

Now we have accidentally hit the Chinese embassy, and China has used this at least as an occasion to stir up their people. Russia is concerned as to whether we will be coming in there, and they have reactivated and are concerned about their nuclear defenses because they do not want us coming in if it is Chechnya.

Other nations around the world are concerned about what our international policy is. Israel is concerned, justly, that if we recognize an independent Kosovo, what does that mean for the Palestinians? Turkey is concerned about what this means for the Kurds. The settlement we are looking towards is worse than we would have had early on while there was still a possibility to put this thing back together.

Furthermore, it does not appear to be winnable. Historically, wars or efforts that have worked have been winnable or had an exit strategy. But that does not and still begs the fundamental moral question: How then do we deal with a Milosevic or a Serbian population? Or, for that matter, in Croatia, where many people were killed and moved out? The ethnic cleansing being the moved out; the killed being the genocide without a trial.

Now Sandy Berger, the National Security Adviser to our Republican conference, suggested that the goal of this administration, and he said this point-blank, was to teach the world how to live together in peace. This shows some of the divisions that we have in this country and in the world regarding, quite frankly, the perfectibility of man. Can we, in fact, especially through bombs, teach the world how to live in peace? Or even without bombs, is that a realistic goal?

In my opinion, that is more a humanitarian perfectibility of man argument and not one rooted in the Judeo-Christian beliefs that this country was founded on.

Mr. Speaker, I will extend my comments with written remarks, because I am very concerned the premises of this war are unachievable and the goals are false and, therefore, because of a kind heart, we have plunged ourselves in an unwinnable conflict that is contrary to our own moral traditions.

TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNITY SYSTEMS PRESERVATION PROGRAM

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, this last week at the Conference on Sustainable Development in Detroit, Michigan, the administration announced the winners of the Transportation and Community Systems Pres-

ervation Program. The TCSP was a little noticed title in TEA-21, which really did not get the attention and recognition it deserved.

□ 1845

There are a number of programs that spend far more than the \$13 million involved, but there are few that will have more long-term impact.

The program had its origin in the experience in my State of Oregon in the early 1990s, where citizen activists successfully petitioned the State Department of Transportation to consider an alternative to a traditional beltway that included careful land use planning, connecting the transportation links, and grouping uses in a way that might be able to achieve the transportation and congestion and air quality objectives without as much concrete. And the fact is that the alternative that they developed was more cost effective than simply building a traditional road.

This LUTRAC program, helping communities design local initiatives to maximize their infrastructure investment, has found its way into ISTEPA.

Yesterday morning, I visited with Federal, State and local officials and local business people in my community dealing with FEMA's Project Impact. And here we found that Oregon's requirement of careful land use planning with local governments actually has made a significant impact in lowering the losses to flood damage. It has resulted in saving Oregon's homeowners and businesses millions of dollars as a result of disaster mitigation.

The TCSP is designed to extend these principles beyond natural disasters to potential manmade disasters of needless loss of farmland, forests, unnecessary traffic congestion, and conflicts between residential, commercial, and industrial uses.

Recently we had a presentation from the director of our State watchdog agency, the Land Conservation and Development Commission, which was set up to enforce and regulate the land use requirements that our Oregon voters have repeatedly supported. He presented the data that I found rather compelling that, in the 20 years that we have had our system, we actually protected an increase of 4 percent more agriculture land in the Willamette Valley in Oregon.

The metropolitan Portland area, although it has increased in population 42 percent, the urbanized area has only increased 20 percent. Unlike what has happened in New York City, where the urbanized area increased eight times more rapidly than the population increase, in Chicago it was 11 times more rapidly urbanization in the population increase, Detroit 13 times.

An even more interesting comparison is we have two fast growing counties in the Portland metropolitan area, one,

Washington County, just to the west of the City of Portland, and one to the north in the State of Washington, Clark County. Both have been the fastest growing counties in their States.

Clark County, in Washington, lost 6,000 more acres of farmland than Washington County, even though in Washington County we have increased more than 40,000 more residents than Clark County. Not only that, but the per-farm income actually dropped by 10 percent in Clark County, while in Washington County, with the land use and transportation protections, farm income rose by 30 percent, farm income rising in a county that is the home of Oregon's high-tech industry.

The TCSP program is going to make a difference in localities that do not have the Oregon land use planning framework and it is going to make a huge difference in our community building on that system.

There have been over 500 applications submitted around the country. This week, in Denver, there are people studying at a conference right now how to use the program.

I strongly urge that each Member of Congress look at the applications from their district, understand how they work. These concepts of smart growth can include a number of programs that simply are not going to be funded without having the adequate support from our Congressional representatives. It will in the long run save far more tax dollars than the modest investment in planning; and, most important, it will include our citizens in helping shape impacts on their destiny.

WHITE HOUSE YOUTH VIOLENCE SUMMIT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRADY of Texas). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I have taken out this time to make some comments about the horrendous tragedy which shook this entire Nation when we saw two deranged young men go into the Columbine High School in Littleton, Colorado, and rampantly murder classmates, schoolmates of theirs.

All of us have done a great deal of thinking about this over the past few weeks. We know that the White House held a conference just yesterday, a youth violence summit, during which many thoughts and recommendations were provided. But I think it is very important that as we look at this situation, the problem of violence in our schools, that we keep this in perspective.

First, our thoughts and prayers continue to go to the families and friends of those who were victims and, of course, to the many young people who

have heard of this around the country who have gotten very, very rattled and frightened because of the prospect of this happening again.

