

constituents in Massachusetts, as well as to many of my colleagues in the Northeast, where bridges are significantly older than in most other parts of the country.

In addition, there would be \$266 billion in lost time and extra fuel burnt by auto drivers stuck in traffic because of bridge work. But traffic safety is not about statistics or abstractions. The damage done by motor vehicle accidents has a very human face. For me, that face most recently in the face of Linda Russell. Linda is a nursing supervisor at the University of Massachusetts Hospital in Worcester. She was badly injured when her car collided with a tractor trailer. As a result of the collision, Ms. Russell's right foot was almost completely severed, and she will be confined to a wheelchair for the rest of her life.

She wrote me in June of 1998 urging me to ask the Department of Transportation to accelerate the issuance of a final rule requiring tractor trailer trucks to be equipped with reflective tape.

□ 1615

A number of my colleagues have asked me why I introduced House concurrent resolution 306 when there are already Federal restrictions in place. The answer is that I have worked in Washington long enough to know that the status quo is only the status quo. If one feels passionately about an issue, one needs to be proactive. The smallest changes add up incrementally.

For example, in 1974, States were given the option to increase maximum truck weights on interstate highways from 72,000 to 80,000 pounds and to permit operations of a twin 28-foot double trailer truck. Less than 10 years later in 1982, Congress forced every State to permit these bigger rigs.

Mr. Speaker, I will just end by simply saying that I want to thank my colleagues for standing with me in supporting this legislation, and I urge the next Congress to take this issue up early on next year when we reconvene.

MISSED OPPORTUNITIES

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, earlier today, during morning business, I made some comments about missed opportunities of our foreign policy and how, as we look back over these past 8 years and judge whether we are better off or worse off here in the United States of America, it is good to take a look at the foreign policy situation, because, in fact, the world is a more dangerous place, and we are, in fact, more vulnerable and more threatened as a result of 8 years of a Clinton-Gore administration.

When we look into why that is the case, what caused this to happen, we find a foreign policy that has really been characterized by photo opportunities on the one hand and lack of consistent attention on the other hand, and it has not served us as well as it might, and we have missed important opportunities at a time when the world is waiting for the world's dominant power to show clear vision and signs of leadership for the next century ahead.

As we look at some of the hallmarks, trying to go back over these past 8 years of the Clinton-Gore administration, we have found that betting on people rather than on institutions in an evolutionary process was a big problem. Putting our money on guys like Milosevic is a bad bet; and Milosevic was, in fact, the guy we put our money on in Dayton for a short-term gain in the Balkans. Unfortunately, it led to long-term trouble; and we are still not out of it there. And Milosevic, while he has now been finally removed by the people of his country in a more evolutionary way, he nevertheless still is a factor, but more important, he is still a war criminal. We have dealt with Milosevic not as a war criminal in the Clinton-Gore administration, but as somebody who we can trust in negotiations. That was a very poor choice.

Aristide in Haiti, another poor choice; a man who is an authoritarian, no friend of the United States, and has receded Haiti from the democratic promise it showed in the early 1990s. By betting on Aristide, I think we have done that country no favor at all.

Foday Sankoh in Sierra-Leone. Probably, CNN has shown the most gruesome shots of butchery, of children going out and maiming children, drugged children going out and maiming children, being used as instruments of war. This is a person the Clinton-Gore administration chose to try and do business with. When CNN pulled the cord on that and they showed Foday Sankoh for the brutal dictator and terrorist that he is, the Clinton-Gore administration retreated from that, and so far we have nothing to replace it.

So when I talk about a hallmark of betting on the wrong guy, that has been one of the problems. Another has been appeasement. We have seen continuously wishful thinking that said, if we could just get these people to go along with us, we will be all right, and we will offer them carrots. Well, we have to remember that the wall came down in Berlin because we were dealing from strength. They had no place to go in the Soviet Union and the United States of America was on the side of right and we were on the side of strength and eventually we prevailed because of those things.

Now we are going to North Korea and we are seeing extraordinary, extraordinary and, I would say, amazing scenes of our Secretary of State basi-

cally recognizing a dictatorship that is has enslaved most of its people, including its children. This is not just enslaving them physically, this is mind control as well, because the indoctrination in North Korea is total. I have been there, and I have seen it. Here, for whatever reason, we are suddenly finding our new best friend, the smiling Kim Jong Il. He is still the same old Kim Jong Il, he is not our best friend, he is a dangerous dictator, and it is a thoroughly Communist country. I do not understand why we are trying to do him a favor.

As we go through and look beyond the appeasements that we could talk about in Russia and China, let me skip to some bad judgment, bad judgment such as we have seen in the Middle East by trying to do a good job, and I give the President credit for that, but by forcing the agenda so fast for whatever motivation that it broke the framework. That was not good judgment; and we are seeing tragically tonight, every night on television, scenes of what happens when one forces a situation beyond its evolutionary capability to deal with it.

We have seen in Iraq apparent, Desert Fox. We bombed the heck out of them, and what happens? We end up winning a very short-term gain and losing our window into Iraq. We do not truly understand what is going on there now. We have lost our eyes and ears, Iraq is evermore dangerous and is now reasserting itself as a leader in the Arab world, as an evermore dangerous enemy of the United States with greater capabilities. We did not do what we needed to do there.

Mr. Speaker, this is a subject that will continue on, because this is a subject that matters to America; and I will be talking more about this in sessions to come.

ELIMINATION OF THE DEATH TAX WOULD BENEFIT ALL AMERICANS

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

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, for quite some time, we have been hearing from our friends on the other side of the aisle that Republican attempts to abolish the death tax is just a sop to the rich and that few "regular" folks would ever benefit from its elimination.

I would like to bring to the attention of the House an article that appeared in The Denver Post this weekend entitled "Death, Taxes end Rancher's Dream." The article describes the plight of the Laurence family who have for the last couple of generations been eking out a living from an 1,800 acre ranch in the Rocky Mountains of Colorado.

Merrill Laurence died 4 years ago and the family has been struggling ever