Now, on top of this rocket here, up there, was this probe called the Lunar Prospector, which is shown on this other visual that I have here. And the Prospector's mission was to map the surface of the Moon's crust and to search for conclusive evidence of water, or hydrogen. Water is made up of two parts hydrogen, one part oxygen. And the mission here was to look for that evidence of hydrogen on the surface of the Moon, which would be a sign that water is in the crust in a frozen form.

This was done through Prospector's neutron spectrometer, which can sense the hydrogen down to a depth of half a meter, and it measures the emanations of neutrons from the surface, which are considered by scientists to be the signature, the indicator that ice exists within the frozen soil on the poles of the Moon.

Well, lo and behold, what was discovered was very strong evidence. It is suspected that water exists on the lunar poles, possibly as much as one million tons of water, which is 30 billion gallons. It is enough water to equal a lake approximately 4 miles long, 4 miles wide, and one meter deep.

How did they get there? Well, nobody really knows. It may have been deposited there by comets. Now, what is the significance of this? Well, the significance of this is huge. Number one, it means that if we were to try to establish a colony on the Moon, that water would not have to be brought to the Moon. So we would have a ready source of water there for humans should they ever colonize the Moon to form, say, an observatory to study the universe on the surface of the Moon, the people would have access to water.

Importantly, though, they would also have access to oxygen. Because we can use the sun's solar rays to generate electricity to split water to form oxygen and hydrogen. Water, again, is H2O, two parts hydrogen, one part oxygen. So we could generate the oxygen needed for the people to breathe and we could create an atmosphere.

Another very important thing is we can take that oxygen and hydrogen and use it as rocket fuel. Indeed, hydrogen and oxygen is the primary fuel used on our Nation's Space Shuttle when it rockets off into space. So this is a tremendous breakthrough. And I applaud the team at Ames Research Center and Allen Bender and all of the researchers who were involved, especially the people at Spaceport Florida, in getting this probe into orbit.

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

(Mr. ALLEN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

HOME HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about an issue that I am very concerned about today and that affects the quality of health care throughout this great Nation.

A few years ago, back in about 1989, I was involved in an automobile collision in which two, my car and another car, collided. The other car crossed the center line, and we had a horrendous crash. And I ended up serving about 4 weeks, receiving acute care in my hometown of Bay City, Michigan.

After I was released from the hospital, I had the privilege of being able to be a recipient of home health care. During that time, I was in a wheelchair and also on crutches for about 12 weeks.

So I got a massive dose, I guess, of education in terms of what the patients of this country go through in terms of receiving that quality health care in an acute facility, but then also having the opportunity to be released from that facility to recuperate further in a home environment.

Mr. Speaker, anyone who has ever had the need for extended medical care, as I have, knows that the ability to recuperate in one's own home provides a reassurance that cannot be provided in any other medical facility.

The people in our Nation that provide home health care provide a vital and cost-effective form of health care and medical treatments. Certainly when we have this quality care, we need to do all that we can to preserve our current home health care system.

That home health care system is, in fact, threatened by part of the recent balanced budget agreement that we voted on here in this House. As part of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997, we required that home health care providers obtain surety bonds in order to be a Medicare or Medicaid-eligible provider. The intent was to be sure that we could guard against fraud in the program, and no one would certainly disagree with that very worthy goal.

However, obtaining bonds can work a financial hardship on providers who are faced with extremely tight cash flows, especially since the Health Care Financing Administration wants to treat the cost of obtaining a bond as a nonreimbursable expense.

Fortunately, there is an alternative available. There is a long-standing provision of the U.S. Code which allows for government obligations like savings bonds and Treasury bills to be used as a substitute for surety bonds when surety bonds are required.

HCFA, to its credit, has recognized this option, and just this week met with officials of the Treasury Department to determine if government obligations could substitute for surety bonds in this instance.

I am happy to report to our colleagues that officials of both the Treasury Department and HCFA have advised my office that this substitution should be an option in the case of Medicare providers, and that they are hopeful in making it applicable in the case of Medicaid providers as well.

There are some details that need to be resolved by HCFA's counsel prior to a final decision being made, but I am hopeful that, in the end, we will be able to achieve meaningful assurance for our Medicare and Medicaid programs, not unfairly limit people's choices of care providers, and minimize any cost consequences to care providers.

I am hopeful that in HCFA's final determination that the agency will accept the face value of the government obligation as the par value, and not require an absolute current dollar-to-dollar match. The obligations, in my view, are sufficient to protect the government's interest and the integrity of the program.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of our colleagues and home health care providers across the country to join me in urging HCFA to, as soon as possible, approve the use of government obligations in lieu of surety bonds, using the face balance as par value in this very important program.

ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I am joined tonight by my colleague and friend the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN). Both of us are members of the Armenia Caucus in the House of Representatives and also the India Caucus.

We have been active in dealing with some of the issues that would bring Armenia and the United States closer together as well as India and the United States.

There are a number of issues that we wanted to discuss this afternoon. I wanted to start out by talking about a recent development related to the Turkish Government, and what I consider a serious threat to academic integrity at two great American universities.

