders of the lessons of every generation that paid in blood to learn these lessons. And to ask young people of thirteen and fifteen to invent a civilization is not only ahistorical, it violates everything we know about how human beings function.

And we should say something simple: Every child should know the Declaration of Independence, and why it says, ''We hold these truths to be self-evident.'' Every child should learn the Declaration of Independence, and why it says, ''We are endowed by our Creator.''

When those children killed in Littleton, they were killing the children of God, who had been endowed with the unalienable right of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. And I will bet you those kids didn't know it, they didn't believe it, they didn't understand it, because for two generations the elite liberals in academia and in the news media have babbled on about somehow getting rid of all this western ethnocentric whatever ... it is irrelevant what your color is. It is irrelevant what geography you come from. When you come to America, you learn to be an American and that means you are endowed. [applause]

So, I ask each of you, you go back to your state. You ask your state legislatures and your governor, let's reestablish teaching the Constitution, let's reestablish teaching the Declaration of Independence, let's make sure every child knows what Creator means, and then let's see how the liberals try to go to the Supreme Court to argue that you can't talk about the Creator in class when in fact it is a historical document about a historic fact that the Founding Fathers all believed in God, including Thomas Jefferson, thank you very much, it's his language. [laughter] [applause]

And so, on Littleton, let me simply say, most children are good. Most schools are safe, but we have been given a wake up call that the experiment in secular liberalism has failed, and we had better truly change, or there will be more symptoms of the pain. And every time our friends on the left babble about gun-control, or some psycho-therapy, or some other kind of feel good stuff, we ought to come back to the basics.

Are you prepared to cut taxes on working families? Are you prepared to eliminate the death tax? Are you prepared to actually have teachers who know something as a requirement of teaching? Are you prepared to reinstate American history and learning about America? Are you prepared to talk about the Creator, and are you prepared to allow children to pray voluntarily? And if you're not for those things, you're not for the changes that are necessary to make sure that we have fewer Littletons and more children who are happy and stable. [applause]

Now, and let me say that avoiding future Littletons requires real change. This has been a mistake. For thirty-five years, we have gone in the wrong direction. This is about real change. And without real change, it won't change.

Let me now turn to foreign policy. Let me say that I have watched with some amazement. I think it is fair to say that of all the Republican leaders in the last six years, I was the most consistently supportive of the president, because I felt as an Army brat, having been overseas, having lived through experiences where politicians back home were critical and divisive, having been through the Vietnam war where some American future politicians led demonstrations in foreign countries, [laughter] having been through Desert Shield and watched every elected Democrat leader vote against Desert Storm, I know how unnecessarily divisive domestic politics can be.

I also know that as a superpower we have a unique role, and let me say, very clearly: I believe the United States must provide leadership in the world, I believe we are irreplaceable, and I oppose unalterably anyone who argues for withdrawal and isolation, because I believe it is our historic destiny and fate.

There is no other country big enough, complex enough, or capable of providing leadership on a world-wide basis, and if we pull back, this planet will become chaotic, and violent, and our children and grandchildren will pay in blood for our timidity.

Now having said that, let me also remind you, you can lead your neighborhood without fixing breakfast for all your neighbors. [laughter] You can lead a community clean-up drive without cleaning out every garage yourself.

But let me talk about Kosovo in the historic setting because, in the last few weeks the crisis has begun to mount in a way that I would have thought, in January, unthinkable.

For fifty years, we led NATO to keep Russia out of places like Yugoslavia, which was the only anti-Soviet communist state in Europe. And now, in a few short months, the Clinton-Gore administration, has fashioned a policy to bring Russia into one of the places we invented NATO to keep them out of. This is a significant mistake.

For the entire history of the human race, the Chinese have never been actively involved in Europe. And now in a few short

months, the Clinton-Gore administration has managed to fashion a policy which gives the Chinese a voice in Europe. The scapegoating in this city will be pathetic, and has to be described honestly as scapegoating.

Let me give you the example of the Chinese embassy. The Clinton-Gore administration ignores intelligence, because as good liberals, they don't believe in a strong America leading the world. They under-fund it, they reduce the number of analysts. They have too few people. They send liberals out to run the agency in such a way—this is not the current director, but the preceding director and his staff—but they undermine the morale of our most effective intelligence agency.

The first director, Jim Woolsey, got to see the president one time. In fact there was a joke that when the plane crashed into the White House, it was Woolsey trying to get in to see the president. [laughter] I did not make that up, you can ask Jim Woolsey. [laughter]

So, for six and a half years the Clinton-Gore administration under-funds intelligence, abuses it, neglects it—go ask how many people there are in the Central Intelligence Agency that speak Serbian. Having had nine years to prepare for Kosovo, beginning in 1990, how much did we beef up? Or ask them how many can speak Chinese? How big is the shortage of Chinese language experts in the American intelligence community?

