Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this is the culmination really of years of determination and dedication on the part of the delegate and gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) and of the chairman of the D.C. authorizing committee, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS).

This is in no way critical of the D.C. Financial Control Board, but it is the culmination of a vision. It had to start with fiscal responsibility. It had to be bolstered by economic opportunity. But it also had to include responsible stewardship.

We have that responsible stewardship, that leadership, in Mayor Williams. This is a reflection of the fact that those who have worked tirelessly for the District of Columbia truly believe in democracy, truly believe that the citizens of the District of Columbia are capable of governing themselves.

This gives them that opportunity, and if in the future we hope to hold the D.C. government responsible for its actions, we can only do that by giving them the authority to make those decisions. You cannot have one without the other. You cannot hold them responsible without giving them the authority to make decisions on their own. This gives them that authority.

This is the least we can do for the District of Columbia, and, again, this is what it was all about. It happened a lot sooner than many people expected, but I know that it is what the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) had every confidence would occur, as did the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS).

I want to particularly thank them. As I started my remarks thanking them, I conclude my remarks by thanking them and I thank those who have worked along with them to ensure that the District of Columbia will one day be the jewel of our democracy, the true capital city of our great Nation.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 433

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''District of Columbia Management Restoration Act of 1999''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds as follows:

(1) Among the major problems of the District of Columbia government has been the failure to clearly delineate accountability.

(2) The statute establishing the District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority proved necessary to enable the District to regain financial stability and management control.

(3) The District has performed significantly better than the Congress had anticipated at the time of the passage of the Authority statute.

(4) The necessity for a financial authority has resulted in a diffusion of responsibility between the Mayor, the Council, and the Authority pending the time when the District government would assume the home rule status quo ante.

(5) This lack of clear lines of reporting authority, in turn, has led to some redundancy and confusion about accountability and authority.

(6) The Authority statute requires the Authority to ''ensure the most efficient and effective delivery of services, including public safety services, by the District government'' and to ''assist the District government in . . . ensuring the appropriate and efficient delivery of services''.

(7) With the coming of a new administration led by Mayor Anthony Williams, the Authority has taken the first step to ensure the accountability that will be necessary at the expiration of the control period by delegating day-to-day operations over city agencies previously under control of the Authority to the Mayor.

(8) The Congress agrees that the best way to ensure clear and unambiguous authority and full accountability is for the Mayor to have full authority over city agencies so that citizens, the Authority, and the Congress can ascertain responsibility.

(9) The transition of authority to the new administration will take nothing from the Authority's power to intervene during a control period.

SEC. 3. RESTORATION OF MANAGEMENT AND PERSONNEL AUTHORITY OF MAYOR OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle B of title XI of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 (DC Code, sec. 47–395.1 et seq.) is repealed.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 1604(f)(2)(B) of the Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997 (Public Law 105–34; 111 Stat. 1099) is repealed.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

PRESIDENTS SHOULD GET AUTHORITY FROM CONGRESS TO SEND TROOPS

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, since World War II, our presidents have been sending troops overseas without Congressional approval. Prior to World War II, it was traditional and constitutional that all presidents came to the Congress for authority to send troops.

Recently, the President has announced that he will most likely be sending thousands of American troops under NATO command to Kosovo. I think this is wrong. I have introduced legislation today that says that the President cannot send these troops without Congressional approval, merely restating what the Constitution says and how we followed the rules up until World War II.

Three years ago, the President sent troops into Bosnia and said they would be there for 6 months. They have been there now 3 years. We have spent over $20 billion. Nobody even asks hardly at all anymore when these troops will be coming home.

We have been bombing and interfering with the security of Iraq for now over 8 years, and that continues, and we do not give Congressional approval of these acts. My legislation is simple. It just denies funding for sending troops into Kosovo without Congressional approval.

This is not complicated. It is very precise and very clear and very important that we as a Congress restate our constitutional obligation to supervise the sending of troops around the world.

It would be much better for us to spend this money that is being wasted in Bosnia and Iraq on our national defense. We spend less and less money every year on national defense but we spend more and more money on policing the world. I think that policy ought to change and it is the responsibility of the Congress, the body that has control of the purse strings, to do something about this.

If the President is permitted to do this, he does it not because he has constitutional authority but because the Congress has reneged on their responsibility to supervise the spending.

It is a bit ironic now that we are sending or planning to send troops to Kosovo. We have all read about and heard the horrible stories about the Serbian leader Slobodan Milosevic, and yet our troops going to Kosovo are going to be sent with the intention that Kosovo cannot be independent; that they will not be able to separate themselves from Serbia; that they cannot decide under what government they want to live.

It is also interesting that one of the jobs of the troops in NATO, if they go into Kosovo, will be to disarm the Kosovo Liberation Army. That is hardly good sense. First, it is not good sense for us to give the permission or renege on our responsibility, but it does not make good sense to get involved in a war that has been going on for many years, but it certainly does not make good sense for us to go in for the sole purpose of supporting Milosevic. He is the one that has been bombing the Kosovars and here we are, we want to disarm the liberation forces and at the same time prevent Kosovo from becoming independent.

