not like, trying to roll back environmental regulations, term limits which they are not prepared themselves to abide by.

It is not we who have stopped them. It is the American people. And indeed what has been notable is the extent to which the Republican Party has fallen out of love with the American people. They came announcing themselves as the tribunes of the voters and increasingly what we have from my Republican colleagues is a sense that the voters are not to be trusted. We heard that, of course, most clearly during the impeachment hearings, but we hear it in other things. They are afraid that if they do not engineer a fiscally irresponsible tax cut far more than the economy calls for, the people will ask Members of Congress to vote for things.

We cannot trust those people. They want a prescription drug program for the elderly. They just lack the moral fiber to go without drugs. They are going to insist that if Congress has some money there we say to 73-year-old people who are faced with a $3,000 and $4,000 drug bill on a $25,000 income that we ought to help them. They will insist on more transportation facilities. They will insist on cleaning up some environmental sites. So that is the problem, Mr. Speaker.

The Republican Party, it is true, is not getting anywhere with its agenda. By the way, on those rare occasions where they have gotten somewhere, we have paid too high a price. If I were tempted to try and listen to their pleas and help them out, I would remember the 1997 Balanced Budget Act where they cut Medicare to pay for capital gains tax cuts and all over this country in hospitals and home health care agencies in Massachusetts where we have lost prescription drugs, people are paying the price for this.

I have been struck by the ''dear colleagues'' I get from time to time from some of my Republican colleagues who having voted for the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 have now decided that it did a terrible thing. It cut Medicare. Apparently, they were somewhere else at the time. Apparently, when the Balanced Budget Act was being formulated and voted and cutting Medicare to pay for a capital gains tax cut, they were absent. They now have returned to find that the capital gains tax cut undid some important parts of Medicare.

Now, it is true, Mr. Speaker, if they want to make another deal involving a tax cut and taking funds away from Medicare I will try to block it. The minority leader, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT) will try to block it and I am glad, but essentially the fault, dear Republicans, lies not with the minority. It lies with themselves and with the unacceptable nature of their program to the American people.

MILITARY CONCERNED ABOUT NATIONAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEARNS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on a recent Monday night I watched the O'Reilly Factor on Fox News. Lieutenant Colonel McCallum, director of the Office of Safeguards and Security for the Department of Energy, joined Bill O'Reilly to discuss Chinese espionage at our Nation's weapons laboratories. Colonel McCallum revealed very important information about the Energy Department's mismanagement of our sensitive national security information.

In fact, after listening to Colonel McCallum's firsthand accounts, I felt compelled to share his story. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor of representing four of our Nation's military bases, Camp Lejeune Marine Corps Base, Cherry Point Marine Corps Air Station, Seymour Johnson Air Force Base, and the Elizabeth City Coast Guard station, as well as 77,000 of our Nation's brave veterans.

I was home in eastern North Carolina over the July 4 recess, and a number of my constituents asked me what Congress was doing to rectify one of the country's worst breaches of national security in our history? Unfortunately, I had very little to report.

That is why I am here today, Mr. Speaker. The security of the United States is an issue with a critical impact on the citizens of this country, yet it has been swept under the rug by this current administration, and it is not surprising. President Clinton appointed Hazel O'Leary Secretary of Energy, a position she held from 1993 to 1997. The Department of Energy is in place to support our Nation's environmental quality, economic policy, energy security and national security, but when President Clinton appointed Hazel O'Leary head of the Department, she had no experience with nuclear energy or weapons technologies. Now she has been accused of directly compromising our sensitive national security information.

Mr. Speaker, Colonel McCallum served under Secretary O'Leary in the 9 years he has served as security director. During the interview, Mr. O'Reilly asked Colonel McCallum if the allegations against Ms. O'Leary were correct. He replied, and I quote, the Secretary shut down our counterintelligence program, stopped our ability to follow leads and largely opened doors to the Chinese and other adversaries who would want our secrets and our nuclear materials.