Negotiations are now under way between the Republic of Turkey and the University of California at Berkeley to establish a Turkish studies program at that university. In addition, Portland State University in Oregon has signed a contract with the government of Turkey to establish a similar program, although Portland State is currently reviewing the conditions of the grant.

These efforts, I want to stress, are part of a pattern that set up Turkish studies programs at great American universities, all funded with strings attached, I should stress, by the government of Turkey.

A similar study program was, in fact, set up at Princeton University in my

home State of New Jersey and at other schools, all with endowments from the Turkish Government.

Last year, yet another effort by the Turkish Government to set up a program at a major American university, I think it was the alma mater of the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN), the University of California, Los Angeles, UCLA, was rejected by the school's history faculty. I know that the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) played a major role in that, and I also spoke out against UCLA setting up this type of chair or program with the funding from the Turkish Government.

I just wanted to say that I believe that everyone associated with UCLA should be proud of the stand taken by that university. UCLA is not only a university with a grade academic reputation, it is also a school that receives public funds giving it an added responsibility to the community for maintaining standards of academic excellence and integrity. I hope that Berkeley and Portland State will also take this factor into consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am indeed an alumnus of UCLA. I was proud when we won the NCAA championship in basketball again and again and again. I was proud when we won the Rose Bowl, and proud when we beat our crosstown rivals, a school whose name I have forgotten. I have been proud to be a Bruin my entire adult life.

I am always aware of the fact that my alma mater needs funds, as every school does. $1.2 million and more was offered to UCLA by the Turkish Government which attached some strings to, in effect, require that whoever sat in that chair would be in favor of the Turkish interpretation of history and of the positions of the Turkish Government.

□ 1515

While I was proud of UCLA so many other times, I was never prouder than when the UCLA history faculty and the UCLA academic community said academic integrity is not for sale in Westwood. I hope that other universities will say the same thing.

The Turkish Government should, as this Congress has called upon it to do, admit the genocide that occurred in the beginning decades of this century and other atrocities.

The United States is the greatest country in the world. Our greatness relies in part on our honesty. Imagine the United States funding academic chairs to say, Native Americans just voluntarily deeded all their lands. Imagine the United States trying to put out propaganda saying slavery never existed. America's greatness is based on truth. The Turkish state should realize the same thing. The Turkish Government should simply recognize the genocide and the massacres at Smryna.

Instead, they are using dollars all around the United States, as the gentleman points out, to undermine academic integrity here in the United States, to go to cash-strapped universities and say, ''Here's half a million dollars, here's a million dollars. You can use it for your history department. You can teach an important part of the history of the world. Just make sure you teach it from a particular angle.''

I hope that Portland State University and the great University of California at Berkeley will follow the lead of UCLA and say, ''Academic integrity is not for sale.''

Mr. PALLONE. I just want to follow up on what my colleague from California said.

As the gentleman said, there are countries that have contributed funds to American universities for various history, language and cultural programs, and in many cases these programs have a high academic repute. The difference between these programs and what Turkey is trying to accomplish and has already accomplished because unlike UCLA, Princeton University in my State accepted these funds, and that is that the Turkish studies program stipulate that their money goes to hire only scholars with close and cordial relations with academic circles in Turkey and those with access to that country's libraries and historical archives.

The programs are not intended to encourage objective research into Turkish history, but rather to further the Turkish Government's goal of using a selective interpretation of history to advance official government propaganda. To that end, Turkey restricts access to its historical archives to those supportive of the official version of Ottoman and Turkish history.

The gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) talked about the Armenian genocide, this terrible crime against humanity, the first example of genocide in the 20th century. Surely, Mr. Speaker, this historic tragedy should figure in any account of Ottoman and Turkish history. Yet that is not the intent.

The Turkish Government is not interested in presenting an accurate, complete or truthful overview of Turkish history, but rather uses cash payments to major universities as a way of manipulating the teaching of the history of the genocide. The consequences are severe, including the denial or whitewashing of historically verified genocide of the Armenian people, as well as other dark chapters in Turkish history, such as the ongoing oppression of the Turkish people, the massacres at Smyrna in the early part of this century and the invasion and occupation of Cyprus.

This is basically a continued suppression of democracy and free speech. That is why the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) and I are so much opposed to what the Turkish Government is trying to do when they donate and they give this money to major universities such as Princeton, UCLA and now Berkeley and Portland State.

I wanted to just say briefly, we had a very interesting Armenian Caucus reception a few weeks ago where we had Peter Balakian, a native of my State of New Jersey and a renowned poet and professor at Colgate University and the descendant of genocide survivors. Mr. Balakian consistently cautioned against the efforts of the Turkish Government to put its spin on Turkish history in major American universities.

I just wanted to take note where he said that the proposed chair, we are talking now about, I think at the time it was either UCLA or Berkeley, would be generated by a country with one of the worst and most violent and most repressive regimes in human rights on this planet.

And so this issue is not just about Turkey, but about academic freedom and academic integrity. So it really goes beyond the issue of even what Turkey is trying to do, but just the issue of academic freedom and integrity at these universities. If the Turkish chair were proposed at a university that included as part of its curriculum the work of scholars like Peter Balakian and others who documented the Armenian genocide, then I think they would have a credible academic program that we would support. But the effort by a foreign government in this way, to buy its way into our universities to rewrite history, should not be tolerated.