But, again, I believe it is important for us to keep this situation in perspective. In fact, I am one who believes that the victims in this case are more representative of the young people of America today than these two deranged individuals.

There are many people who believe that American culture has gone bad. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that American culture has gone bad. It actually has gotten broadened. We have a broadened culture today.

A quarter of a century ago, this country had four television networks: ABC, CBS, NBC, and the Public Broadcasting System. We could choose books from our local library or the corner book store, and that was about it. And we all know what it is that we have today: Two hundred channels on television. We have a million websites out there. And we can go to "Amazon.com" and choose from 4.7 million CDs or books.

And so, as we approach the year 2000, we do not have a violent culture. What we have is a create-your-own culture. And it is mostly a very, very good create-your-own culture. But, obviously, with that broadened culture, at the extreme edges, it can be downright horrible.

So before condemning America, first we should consider that, as I mentioned, that the child victims in Columbine are a lot more reflective of American culture, of American youth, than their child killers.

They were terrific kids. Based on all the reports that we have gotten, they were creative, energetic, religious, and very involved in their community. Those are the kids we find in high school libraries across the country today.

We also know, based on the figures we have seen, that American kids today are more religious, they volunteer more. And I am very proud that, in just a few weeks, I am going to be presenting for about the 15th year Youth Volunteer Awards in Southern California to scores of young people in the San Gabriel Valley in California who have stepped up and volunteered in law enforcement and libraries and hospitals and a wide range of areas where community needs exist.

We find that there are today fewer out-of-wedlock births, and students are less violent today than they were a decade ago. So I think that another tragedy of Columbine is that two mentally deranged individuals can cause us to question and look past all of the extraordinarily positive work of American parents and the positive work that has taken place in our communities. It is impossible to explain or in any way justify insanity, and that is exactly what we have witnessed here.

More than anything, Mr. Speaker, we need to do a better job of identifying and helping young people who are deeply troubled. With this make-your-own culture to which I referred that is so broad, a hateful, sick person can in fact create an entire world of hate and evil for themselves. It is obvious that the answer is not for us to go back to four television networks, 10,000 books, and PAC Man. But the answer is for us to more successfully intervene in the lives of troubled youth who are spiraling into a world of violence.

It seems to me that we need to recognize, Mr. Speaker, that there are solutions, not necessarily Federal governmental solutions, but we want to do what we can here. But there are solutions. Last week I met with the sheriff of Los Angeles County who is proposing that we move ahead and do everything possible to have boot camps for those kids who are taking guns into schools. And we need to prosecute those young people who take guns into schools.

So those are just a couple of the steps. And I hope very much that we can recognize the positive things that are taking place there, as I know many of my colleagues will be presenting Youth Volunteer Awards throughout their districts in the coming weeks.

TRANSITIONING TO A NEW ECONOMY

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk a little bit about our new economy, the information-based economy, and all the transitions that have been happening during this decade and really since about the mid-1970s and into the 1980s.

It has been a dramatic change, one of the largest changes arguably in human history in terms of the direction of our country; and it has been shifted towards a new economy, based primarily on technology and information. And one of the most important challenges that we in this body will face in the years ahead is adjusting to that, is figuring out how to understand how our economy has changed and, as a consequence, how we need to change to embrace that.

One of the biggest arguments that I want to make off the start is this is not an option. The new economy is not something that we can choose to opt in or opt out of. It is a fact of life, and we need to be prepared to adjust to it. And there are some policies that we can adopt.

But, more than anything, right up front we need to increase our knowledge as policymakers, I urge all Members of Congress to do this, of the changes that have occurred in our

economy that have moved it more toward a high-tech economy, and what changes do we need to make as policymakers to address that.

I would like to lay out five broad categories today and just say that, as a member of the New Democratic Coalition on the Democratic side of the House, we are working very closely on these issues, working with leaders in the technology field, leaders in the education field to try to make the policy changes that are necessary because I think it is critical that we address those.

The biggest one, of course, is education. We need to shift our education systems from K-12 to beyond to embrace the idea of life-long learning and the importance of technology. The three R's are still absolutely necessary. But if they do not have some knowledge in there about computers as well, they are going to be left behind in the new economy, and we need to make sure that that is included.

We need to make sure that people understand that the world has changed, they are not simply going to be able to get through high school and then move into a job and never have to update their skills. They are going to have to be willing to constantly update their skills, and we in government are going to have to provide the access to the updating of those skills, whether it is Voc, higher education of any kind, retraining on the job. We need to create those incentives.

But at the beginning, at the front, before we get to that, we need to change our K-12 system to make it more aware of the needs of technology and of the need of teaching kids how to learn and how to learn for life.

Secondly, we have to invest in research and we have to give our companies in this country the incentive to make those investments.

An important issue is going to come through Congress at some point this session that would permanently extend the R&D tax credit. That will have a critical impact on our economy. Research and development is absolutely necessary to keep up with the breakthrough technologies that seem to be happening on a daily basis. We need to give our companies the incentives to make those investments.

Currently, we only offer the R&D tax credit for one year and then we play this game of roulette in the next year as to whether or not we are going to let it go on from there. Companies cannot plan in that sort of an environment. They do not know whether or not they are going to have the money to do the research over the long haul. We need to make that permanent.

Third, we need to build the technology structure. This is about broadband communication, giving people access to the Internet. The Internet has the ability to be the greatest equalizer