Mr. Speaker, this is a direct quote from the security director for the Department of Energy. Colonel McCallum confirmed that Mrs. O'Leary was more concerned with helping the Russians and Chinese with their economics, which is what President Clinton wanted her to do, than she was with the security of the United States of America.

Mr. O'Reilly then asked the colonel his response after witnessing these grave breaches of national security. Colonel McCallum replied, we raised the issue to the Secretary's office on a routine basis to try to get to the Secretary to allow us to protect our highest secrets, to protect our nuclear material and nuclear weapons in the appropriate way and, frankly, we were unable to get in the front door or get her staff to focus on the issue.

Mr. Speaker, that is a direct quote. This is an outrage. The director of security repeatedly contacted the Secretary's office asking her to do something to protect our sensitive nuclear technology, and she ignored him.

Colonel McCallum is not just a disgruntled employee. He served two tours in Vietnam and has a distinguished military career. So why would he risk losing his job with the Department of Energy, his livelihood, by speaking out against his employer? Because, Mr. Speaker, he is telling the truth.

After a 28-year career, Colonel McCallum has been placed on administrative leave and his job has been threatened, simply because he has tried to come forward with the facts.

Mr. Speaker, Colonel McCallum comes from a military family and has a long history of service himself. Yet he is willing to sacrifice his own job by coming forward with concerns based on his faithful dedication to this country. He is a true patriot. He can confirm that under the leadership of President Clinton's appointees, the Department of Energy has ignored the concerns of its security staff and allowed for a Communist nation to steal our nuclear secrets.

Mr. Speaker, Colonel McCallum is right. America must help the administration wake up to the reality that we need to make real and effective changes now to tighten security at our Nation's weapons laboratory. The security of our Nation and the security of every citizen in America may depend on that.

□ 1300

CURRENT ISSUES AFFECTING GUAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEARNS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor of representing Guam, which is the most distant U.S. area that is still represented in this body and is on the other side of the International Dateline. This means that Guam will be the first location in America that will witness the effects of the so-called Y2K bug.

Guam is 15 hours ahead of the East Cost on the Continental United States.

Thus on January 1, 2000 Guam time, the entire Nation will know far in advance of the beginning of their New Year's celebrations here on the East Coast what the devastating effects of Y2K will be.

The administration, via the Office of Insular Affairs at the Department of Interior, has just announced that the territories will receive $22 million in new Federal funding to help repair the local governmental computer systems and make them Y2K compliant.

However, Mr. Speaker, I have learned from very reliable sources that the breakdown of this necessary emergency funding will represent the greatest inequity in Federal territorial relations that Guam has experienced since 1898 when Guam became a U.S. possession. The administration, with no explanation, nor just cause, has deemed that out of a possible $22 million in assistance divided for four territories, Guam will receive a mere $60,000, and Guam will be the first one to experience the Y2K problem.

This amount is unconscionable, and this level of funding is proportionately ridiculous in terms of Guam's real Y2K problems which are estimated to be around $26 million to repair.

Somewhere along the road between the Office of Insular Affairs and the Government of Guam, there seems to have been a breakdown in cooperation. The USDA made an assessment of the Government of Guam's Y2K readiness earlier this year, along with other territories. Supposedly, their efforts were met with some resistance by local officials and agency heads. I do not know if any of this is accurate; but at this stage, casting blame will not solve the problem.

The fact remains that, if the rumors of uncooperativeness are true, and I am not sure that they are, the $60,000 apportionment out of $22 million is tantamount to a punitive action.

It is my understanding and certainly my hope that OMB and OIA will be meeting very soon to discuss redressing this gross inequity or to supplement the total pool of funds. I will make every effort to impress upon the administration that they need to make realistic and equitable allocations for Guam and the other territories.

To that end, I will be contacting the House Committee on Appropriations' chairman and ranking member to express my deep concern over the proposed Y2K funding allocation. I hope and I trust that the realignment of this funding proposal can be met.