I know both the Armenian-American and the Greek-American communities have led the fight against this ongoing campaign. What is happening now at Berkeley and Portland State is just another manifestation. I just hope that these two universities will follow the example of UCLA and reject this effort by Turkey to buy its way into our country's higher learning institutions.

Mr. SHERMAN. I should point out that the Turkish studies proposal at the University of California at Berkeley has an element in it that goes even beyond the undermining of academic freedom. That would have been the case if UCLA had accepted the offer, which I am so proud that they chose not to accept.

The University of California at Berkeley, has proposed to establish an advisory committee which would control how the funds will be spent, the selection of visiting faculty and the establishment of an endowed chair. That advisory committee will have on it an official of the Turkish Government. This is an odd provision to have in a committee given authority over what is taught and how it is taught and who teaches at a great American university.

Mr. PALLONE. I was looking at what the gentleman said about this advisory committee and its makeup. They are actually in charge of providing advice on the disposition of the proceeds of the endowment, the choice of teaching

personnel, visiting faculty, the planning of lectures and cultural events, fund-raising. They basically are going to have input into the whole process.

Mr. SHERMAN. I think it is unprecedented and particularly unprecedented to give that kind of power to a country and a government which, unfortunately, is bent on a process of genocide denial.

My own background is that I am a Jewish American. We have said time and again, ''Never forget, never again,'' when it comes to the Holocaust that destroyed over a third of the Jewish people in the world.

It has been recognized by scholars of genocide that the last step in a genocide is genocide denial. First is the actual murder and then the cover-up. Because what that does is it does not only kill as the genocide kills, but it kills the memory of those who perpetrated the crime and those who were victims of it.

We must prevent this last step of the Armenian genocide. We must say, as to that genocide and as to all genocides, never forget, and never again.

Another concern we should have is that genocide denial is not only the last step in the last genocide, it is the first step of the next genocide. That genocide may not be against the same victims, that genocide may be not committed by the same perpetrators, but when genocide is denied in one place in the world, it sets the stage for genocide to be committed somewhere else in the world.

We have all heard the words of Adolf Hitler when he explained to his minions his plan for the destruction of the Jewish people and why he thought they would get away with it. He said, ''Who remembers the Armenians?'' Well, over some 70 years later, here in the House of Representatives; we do remember those who were victims of the Armenian genocide, and we will never forget. And we should never countenance the academic integrity of our great universities being used to try to wash away the blood. That blood should be acknowledged, it should be apologized for, and we should look forward to the day when some new Turkish Government takes a new tack, a tack of recognizing the mistakes of the past, rather than using funds to try to erase them.

Mr. PALLONE. I was listening to what my colleague from California said.

One of the things that Peter Balakian mentioned to me, and I think that he is actually going to be writing a book on this subject, is that at the time when the Armenian genocide was taking place in the early part of this century, there was a tremendous amount of documentation; it was written up rather frequently in just normal daily newspapers in the United States and throughout Western Europe. It was a major topic. People were concerned about it. Help was sent over to the survivors.

Efforts were made on a diplomatic level by the United States and other Western countries to prevent it. And all of a sudden, by the time, I guess, sometime in the mid-1920s when it was over, all that disappeared. In other words, the emphasis that existed at the time, the public concern and fury just simply died out. At that point and ever since then, either the Ottoman and then finally the Turkish Government began this process of trying to deny that it ever occurred.

One of the things that he said that he was going to do was to bring out some of those old accounts at the time. I was surprised to hear that, because I figured that there was not a great deal of attention devoted to it at the time, but in fact the opposite was true.

It is kind of scary to think that something that was so much the focus of attention at the time it occurred, in a matter of 10 or 20 or 30 years could sort of be buried in the fashion that it was.

As the gentleman said, what we have seen in the last few years, really in the last 5 years, is sort of a flowering of research and books and renewed interest in the genocide. I think that is all very valuable, because that is the only way we could ever get to the point where it is recognized here in the United States and other countries.

One of the things that I know you and I are very concerned about is that we still do not recognize here in our Government of the United States, we still do not have an official recognition of the genocide. That is very disturbing and something that hopefully we will be able to correct at some point in the future.

If the gentleman will allow me, I want to talk about two other issues that are of concern with regard to U.S.-Armenian relations. Both the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) and I have been very concerned about the fact that Armenia continues to be blockaded by two of its most significant neighbors, both Turkey and Azerbaijan. Of course, we are very supportive of section 907 of the Freedom Support Act, which denies any assistance to Azerbaijan until they lift the blockade of Armenia and Nagorno-Karabagh. We have also played a role in trying to get assistance to Armenia and Nagorno-Karabagh, humanitarian assistance, which is necessitated by the fact that they do continue to be blockaded, and they have difficulty receiving certain supplies and humanitarian assistance.

I just want to mention very briefly that it is very unfortunate, and I know, as a member of the Committee on International Relations, that the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) has addressed this, that this year once again our Secretary of State, Madeleine Albright, again essentially articulating the administration's policy, came before his committee and suggested very strongly once again that section 907 be repealed.

