

of my colleagues not only the positive parts of the anthracite coal's legacy to Northeastern Pennsylvania, but also another part of the legacy that still be seen today: the need for a comprehensive reclamation of the mine-scarred land.

The federal Office of Surface Mining has estimated that the restoration of all the land and water in the anthracite region would cost more than \$2 billion, but until this year, the anthracite region has received only about \$10 million annually from the federal government to restore abandoned mine lands. At that level of funding, we will have a critical environmental problem in place for two centuries.

Let us not forget that this is fundamentally an issue of fairness. Pennsylvania anthracite coal fueled the Industrial Revolution that made America the superpower it is today. Unfortunately, the physical scars left by the Industrial Revolution of the 19th and 20th Centuries have decreased our competitiveness in the Information Age of the 21st Century. As Mr. Morgan eloquently points out, this has had the effect of forcing many of our young people to look elsewhere for opportunities.

In the same way that the federal government has made a commitment to restoring the Everglades in Florida, a similar comprehensive approach is needed to restore the anthracite region in Pennsylvania.

Restoring the anthracite region is also consistent with the growing consensus that it is better to clean up and reuse formerly polluted "brownfields" for industrial development than to wipe out more of America's disappearing "greenfields," the untouched open spaces that are so important to our quality of life.

For these reasons, joined by Congressmen SHERWOOD, HOLDEN and GEKAS, my three colleagues from Pennsylvania who represent the anthracite region, I have sponsored the Anthracite Region Redevelopment Act (H.R. 4314), to create a new bond program that would provide \$1.2 billion in 30-year tax-credit bonds to finance a comprehensive environmental cleanup of the region.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to hail from the hard-coal region of eastern Pennsylvania. As Mr. Morgan's statement illustrates well, in the richness of our cultural fabric, our work ethic and strong values, our love of country, in all these we are second to none.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JAMES H. MALONEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 27, 2000

Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I was not present during rollcall vote #551. Had I been present I would have voted "No."

Additionally, I was not present during rollcall vote #552. Had I been present I would have voted "yes."

THE GOVERNMENT PROGRAM EVALUATION COMMISSION ACT

HON. BILL ARCHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 27, 2000

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, "We know from past experience how difficult it is to curb the

momentum of expanding government activity and we know that this portends the continuation of levels of taxation higher than we all want to bear. We are trying to get this message across: we want to pause in this headlong rush toward even bigger government."—Wilbur Mills

The former statement made 32 years ago by my predecessor in the Ways and Means Committee, Chairman Wilbur Mills, continues to hold as much truth today as it ever did in 1969. Our federal surplus, and ensuing spending frenzy, have created an even greater urgency that we recognize the importance of a restrained and focused government.

Bloated federal agencies have increasingly taken more American taxpayer dollars and spent those dollars not wisely, but wastefully. Despite the good intentions of the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993, misuse of taxpayers' money climbs ahead at an alarming pace. The Results Act was intended to help Congress in its oversight obligations by requiring federal agencies to set goals and use performance measures for management and budgeting.

Now, even the budget process is careening out of control. The annual congressional budget resolution has all but been cast aside. Congress spends with abandon. Not only is the surplus at risk, the entire process is at risk. On the other side of the coin, waste, fraud, and abuse in the federal government has never been greater. Recently, the Subcommittee on Government Management, Information, and Technology found that \$65 billion has been wasted by the federal agencies of the executive branch, not to mention \$245 billion in overdue taxes owed to Washington. A recent IRS report showed an estimated \$7.8 billion in Earned Income Tax Credit claims for 1997 were erroneously paid.

It is for that reason I am reintroducing a bill put forth by my able predecessor, Chairman Wilbur Mills, which seeks to establish the Government Program Evaluation Commission. Such a Commission would be created on a bipartisan basis and composed of members from the private sector. The Commission would study and evaluate existing federal programs and activities for the purpose of determining three objectives: (1) To evaluate the effectiveness of each program or activity, relative to its costs; (2) to determine whether the program or activity should continue and at what level; and (3) to assign a relative priority level for the purpose of allocating Federal funds.

The Results Act has not met expectations partly because its task of self-analysis has effectively kept its potential low. The Government Program Evaluation Commission is unique in that it would create a truly independent commission on the outside looking in. I am introducing this bill at this late stage to highlight my concern in hopes that Congress will readdress this urgent problem in the future. A government with the most brilliant laws cannot be successful if it mismanages those laws. Chairman Mills' vision of a limited but highly effective government is a legacy I would like to impress upon my fellow Members as this Congress wraps up its business.

SUPPORT FOR THE NEW SERBIA

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 27, 2000

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, as a member and former Chairman of the Helsinki Commission, I have followed Yugoslavia's violent demise this past decade very closely, by traveling there, by meeting officials from there here in Washington, by participating in dozens of Commission hearings on various aspects of the conflict.

Throughout this period, it has been obvious that, whatever ethnic animosities might have existed beforehand, the horrific aggression against innocent populations and, yes, genocide, was instigated by Slobodan Milosevic, deliberately, in order to maintain and enhance his power in Serbia. As his nationalist agenda was belatedly but forcefully rejected by the international community under U.S. leadership, Milosevic increasingly resorted to repression at home, against the people of Serbia. There has been opposition to Milosevic for a long time, but only this month did the people, the political opposition and independent forces join together and say "enough is enough." I congratulate those brave Serbs who stood up to a regime that has lied to them, cheated them and denied them their rights for over a decade.

The changes taking place in Serbia are, however, good not only for Serbs but for all people in the region. Other problems exist, but, with Milosevic out of the way, the stage is set for long-term stability and economic recovery in southeastern Europe. It is now possible to make the progress we all want so that our troops, doing critical work there, can come home with mission accomplished. Whatever we felt about the deployment in the first place, we should all be able to agree on that.

For this reason, I support the decision of the President to provide quick support to the new Yugoslav President, Vojislav Kostunica, and his colleagues. The Conference Report on Foreign Operations Appropriations for fiscal year 2001 similarly reflects the general consensus that assistance needs to be provided to Yugoslavia quickly in order to solidify the gains being made by the Democratic Opposition of Serbia. The country is in a state of transition, and there is no question about the need to send a positive message.

Such a message, however, does not preclude a cautionary message. I believe there is a need to place some conditionality on assistance. Cooperation with the Tribunal in The Hague prosecuting war crimes, ending the support for nationalists in neighboring Bosnia and promoting the rule of law and tolerance of minorities at home are all principles we must apply to the new leaders in Belgrade, as we have applied them to leaders of other countries in the region.

I agree that we should be flexible, and the conference report reflects a good compromise on the application of conditions. That said, I would like to make the following points. First, the large amount now allocated for Serbia should not come at the expense of ongoing funding for Croatia, Macedonia, Albania, Bosnia, Bulgaria and others in the region who have worked with the international community all along, undertook major burdens themselves