So having had six and a half years of under-funding, the CIA makes a mistake. But the Commander-in-Chief is not responsible. The Commander-in-Chief is never responsible. If, in a war, the president is not accountable, then what does the Constitution mean? COMMANDER-in-Chief. [applause]

In all of this Washington babble about who is responsible, the Clinton-Gore administration had six-and-a-half years, almost seven years, to beef-up our intelligence capabilities. They didn't do it.

I forced the extra funding last fall, finally, and it is still too little, and if we are going to be the superpower that leads the entire planet we need a dramatically bigger intelligence capability.

It doesn't mean you need to overhaul the CIA. It doesn't mean you don't have to rethink our intelligence capability, but I am tired of liberals yelling ''reform'' when what they mean is ''don't fund them,'' and then blaming the people they didn't fund for the mistake that was human error.

We got it last year when the Indian nuclear explosion was not detected because we don't have enough analysts, and we don't have enough satellites to watch everything, and now we are getting it this year. The fact is that the Clinton-Gore Administration under-funds intelligence and we are now paying the price with the Chinese for the Clinton-Gore failure to provide adequate funding. [applause]

The fact is, the Clinton-Gore Administration has under-funded defense, and God help us if either the North Koreans or the Iraqis decide to take advantage of our current disposition. Does this administration honestly believe that nobody else in the world watches CNN? [laughter]

The reason you have to have, and I'm very serious, this is a matter of life and death. The reason is you have to have a military big enough to do three things: One campaign; be ready for a second campaign; and retain a training and procurement base for a third campaign.

And [RNC] Chairman [Jim] Nicholson knows this. He is a West Point graduate. He served in Vietnam. He understands these things. The reason you have to do all three simultaneously is because you are in a dangerous world.

And when you focus on Iraq, and the President did for a little while in 1997. And I was with him, because I thought he was doing the right thing? And then he forgot it. Saddam is still there, but none of the stated goals—remember all the worries, the sack of sugar, the danger of biological weapons. They didn't go away. It is just that this administration's attention span is relatively short.

So Saddam is still there. The world is getting more dangerous. He is doing every single thing that Bill Clinton and Bill Cohen told us to worry about, but we're not in that campaign right now because we can't afford to be.

The North Koreans are lying to us about nuclear weapons. We know they are lying. They know we know they are lying. The Chinese, the South Koreans, and the Japanese know they are lying. And they know we know they are lying. And the North Koreans are routinely irrational. Despite 50 years of effort we know almost nothing about North Korea because it is the most sealed off society in the world. And it is preeminently dangerous.

And then you have Kosovo. A campaign designed as though all of military history ceased to exist. As though there are no lessons of Vietnam. The very people who were opposed to Vietnam are now bringing us a European Vietnam, and they have learned nothing from the Vietnam campaign. [applause]

Compare the lessons of Desert Storm and Kosovo. In Desert Storm, President George Bush, Secretary of State Jim Baker, National Security Advisor Brent Scowcroft, Secretary of Defense Dick Cheney, and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs Colin Powell said very clearly to the theater commander Norman Schwartzkopf, ''what is it going to take to win decisively with minimum American casualties in the shortest possible time.'' And they spent six-months in a majestic, slow, careful buildup of overwhelming military force. They launched an air campaign that in six weeks pulverized the Iraqis and they launched a four-day ground campaign. It is the textbook study of a how a Democracy prepares relentlessly to impose victory with minimum American casualties.

Now I don't know what General Clark was thinking about, because he knows better. And I don't know what the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs was thinking about, because he knows better. And I don't know why none of the Joints Chiefs have resigned [applause] because this campaign is a violation of every rule I know of in how you design a campaign. Instead of Theodore Roosevelt's speak softly and carry a big stick, we've yelled and carried a toothpick.

And what has happened? The people we were protecting were driven out, killed, or raped. The people that are under the shelter of the United States of America are no longer in Kosovo. The Serbians accepted a brutal choice: we get to kill them, and they get to kill Albanians. But they've accepted it.

The Russians are now reestablished as a power in Europe. The Chinese are getting engaged in Europe. We are wasting our resources. Our prestige is diminishing. And all over the world we look like a violent, helpless, pathetic country.

Would you want to be protected by a Clinton Administration that guaranteed that protection meant you would be driven out of your home? They allowed it to happen to the Kurds in northern Iraq. They are allowing it to happen now to the Albanians in Kosovo.

And the President, of course, isn't responsible because he is in a permanent campaign, so he doesn't have to be Commander-in-Chief unless we are seeing him step off the airplane to be saluted by military people who know better. They know this is a pathetic disaster for the United States. [applause]

Finally, with the Chinese having carefully orchestrated riots because even when they try to buy an administration, they can't always get what they want. Let's be clear, the Clinton Administration's Justice Department did everything it could to block an honest investigation of the Chinese money laundering, and we know far less today about either the Chinese cash or nuclear secrets.