□ 1530

We are very much opposed to that. We think that it is totally inappropriate, given that the blockade continues to do anything to water down section 907. We have also been concerned that even though this House in this Congress and the President signed a bill last year that appropriated $12.5 million in humanitarian assistance to Nagorno-Karabakh, that it has not been forthcoming. I do not believe any of that money has actually gone to Nagorno-Karabakh, and the need is there.

I would ask my colleague to comment on it, that there has been some suggestion by the State Department that some of that money will be forthcoming soon, but I am still very concerned that Karabakh will not receive the full $12.5 million and that the State Department is not doing enough to make sure that that money gets there. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. Recently, before our committee, representatives of the State Department claimed that the first aid program within the borders of Nagorno-Karabakh would be established within the next few weeks. We appropriated that money for a fiscal year that began October 1, and I wish that they had acted more expeditiously. I share in my colleague's concern to ensure that the $12.5 million goes to where it is supposed to go, where we appropriated it; that is to the victims of the war who are currently within the borders of Nagorno-Karabakh.

Unfortunately, as the gentleman knows, our government chooses not to recognize the independence of Nagorno-Karabakh. We joined the foreign minister of Nagorno-Karabakh just a few days ago in recognizing the tenth anniversary of the independence of that nation, a nation that fought for its independence just as we in the United States did; a nation whose government reflects the desire for independence that the vast majority of its people share, and a government that I hope will be recognized by the United States.

I know that American oil companies are very anxious to see peace in that part of the world, to make sure that oil can be drilled for and obtained and that pipelines can be built. But the best route for those pipelines is through a peaceful Caucasus, and peace will arrive in the Caucasus when the rights of the people of Nagorno-Karabakh are recognized. I yield back to the gentleman.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, we of course are going to make a major effort over the next few months to monitor this assistance going to Karabakh and to make sure that it does get to those who need it, and also to make sure that section 907 is not repealed. Obviously, we are going to have the battle over the next few months also to make sure that over the next fiscal

year this humanitarian assistance gets to both Armenia and Nagorno-Karabakh.

I wanted to move on, if I could, to our other area of concern and that is India, because India in fact just went through a very successful election. Once again, India of course is the largest democracy in the world, and it amazes me every time they have an election that so many hundreds of millions of people are able to vote in an election and that it is essentially a fair election and that people vote and take part in a very orderly process.

One of the things that I know that the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) and I have been concerned about is that we want to make sure that India continues to rise in importance, if you will, and be a priority of American foreign policy. I think that we have seen that happen over the last few years. We have seen that the amount of trade that takes place between the United States and India continues to grow. The United States is India's largest trading partner right now, and in addition, at the presidential level, at the cabinet level, we have seen many of the cabinet members visit India to show that India continues to be more and more important as part of the United States' foreign policy, and the President, President Clinton is again committed to going to India sometime in 1998, which again shows the significance of India.

One of the things that we have been working on, though, in the same vein, we had the opportunity earlier this week on Tuesday at our India Caucus meeting to hear from Bill Richardson, who is the United States Ambassador to the U.N., one of our former colleagues here from the House of Representatives, and we discussed a number of issues that pertain to current U.S.-India relations at the United Nations. However, I just wanted to talk briefly about the topic of India's permanent membership to the U.N. Security Council.

I introduced a House Resolution, along with the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) and other Members of our India Caucus last year, that calls upon this body to express our support for India becoming a permanent member to the U.N. Security Council. Last year the president of the U.N. General Assembly, Mr. Razali Ismail, introduced a plan to expand the U.N. Security Council permanent membership, and although this plan has not moved forward, I believe that expansion of the Security Council is extremely important. It is the only organization within the U.N. that can apply economic sanctions and military force to carry out its decisions. I also believe that membership to the Security Council should better reflect developing countries, and India in particular qualifies for membership because of its size and crucial role in South Asia.

I wanted to talk about this a little more, but I would like to yield to my colleague on the same subject.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for putting together that meeting with our former colleague, Bill Richardson, who represents us so well at the United Nations.

As Mr. Richardson pointed out, it is the policy of the United States to see an expansion by five seats of the Security Council. There are issues of regionalism as to where those seats should be allocated. There is a belief that Germany and Japan, being such powerful nations and such large contributors to the United Nations, should be represented.

But aside from issues of regionalism, if India were its own region it would be larger than Sub-Saharan Africa, larger than Latin America. We are talking about a population of virtually 1 billion individuals. For a nation that size not to have a seat as a permanent member of the Security Council flies in the face of its importance. One-fifth of humanity lives in India, and at no time should that one-fifth of humanity be excluded from the Security Council.

We do not have to change our position with regard to Latin America, we do not have to change our position with regard to the other countries of Asia or the countries of Africa, but if there are going to be 5 new seats on the Security Council, it should be the position of the United States that one should be reserved for the one-fifth of humanity that lives in India. I yield back.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman.

My understanding is that the Clinton Administration, as the gentleman said, supports expansion to five seats: one for Germany, one for Japan, and then one each for Asia, Africa and Latin America. The Clinton Administration is not saying that the Asian seat should be India at this point, but we believe that it should be, and we are hoping that at some point we can get this administration and the State Department to agree that that Asian seat should belong to India.

