

Authorizes \$50 million in FY 2001, \$75 million in FY 2002, and \$100 million in FY 2003 for federal microbicide research and development.

Mr. Speaker, thanks to the leadership of Leslie Wolfe and the Center for Women Policy Studies who first brought the need for microbicides research to my attention, I introduced Women and HIV/AIDS research and prevention legislation back in 1990. Congress has confirmed the importance of microbicides research by including report language I submitted during the appropriations process calling for greater NIH attention to this research. Now that the reality of a microbicide is much closer, more resources and greater coordination of federal research is urgently needed. With vigorous attention and sustained investment, a microbicide could be available within five years.

Microbicides represent another potential weapon in the arsenal against HIV/AIDS and STds. Microbicides would be an important complement to potential HIV vaccines since they are likely to be available sooner, will be easier and cheaper to distribute, and will be effective against a range of sexually transmitted infections. They are particularly important for women, whose risk of infection is high and whose direct control over existing prevention options is low.

Microbicides will give women all over the world one more way of protecting themselves against the ravage of HIV/AIDS and other STds. I urge all of my colleagues to support the important legislation we are introducing today, and give women and their families a fighting chance against the HIV and STD epidemics. Women in this country and around the world, as well as their partners and children, desperately need and deserve more options to stop the spread of deadly infections.

#### GULF WAR ILLNESSES

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

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, America has been built by the bravery and sacrifice of patriots. Exactly 135 years ago this week, Abraham Lincoln stood on the east steps of this grand Capitol building and delivered his second inaugural address. Thousands stood in silent attention as he delivered his concluding paragraph:

With malice toward none; with charity for all; with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in; to bind up the Nation's wounds; to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow and his orphan, to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations.

Mr. Speaker, there is nothing more important our country can do than bind up the wounds of those who fight for the freedom of all Americans. We must fulfill the promises we have made to our sons and daughters who have put on the uniform of this country.

In 1991, American troops began coming down with an alarming spectrum of maladies which soon became known as Gulf War illnesses. These valiant sol-

diers offered their lives in service to America. They deserve every effort by their government to answer questions about what might have made them sick. They deserve every effort by their government to try to find treatment for their illnesses.

But what is really happening? Unfortunately, some in government have given the appearance that they will do everything in their power to block the answers to the questions and to block the search for treatments. A recent scientific, peer-reviewed study showed an overwhelmingly large number of tested veterans suffering from Gulf War illnesses are testing positive for antibodies to squalene. This study, "Antibodies to Squalene in Gulf War Syndrome," was recently published in the February 2000 issue of *Experimental and Molecular Pathology*. On January 31, I and nine of my House colleagues sent a letter requesting that the Department of Defense do an objective analysis of this study. We had great hope for that test, that this study might prove to be a breakthrough that would lead to better treatments for suffering Gulf War era veterans.

While waiting for a response to our request, I discovered that the Department of Defense was misrepresenting and attacking the article on its own Anthrax Vaccination Inoculation Program Web site, AVIP. In one section, AVIP even claimed that the conclusions derived from the test results in the study had no scientific basis. The results of a peer-reviewed study published in a scientific journal have no scientific basis? This is an outrageous statement. Our DOD is obviously stonewalling this issue. Therefore, I sent a letter to Secretary Cohen requesting that the inaccurate AVIP statements be removed. DOD needs to do this immediately.

Last week, DOD delivered the response requested by myself and nine colleagues. I had hoped that DOD would seize this opportunity to conduct a legitimate, thorough inquiry of the scientific, peer-reviewed study. Instead, we were provided irrelevant material and an anonymous half-page analysis. It is difficult to imagine that DOD would expect Congress to accept a half-page anonymously written analysis as an appropriate response to our request. The main point of our letter was completely ignored.

Mr. Speaker, we need answers and action from DOD, not a maze of smoke and mirrors. The people's representatives are asking for answers from Secretary Cohen, and all we are getting is stonewalling and bureaucratic delay tactics. How can DOD expect to regain the seriously eroded trust of its military personnel if misrepresentations posted on the official Web site are allowed to go unchallenged and congressional requests for legitimate information are stonewalled?

Mr. Speaker, Secretary Cohen must intervene to halt the misinformation campaign being waged by DOD officials

concerning issues surrounding antibodies to squalene research. He must provide Members of Congress and those suffering from Gulf War illnesses the real answer. The Department of Defense must stop this deadly game of delay and distraction.

#### ISSUES AFFECTING THE WEST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) is recognized for half the time until midnight as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the time that I have been given this evening. The gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) who is a longtime friend of mine and I intend to spend the next little while with Members talking about issues that are important to the West. As many Members know, my district is the Third Congressional District of the State of Colorado. That district geographically is larger than the State of Florida. I adjoin the fine State of Utah.

As Members know, many of the issues that we share in Utah are very similar to the issues in the State of Colorado. In fact, as we look at the map that I have here to my left, many issues of the West, whether we are talking about Wyoming, Montana, Idaho, Nevada, Arizona, New Mexico, we have many similar issues in the West.

Tonight, to begin our remarks, I thought I would talk a little about what the concept of multiple use really means. What is multiple use? Why is it critical to the West? What is the history of multiple use? We really need to turn our clocks back in time and look at the beginning of this country, when most of the populations, again referring to the map to my left, were on the East Coast.

Back then, possession really was nine-tenths of the law. In other words, you really had to go out and occupy the land. You could not just have a deed. We kind of take that for granted today. If we have a deed for property, we go down and register it at the county courthouse and we do not have to worry about going out and standing on the land in order to continue possession or sometimes even able to initiate possession.

In the frontier days, you had to do that. What our forefathers, the problem they ran into is people really did not want to leave the East. Our new country had just made some purchases. We got land like through the Louisiana Purchase, and we needed to get people out there. Just the fact that we bought the land from other countries as a young country did not mean we really were going to be able to hold on to the land. What we had to do is move people onto the land. We had to give people incentive to move from the East to go to the West.

And so to give that kind of incentive to our citizens of this young country,