The other item I would like to address is the INS reimbursement for the Government of Guam. Earlier this year, and in fact going back to last year, there has been a steady stream of illegal immigrants making a nearly 2,000 mile journey over the open ocean from the People's Republic of China to Guam.

As a result of this, there has been over 500 illegal Chinese immigrants that have been captured in Guam and have been detained in Guam. Governor Carl Gutierrez intervened to prevent that action, the INS from releasing these people into the general community.

Now, the government of Guam has been housing these illegal immigrants since January at a local corrections facility. This is a Federal responsibility. The Clinton administration thankfully has committed to reimbursing the Government of Guam for all costs incurred in relation to detaining and capturing the Chinese illegal immigrants.

Last June, the Governor of Guam estimated that the cost to date had tallied some $4.4 million.

I understand that the administration will be offering an amendment to the Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary bill which will make good on this commitment.

I am grateful for that opportunity, and I urge all the Members of this body as well as Members of the other body to support that and to continue to work towards the equitable distribution of funding for our insular areas.

CONGRESSIONAL AUTHORITY IS SLIPPING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. METCALF) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, before coming to Congress, I taught history for 30 years in my home State of Washington. But it should not take a historian, a lawyer, or even a politician to realize that Congress has ceded a measure of fundamental constitutional authority to the executive.

In fact, it is the hundreds of phone calls and letters from Americans in my district and around the country that brings me to the floor today. These citizens are concerned, and I am concerned, that Congress has subjected the people to laws it never made because we have allowed our legislative responsibilities to be usurped by the executive department.

In the past, Presidents worked with Congress to pass legislation. Indeed, that is what the Founders intended. Nevertheless, Congress, over the years, has allowed Presidents, both Democratic and Republican, to issue executive orders and proclamations that push far beyond the prescribed executive authority. Presidents have used these administrative actions to enact their agenda without the consent of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, we have tolerated this type of executive orders and proclamations for too long. I am deeply concerned about what I perceive to be a culture of deference in the Congress, deference to the executive. Congressional authority is slipping.

In fact, this President has issued more than 297 executive orders since taking office. Some of these infringe on the powers and duties reserved exclusively for Congress as dictated by the U.S. Constitution. In fact, one was so egregious that it had to be rescinded last year. That was executive order 13803 on federalism, which imposed new guidelines and granted the President unlimited policy making authority. Furthermore, it expanded the burden of big government on American citizens.

Last August, due to its blatant regard for congressional authority and disregard for the 9th and 10th Amendments, the White House finally succumbed to intense pressure and suspended or withdrew the federalism executive order.

The American Heritage Rivers Initiative, Executive Order 13061, is another example of our current President's attempted usurpation of the legislative powers of Congress. The Rivers Initiative was born when the President decided, without studies or public hearings, that he could take governing authority away from States and local governments.

The Constitution requires Congress to first approve all revenue spending. However, Clinton's executive order would require States to give up certain rivers to Federal control. It is a threat to citizens' private property rights. Even more disturbing, the Rivers Initiative also would have given the President the power to reprogram government funds and spend taxpayers' money for projects without a vote of Congress.

The President's use of executive orders and proclamations is reckless. Some fear the President may try to use these presidential directives in the future to further his international agenda in U.N. treaties or to increase his authority under the so-called emergency powers to spend more taxpayer dollars.

Executive orders and proclamations are a legitimate source of law only when they draw upon the constitutional powers of the President or when Congress expressly delegates such authority.

I urge every Member to join with me, and the 72 of our colleagues, and cosponsor House Concurrent Resolution 30. My resolution institutes a check within the Congress. It is a signal that executive infringements on legislative power will prompt Congress to protect its constitutional prerogatives.

Those of us in Congress have taken an oath to uphold the Constitution and to protect the balance it established. To fulfill our oath of office, I urge each Member to support this resolution. We must protect our constituents from the abuses of unchecked executive power.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.