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to say that we understand that this process of expanding the Security Council and gaining India access to one of the seats may take some time. It seems like to some extent it has been somewhat slowed down in 1998, but if it does not come up this year, it probably will come up again, and we are going to continue to make the fight that the United States should take the position that India be included as one of the permanent members; again, part of the process of stressing the importance of India not only in terms of the world but also in terms of our foreign policy, and I think that our caucus members have played a major role in trying to make that point.

So at this point I would like to yield to my colleague from California and thank him for participating with me in this Special Order where we talk about these issues relating to Armenia and India, and thank him for all of his support with the caucus.

FOREIGN POLICY AND DOMESTIC CONCERNS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS). The gentleman from California is recognized for the balance of the hour as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) for creating, founding, heading, and organizing both the Armenian Caucus and the Indian Caucus long before I got to Washington, and to thank him for the leadership that he shows in building a relationship between the United States and the first full-fledged democracy in the Caucasus, namely Armenia, and his leadership in cementing a strong relationship between the United States and the world's largest democracy, namely India.

I became aware that I would be speaking before this House just a few minutes ago, and accordingly, I have sought to put together my notes as quickly as possible. I am going to be dealing with a number of subjects, several involving foreign policy, since Mr. Pallone and I have just discussed elements of foreign policy, and then focusing on some domestic concerns.

The first foreign policy issue that I would like to focus on is the need to establish an American embassy in the eternal, indivisible capital of Israel, Jerusalem. In 1995 this House and the other House passed, and it was enacted into law, a statute, the Jerusalem Embassy Relocation Act, which calls upon the United States to establish its embassy in Jerusalem rather than in Tel Aviv.

That act states that the new embassy should be built and completed and opened by May of 1999. In a simple phrase, it says, as to the American embassy, ''next year in Jerusalem.'' Unfortunately, the State Department has not even begun the logistical work to move the American embassy to Jerusalem. Its failure to do so shows not only a lack of respect for the statutes passed by the House and the Senate, but also a missed opportunity.

We have an opportunity to show that we stand with Israel on one of the most contentious issues in the Middle East; that we recognize that since 1950 Jerusalem has been the capital of Israel; and that we recognize that since 1967 Jerusalem has been the united and indivisible capital of Israel. Instead, we continue to maintain our embassy in Tel Aviv. This is clearly a mistake.

There are several other similar mistakes committed by the State Department. For example, when an American traveling in Jerusalem gives birth, the passport of that newborn American indicates that that person, that new American baby was born in Jerusalem, which seems logical, except when one realizes that if that same baby had been born in Rome, the passport would say, place of birth, Rome, Italy. Place

of birth, Paris, France. Certainly if an American child is born in Jerusalem, the passport should indicate that the place of birth was Jerusalem, Israel.

We make a number of other mistakes. We maintain a consulate in the eastern section of the unified city of Jerusalem, but we treat that consulate as somehow independent of the American embassy to Israel. Certainly, that consulate should report to the Ambassador, just as every other consulate reports to the embassy in the relevant country.

This year, the State Department is asking our committee, the Committee on International Relations, to authorize hundreds of millions of dollars for the construction of new embassies, and in particular for a new embassy in Berlin. The poetry is not lost on this Member.

□ 1545

Here we have the State Department wanting to spend hundreds of millions of dollars, of our tax dollars, building a new edifice glorifying the union of Germany and the unification of Berlin. That is a fine thing, but not if it precedes the construction of a new embassy in Jerusalem.

That is why I hope that my colleagues will join me in the enactment of appropriate legislation to say that no American Embassy should be built in Berlin until we move the American Embassy to Jerusalem.

At the end of World War II both Berlin and Jerusalem were divided. Jerusalem was reunified in 1967, yet the American Embassy was not moved there. Berlin was reunified decades later, and yet the State Department wants to build a large, new edifice in Berlin before moving the U.S. Embassy to Jerusalem.

The best way we can ensure that we have not dishonored the victims of the Holocaust is to ensure that before a gleaming new building is built in Berlin with the American flag, symbolizing our relationship with a new and rebuilt Germany, that we build an Embassy in Jerusalem indicating our steadfast relationship with a reborn Israel.

DOMESTIC POLICY

Mr. Speaker, I have concluded my remarks on international policy, except for those dealing with international trade, which I would like to address in a few minutes. Before I do that I would like to focus a little bit on domestic policy.

First, I would like to thank President Clinton for declaring first, Ventura County, and then Los Angeles County, to be disaster areas eligible for Federal relief. The President went even further. Just 10 days ago, he visited the disaster scene and conferred with many of the disaster victims from both Los Angeles and Ventura Counties.

The President's responsiveness is something that those who suffered from the El Nino rains and floods will always remember. Now, I call upon the Army Corps of Engineers to work with officials in the City of Thousand Oaks to make sure that on an expedited basis, the sewer system of that city and its other waste treatment facilities are rehabilitated.

All we are asking is that the Army Corps of Engineers expedite its permitting process to make sure that that facility is fixed before this coming fall and winter, when we need to make sure that those facilities are operational.