And by the way, I don't blame the Chinese for stealing our secrets, they are a sovereign power. They should do what's in their interest. I blame the Clinton Administration for not protecting the American secrets from China. [applause]

The Chinese staged these riots, which you know are staged, because the Chinese lock up people who get up and say ''hi, I'd like to have free speech.'' Five years in jail. [laughter] ''I'd like to go riot against the Americans.'' Can we give you a bus? [laughter] I mean, who's kidding whom; these are staged, organized government dictatorship riots.

We are a country without a defense against Chinese ballistic missiles. We could lose some of our men and women in Kosovo. We could lose a lot of people if the Iraqis or the North Koreans try to take advantage of our weakness. We could lose an American city, and there is no ballistic missile defense.

Why? Because the party of trial lawyers believes that we should have a legal document with a ''Soviet Union,'' which disappeared in 1991, rather that using the best scientists and the best engineers. And we need a crash program to apply, not just for the U.S., but a global missile defense, so that all of our allies can rest safe. And we need to adopt a very simple rule.

Let me be very clear, I'm not arguing for being in Kosovo or not. And I would actually urge most of my former colleagues to just shut up about it. Having civilian politicians give their ideas about their campaign plan is sort of irrelevant.

We ought to have a very simple set of standards as a country. If we say that we are going to do something, and if the President comes to a joint session—which this President should do, and should have done for three months, and how he can get away with not addressing the Congress and talking to the nation about Kosovo is beyond me. [applause]

We ought to have a standard rule, if you are going to commit American forces, you address a joint session. I mean this for all Presidents for our future. We've got to learn to lead and we've got to learn to do it within our Constitution.

He should come to the Congress. He should say, ''This is the problem. These are our values. These are our goals.'' He should then say a simple thing: ''I have instructed the chairmen of the Joint Chiefs to design a military campaign plan that will achieve victory for America with minimum cost in lives and minimum use of time. The chairman will be expected to execute that campaign and if it fails, he would be retired and his successor will be expected to design a successful campaign.'' No elected politician should attempt to micro-manage whether or not we move Apache helicopters. [applause]

Let me just close with this personal testimonial, for whatever it's worth. My stepfather served 27 years in the U.S. Army infantry. It was at the end of the Second World War, fought in Korea, fought in Vietnam. We lived—when I was growing up, I was born in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania. We lived in Fort Raleigh, Kansas; Avignon, France; Stuttgart, Germany; and then Fort Benning, Georgia; which is how I became a Georgian.

He served his country because he loved it. He served his country because he thought it really mattered. He thought a world in which the Soviets dominated or the Nazis dominated would be a horrible world. A world in which America led would be a remarkably better world.

Not a perfect world, because people aren't perfect. If you believe in God, you know how inadequate you are. But a world in which a decent country, of decent people, of all races and all nationalities could pursue freedom and safety, and could create prosperity like no one has ever seen. Forty years ago, he convinced me at the battlefield at Verdum, when I was fifteen, that this is all real.

For 40 years, with the help of the Georgia Federation of the Republican Woman, and the Young Republicans, and thousands of volunteers and lots of donors, and the people of Georgia, I was allowed to study, to learn. I was allowed to run for office and lose twice. I as allowed to run a third time and win. Ultimately, with your help, we created a majority.

I have not talked about any issues for five months. I have not really laid out what I feel from the heart, but I couldn't come here today in the middle of the agony that each of us must feel for the children and the families of Littleton.

I couldn't come here today, and let's be honest, in the tradition of Lincoln, we should feel as much agony for the innocent Serbs that are being killed as we feel for the Albanians. We are all humans. Our Creator endows us all.

And we have to be a great enough nation that our hearts go out to everybody in a conflict. And that we want to help everybody. We want to find a way to lead a world without violence because our moral dedication, not our purity, let me be clear to my liberal friends none of us are pure. That is not what this is about. Purity of purpose doesn't mean purity of execution, because we are humans.

This has been the greatest opportunity for simple, everyday human beings to get up in the morning, to love their families, to pursue happiness, to work for a living, to create a better future than has ever been created. And we have to save it domestically or we will have many more Littletons. And we have to learn to lead in the world or we will have many more Kosovos.

Sadly, not happily, because I tried for six years to work with this administration. Sadly, the Clinton-Gore Administration has proven both in their reaction to Littleton and in their utter total mismanagement in Kosovo, that liberalism once again has failed, and we have to be the standard barriers.

Just as we were with Eisenhower, just as we were in 1968 with Nixon, who ended the Vietnam War that Johnson started, just as we were with Ronald Reagan who created the cause of freedom worldwide and defeated the Soviet Empire, just as we were with George Bush, who had the nerve and the discipline to let the military run a winning campaign, despite every liberal Democratic elected leader in the Congress.