I would like to address a bit the budget agreement that we crafted in this House last year, and point out that the new revenues coming in, the new so-called surplus, is beginning to fray some of the discipline we exercised last year.

I turn to many of my colleagues who, along with me, care so much about helping the poor, and point out that while we could all think of new programs to help the poor, nothing has done as much for the poor and unemployed in America than the rebound of the American economy, the foundation of which is fiscal responsibility here in Washington.

That is why I think we must continue to exercise restraint, continue to say that new programs must be paid for by cutting old programs, and make sure that we not only balance the budget, but try to begin to build up a surplus, a surplus available to protect the Social Security system.

Likewise, many friends of mine on the other side of the aisle and on both sides of the aisle are anxious to see the Federal Government do as much as possible to help business. We have many fine programs to help business, whether they be tax credits, whether they be the programs of the Small Business Administration, or the Department of Commerce. But none of those programs is as important for business expansion as maintaining fiscal discipline here in Washington.

There is the fact that while countries in Asia are suffering mightily, while Japan is in the doldrums, while unemployment is in the double digits in most countries of Europe, during all of that, America's economy is on the rebound, and thankfully, now, California's economy is on the rebound. That is due in large part to fiscal discipline here in Washington, discipline that we must, must retain.

Within the context of that fiscal discipline, last year we were able to provide money from the Land and Water Conservation Fund, some $699 million of additional funds, to acquire environmentally sensitive lands around the United States. This year there is no request for the administration to spend any additional and extraordinary amount.

Yet, as we approach the end of the millennia, it is critical that we look around this country, find the environmentally sensitive lands, prioritize them, and acquire those lands that we can afford. Nowhere is that more important than in the Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area.

My colleagues have heard me talk about the Santa Monica Mountains, to where they are beginning to call me Santa Monica Mountains. But this is a national park visited by over 30 million people every year. Over 30 million people visit the beaches and the mountains within the Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area. Over 1 in 17 Americans live within a 100-miles drive of the Santa Monica Mountains, one out of every 17 Americans.

It is important that we continue the process of saving those mountains from development, of expanding the Federal ownership, along with the State and county ownership, to look for the day that we will complete the land acquisition plan. I will be asking the Committee on Appropriations this year for $8 million to acquire some critical land in the Santa Monica mountains, lands that will expand the Backbone Trail and widen it so it is large enough not only for hikers, but that the trail is wide enough so that animal populations in one part of the park can move to another part of the park.

I am told by biologists that this is critical to maintain healthy animal populations, so that our furry friends are not forced to date their cousins, but rather, can move from one part of the park to another to establish healthy and viable animal populations.

I want to talk a little bit about the tax cuts that this House and the Congress adopted last year. One element of those tax cuts was the child tax credit, $400 per child in 1998, growing to $500 in 1999. Unfortunately, neither the IRS nor the press has done a very good job of telling parents how they can take advantage of this credit.

For most Americans, the child credit is something their accountants are saying, well, that is for next year. There is no line for it on the 1997 tax returns that Americans are completing this month and next month.

The fact is that our constituents can get the benefit of the child credit now, simply by going to their employer and filling out a new W–4 form, which will reduce their withholding, which will increase their take-home pay, and accomplish the goal of this Congress, which was not to make people wait until April 15, 1999, but to provide working families with tax credits today.

I would urge the press, I would urge the IRS, to do a better job of telling those who are eligible for the child credit and those that are eligible for the HOPE scholarship and the other tuition tax credits to go to their employer, fill out another W–4 form, and take advantage of this congressionally mandated tax relief today.

While I am focused on fiscal issues, I would like to turn the House's attention to our international trade deficit. For all too long our foreign policy seemed to be marked, and may still be marked, by the following plea, where America goes to other countries and says, we would like the honor of defending your country for free. In return

for that great honor, we would like to make trade concessions.

America needs to move forward, both on the burden-sharing fronts, so our richer allies assume a more full and fair share of the costs of defending the world from rogue States, from terrorists, et cetera, but also we must move forward to a more aggressive trade negotiation regime.

We had representatives of the State Department come before the Subcommittee on International Economic Policy and Trade of the Committee on International Relations just last week. They spoke with pride about how the United States had never been cited for a foul, had never been criticized officially by any of the referees of international trade. They said it with pride.

Earlier today I spoke with pride of the UCLA basketball team of today and of former years. Trust me, that team would not have been successful if they could proudly state that in every game they never committed a foul. If you want to win the game, you have to get in the paint, you have to throw some elbows, you may be called for a foul, you have to dive for the loose balls, you have to dive for the rebounds, jump for the rebounds as well, if they happen to be higher than you are, and that is not what our foreign policy establishment is doing. They are losing every game in the realm of international trade, and taking pride that they have never been called for a foul.

Instead, we have to focus on the one great deficit that we have not been able to cure; that is, the trade deficit. For decades, as we ran a larger and larger trade deficit, we were told by international economists, that is not the other country's fault, that is the fault of the United States Congress, because the trade deficit will always follow if you have a fiscal budget deficit.

An economist presented very clear arguments as to why a Federal deficit meant that we had to borrow from abroad. By borrowing from abroad, we increased the value of the dollar in international trade, and by doing that, we made our goods more expensive, imports cheaper, and that resulted in a trade deficit.

It was all very logical, except for one thing; we have eliminated the Federal budget deficit, for all intents and purposes, and yet, the trade deficit does not just remain, it continues to grow. The international economists and the establishment, the foreign policy establishment, has simply shelved its old arguments and continues to say, well, do not do anything about our trade deficit.

I think it is time that America must do something about its trade deficit, and it is not by adopting one-way trade agreements in which we open our doors to imports from abroad and do not insist that other countries allow American goods to be sold there.

We must insist upon transparency. We must insist that other governments do not discriminate against our goods and services underneath the table, and where that insistence is unsuccessful, we must look at goal-oriented and result-oriented trade regimes.

I would prefer a process-oriented regime, but where a country corrupts its own processes, where it has hidden tariffs and secret rules, where a Communist government controls its own economic enterprises and tells them orally and secretly not to buy American goods, then a process-oriented trade regime is not going to work. We may have to look at a result-oriented regime.

Moving from the fiscal issues, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues two bills that I have introduced, or in one case will introduce later this month, designed to protect our children. The first of these bills bans packs of cigarettes that contain just one or two or three cigarettes.

When I first saw such marketing plans, I wondered what the tobacco companies had in mind, until an expert told me, those are called kiddy packs. They sell for 25 cents, and they are sold chiefly to those who are 11 or 12 or 13 years old, young kids that do not need a whole pack of cigarettes because they are not addicted yet; young kids that could not necessarily afford a full pack of cigarettes, but for their candy bar money, they can buy just a couple to start.

□ 1600

We should insist that cigarettes are sold in packs of 20. I know the FDA is trying to accomplish this through regulations, but the legality of those regulations is subject to challenge. We can eliminate any challenge bypassing a statute in the United States Congress to say no to kiddy packs.

I want to point out that we in California achieved this same goal through a unique device. Until I was elected to Congress, I served on the State Board of Equalization, California's revenue commission. And the tobacco companies came to us and they said, we would like to start selling packages of cigarettes with only one or two cigarettes in the package; and we would like you to give us a different revenue stamp so that we do not have to pay the revenue for an entire package of cigarettes if we are only going to put one or two in the package.

It seemed like a reasonable request from an industry that pays a lot in taxes, until we analyzed what they were aiming for. They were aiming for an opportunity to sell kiddy packs, packages that are chiefly purchased by young teenagers. We at the State Board of Equalization in California said no to kiddy packs.

We said no, we will not issue a different denomination revenue stamp; and by insisting that the full tax for a package of cigarettes be paid whether the package contains 20 cigarettes or two cigarettes, we made sure that kiddy packs were not sold in California.

It is now time for Congress to act, and not act through the back door, not hope that some tax device will not be evaded, but instead, have a simple, direct, absolute ban from coast to coast against these pernicious cigarette packages.

A second bill that I would like to commend to my colleagues is the Child Protection Act. This act is designed to make national something that has worked very well in California.

Last year there were over 425,000 children who were sexually abused. It is time for the Federal Government to do all it can to empower parents to be able to protect their own children. In California, working pursuant to Megan's Law, we have established a single telephone line that people from all over the State can call. If they identify a particular adult, identify how that adult comes into contact with their children, whether it be as a babysitter or a Scout leader or whatever, and ask whether that individual has been convicted, not merely accused, not merely rumored, but convicted of a sexual predatory offense, these parents will be given that information.

There have been over 11,000 inquiries to this line that is maintained by the Justice Department of the State of California, and of those 11,000 inquiries, on over 1,000 occasions parents were advised that the individual about whom they sought information had indeed been convicted of a sexual predatory offense.

For example, there was an amusement park that noticed that an individual would show up every day by himself and would often talk to children, strike up friendships there at the amusement park, that this individual had purchased a year-long pass but he never came to the amusement park with his own children. They checked on that individual, who had purchased a year-long pass, and determined that he had been convicted of a sexual offense involving a child under age 14.

There were several other circumstances that are just as poignant. Already more than 30 of my colleagues have joined me in cosponsoring the Child Protection Act. I urge the rest of the Members of this House to do so as well.

What this act would accomplish is to take national that information line that is operating in California. First, we would work from a national database so that instead of being able to report on whether the individual had been convicted in California, we would be able to report to parents whether that individual had been convicted anywhere in the United States. In this way, we would provide better information to the parents of California.

Just as important, we would be able to provide information to parents in all 50 States and to provide the same kind of protection that has protected over 1,000 children in California, provide that same kind of protection to children from coast to coast.

Mr. Speaker, there are many more issues that I could review, but I think I am approaching the end of my time.

GLOBAL CLIMATE CHANGE

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

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, we are hearing increased rhetoric, some of it bordering on fantasy and hysteria, concerning global climate change. What is lacking and desperately needed is a full and open and robust debate. Is our climate changing?

One temperature measuring system suggests that since 1900 there has been less than 1 degree of warming. Two other systems point to a slight cooling trend. While treaty supporters assert that the science of issues of global climate change are settled, the evidence clearly and loudly says that the debate should just be beginning.