We have to have the nerve over the next eighteen months to tell the truth to the American people. To let the news media scream at us, and to count on the fact that, in the end, this is a great country, filed with good people, and they know better than the talking heads on Sunday morning.

Thank you, good luck and God Bless you, [applause]

INTRODUCTION OF THE SENIOR PRESCRIPTION DRUG ASSISTANCE EXPANSION DEMONSTRATION ACT

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1999

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce The Senior Prescription Drug Assistance Expansion Demonstration Act of 1999. In doing so, I am offering legislation which serves as a viable first step towards addressing the serious issue of rising prescription drug costs for our Nation's seniors.

The purpose of this legislation is to provide assistance to those states which have undertaken the step to offer supplemental assistance for low income seniors to help defray the rising cost of prescription medications.

This legislation will create a demonstration project that will provide block grant funding to permit three states with an existing prescription assistance program for low income seniors to raise their income eligibility by $5,000 for both single individuals and married couples. Should the program be successful, it can later be expanded to other states that have created such prescription assistance programs.

This legislation recognizes that the participating states have widely varying requirements with regards to the administration of their prescription-assistance plans. Consequently, it will not alter these requirements in any way, except that to qualify for the federal funds, each state must raise its income eligibility for both the single and married categories.

Mr. Speaker, the last five years have seen both a rapid increase in the amount of revolutionary drugs available on the market, as well as in the price of those drugs. The availability of these new drugs has been a wonderful result of annual advances in medical technology and knowledge. Regrettably, these advances also come with a price, one that is increasingly difficult for many senior citizens to pay.

A number of our colleagues in this House, as well as in the other body, have offered various bills designed to address the rising cost of prescription medication for senior citizens. These bills have tended to use either price controls, or the extension of free or heavily subsidized prescriptions as a new federal entitlement, as a solution to this problem.

The nation's experience with price controls during prior administrations has shown that they are not a viable tool. Moreover, while the new entitlement proposed by the current administration sounds appealing, neither the President, nor anyone in the minority has offered a viable way to pay for it. In our current budget environment, an entitlement proposal without a clear funding source is nothing more than a hollow promise.

Furthermore, price controls for prescription drugs run the very real risk of stifling future development in medical advances. While none of the major drug companies has any reason to plead poverty, the implementation of a federal system of mandatory price controls would certainly serve as a major disincentive on the future research and development of new prescription medications. In this sense, medical success does come with a price.

On the other hand, prices should not be so high that the target audience for which the drugs were developed cannot afford to purchase those drugs. Regrettably, this has increasingly been the case over the past several years for seniors living on fixed incomes.

The Federal Government has a vital role to play in fostering innovation in medicine, so that today's seniors can receive the benefits of tomorrow's new medical technology. The last few years have seen wonderful advances in drugs to treat osteoporosis, arthritis, and Alzheimer's disease.

At the same time, a new federally run bureaucracy is not the answer to address the needs of our senior citizens being able to afford these new drugs as they become available. Such a bureaucracy would take medical decisions on which drugs to prescribe away from doctors, dampen the overall level of medical research on new drugs, and force seniors to accept a one-size-fits-all federal program.

This legislation would avoid those problems. It sets out to expand on ideas that the states have shown do work in practice. The Epic program in New York is highly successful, and legislators of both parties in Albany have consistently voted to expand the program each year. However, these State officials understand that New York cannot afford on its own to cover every senior that it should.

By partnering with New York and other States with prescription assistance programs, the Federal Government will be able to both provide aid to thousands of seniors on fixed incomes with their monthly prescription drug bills, while leaving prescribing authority where it belongs, with the doctors. In essence, everyone wins.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join in supporting this worthwhile legislation, which helps needy seniors by providing the States with resources to expand programs which have already been proven to work.

A TRIBUTE TO PAUL MATHIEU AND FAMILY OF MIAMI, FLORIDA

HON. CARRIE P. MEEK

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1999

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Mr. Paul Mathieu and the Mathieu Family of Miami, Florida, for the outstanding example of faith in action and excellence which they embody in their daily lives.

Paul Mathieu is a Jackson High School graduate who will be attending Harvard University in the fall, accomplishing his parents' dream of seeing all of their children attend college. He is the ninth child of Phinelie and Teucheler Mathieu, who came to Miami from Haiti in 1974. Their incredible faith, courage, and ethos of hard work have enabled this remarkable Haitian immigrant family who fled political repression, social brutality, and physical danger in their homeland to seek, and ultimately, to find, a better future for their children in their new home. Each of their children—Techeline, Firma, Fednie, Samuel, Emmanuel, Marc, Luckson, Marthe, and Paul—has contributed significantly to the family tradition of success and of active citizenship in America.