Here are some of the risks not mentioned by treaty supporters: the risk that energy suppression mandates will devastate employment in major U.S. industries; that rising fuel and electricity prices will depress the living standards of American families; that new tax and regulatory policies will handicap employers, enrich special interests and expand bureaucracy and risk the surrendering of more U.S. sovereignty to the U.N.

Now, some people think that the Kyoto Protocol is the flawed execution of a bad idea, based on the conceit that government planners can know today what will be the worst calamity facing mankind 50 or even 100 years from now. Mobilizing the nations of the world and spending vast sums to fend off one possible threat that may prove to be nonexistent or trivial compared to the age-old scourges of poverty, hunger, disease and oppression is not a prudent insurance policy.

The resources available to protect human health and safety are limited, especially in the Third World. Any policy that diverts trillions of dollars from real problems and real science to speculative and imaginary ones, or that locks mankind into politically correct and industrial policy schemes can only make societies less resilient, less able to meet the challenge of an unknown future.

Mr. Speaker, should we risk the American economy and way of life before the evidence is conclusive? Let us have the debate first. Let us not approve the many billions of dollars that the President has requested to start implementing in this year's budget. The President has not submitted a treaty to the Senate. No debate has been held in the Senate. No ratification of a treaty has taken place.

Let us tell the President, no, no, no, on funding until we have the debate first and until the evidence is conclusive. I have no doubt that if the evidence is conclusive, if we do come to that conclusion, this Congress will do whatever is necessary to resolve the problem.

But until we have that debate, until the evidence is in, until we have absolute proof, let us say no to the President to spending billions of our tax dollars, starting this year, on a treaty that has not been approved by the Senate.

REPUBLICAN AGENDA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from California (Mr. RIGGS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank our leadership for designating me as the person representing our leadership and House Republicans during this special order. The very first thing I want to do is compliment the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. PETERSON, who preceded me to the well for his very, very incisive remarks on the global warming theory, particularly when we get so much ''chicken little'' hysteria on environmental issues back here in Washington that are not always supported by very sound science. I thank him for his comments today. I join with him in his efforts.

I also wanted to take the floor to address the House during this special order because just a couple of days ago the President accused congressional Republicans, since we are the majority party and we do have a responsibility for governing the legislative branch of government and the country, to accuse us of being a do-nothing Congress, specifically with respect to his proposals.

So I would like to challenge his comments, I do not think they should go unchallenged or that we should allow them to stand without a rebuttal, and try to put things in context for my colleagues; and to, and for, frankly, our fellow Americans who might be viewing or listening to this debate.

First of all, with respect to the President's new education proposals, let me assure my colleagues that we Republicans in the Congress have our own agenda. It focuses on common-sense reform, not creating more bureaucracy back here in Washington, not funding a host of new Federal programs and regulations with your hard-earned tax dollars.

We would prefer, we Republicans would prefer to focus on parental involvement and parental choice in education. We understand that the key to improving education in America today is to empower parents to choose the education and the schooling that is most appropriate, that they deem most appropriate for their child. We understand that empowering parents through greater choice in education is the only way really to make our education system more competitive and, therefore, more accountable. It is called ''bootstrap improvement'' because empowering parents, giving parents more choice, and I favor giving parents the full range of choice among all competing institutions, public, private or parochial, that has been my position even before I was elected to Congress and certainly before last year when I assumed the chairmanship of the education subcommittee in the House.

I personally believe that empowering parents to choose the school and education that is appropriate for their child is the only way to make schools more accountable. However, that involves what we would call a paradigm shift. That involves shifting the focus in education from the providers of education, the whole education establishment, including the very powerful teachers' unions, shifting the focus from them, the providers of education, to parents, the consumers of education.

We are working hard to do that here in Washington. We are working hard to help working families and stay-at-home mothers.

With respect to the President's child care proposal, he wants to put more and more emphasis on institutionalized, that is to say ''outside the home,'' child care, especially for families where both parents work. We Republicans believe that as a matter of government policy and in terms of spending again your hard-earned tax dollars, we should not favor institutionalized day care. We should not, as a matter of policy, almost discriminate against families where one parent chooses to stay at home in order to be there for the children, in order to provide the children with the additional care and nurturing that they need during their early or all-important formative years. In fact, we think that, again with respect to child care, the President's emphasis is in the wrong place, that we ought to reverse his emphasis and put more emphasis on helping families keep more of what they earn so that both parents do not necessarily feel compelled to work outside the home in order to be able to meet the needs, the financial needs of that family.

With respect to education, we also want to drive more money down to the local level. We would prefer that at least, at least 90 cents of every Federal taxpayer dollar for education, every dollar that you send to Washington that is earmarked for Federal education purposes and programs, we would like to ensure that at least 90 cents of every dollar go back down to the local level, ideally to the classroom to pay someone who actually knows that child's name, who works with that child on a daily basis, rather than continue to use it to build more bureaucracy back here in Washington.

□ 1615

That only leads to concentrating more power, more money, more decision-making in Washington as we Federalize education and move further and