The issue here is money, but there is also a bigger issue and that is the responsibility that we have to decide when troops should be sent. Once

troops are sent into a foreign country, it is very difficult for us to bring our troops home.

□ 1815

Troops in Kosovo will not serve the interests of the United States. They will not help our national security. It will drain funds that should be spent on national defense. At the same time it will jeopardize our national security by endangering our troops and raising the possibility of us becoming involved in a war spreading through the Balkans. This should not occur.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am asking my fellow colleagues to join me in cosponsoring this legislation just to say that it is not the prerogative of the President to send troops around the world whenever he pleases. That is the prerogative of the Congress.

I do know that it has not been stated this clearly in the last 40 years, but it is about time we did. And besides, one thing more, the President has admitted, at least it has been in print, that he is likely to place these troops under a foreign commander, under a British general.

Mr. Speaker, we do not need this. We need to restrain the President's ability to send troops.

MAKING THE POSTAL SERVICE A PARTNER IN ASSURING LIVABILITY OF AMERICA'S COMMUNITIES

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most exciting issues that has arisen in this new year has been that of livable communities. It received prominence in the President's State of the Union address. Just this last week, on Friday, it was the feature article in the National Journal. The Saturday New York Times front page political memo had again an issue about livable communities. It is in large part an expression of how government can be a partner with citizens, with the business community, to try and really achieve what it is that Americans deeply care about because, at heart, Americans care when their children go out the door in the morning that they are safe, they want that family to be economically secure, they want them to be healthy physically and in terms of their environment.

One example of that partnership that can make a difference for livable communities is the impact that the local post office has on small and medium sized communities particularly around the country. The post office is a symbol of how we connect to one another. The mail collection and distribution is vitally important in terms of community dynamic. Time and time again we find that post office on Main Street is an anchor for that Main Street business activity; it is a source of pride for people in the local communities; often it is a historic structure.

Unfortunately, when it comes to the location of that service, historic post offices around the country are being in some cases removed from those historic downtown locations. In some cases they are being, the post office simply has not been the type of neighbor that our communities deserve, and it is sadly not unknown for the postal service to not play by the same rules that the Federal Government imposes on others.

I have a series of examples in my office where these historic outposts have abandoned historic downtown locations to be located in a strip mall at the edge of town, perhaps without any paved sidewalks. Many communities in, for example, Portland, Oregon, where I am from, there is a lot of work to try and plan for the future to be able to promote a more livable community, and in fact the Oregon planning model is heralded by some as the most advanced in the United States. But despite the notoriety, despite the outreach, the Postal Service, for instance, was completely clueless to the work that we have been doing in our community to plan facilities for the next 50 years. It does not have to be that way.

I am introducing legislation this week that would require the Post Office to obey local land use and planning laws, to have them work with the local communities before they make decisions that can have such a wrenching affect on the fabric of community. I find it ironic that in case after case the Post Office gives the public more input into what version of the Elvis stamp it is going to produce than decisions that really can be life and death for small town America.

We also have a provision in this bill that makes some minor technical adjustments over what we had in the previous session of Congress because we have been listening to people in the Postal Service and we want to give them necessary flexibility. We do not want it to be a straightjacket, but we do want it to be a model of how America can and should work.

I would hope that, as we are promoting livable communities around the country, that the Federal Government will lead by example, by acting the way we want other actors and actresses to behave to promote more livable communities. I would earnestly request that my colleagues join me in sponsoring this legislation to make the Postal Service a full partner in assuring the liveability of America's communities.

MY GOAL AS A REPRESENTATIVE: ENSURING FEDERAL POLICIES ARE CONDUCIVE TO PRESERVING UNIQUE WAY OF LIFE IN RURAL AMERICA

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

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post headlines trumpets good news. The economy outpaces growth forecasts, the stock market is up, unemployment is down and prices from the grocery store to the gas pump are low and stable. The conventional wisdom is that life in America is as good as it gets, and perhaps for some Americans it is. But behind the statistics lies pockets in this country where the economic lives of our citizens are not so good.

I rise today on behalf of the citizens of rural Kansas, the farmers and ranchers, the independent oil producers, senior citizens on fixed income and communities leaders struggling to hold on to essential services. These folks take little comfort in government statistics showing how good the economy is doing. In rural Kansas times are tough. Agriculture, still our economic base, is caught in a vice grip of depressed prices. Even our most diversified operators are struggling as prices for almost everything we produce in Kansas, cattle, corn, wheat, hogs, milo, soybeans, are all at historic lows. The new Census of Agriculture shows Kansas has 1,685 fewer farms this year than just 5 years ago. USDA reports that net farm income will be down for the third year in a row, and exports are reduced as well.

The President's new budget fails to address the difficulties in agriculture. No new money for crop insurance. Farm program spending is reduced, and money for export promotion is cut by 15 percent. Even money for our food donation program such as P.L. 480 is cut by almost a billion dollars from last year's level.

Mr. Speaker, we in Congress must find solutions, and removing agricultural sanctions is a start. The American farmer cannot continue with 52 percent of the world markets threatened by unilateral sanctions. I joined in introducing legislation on the first day of this session to remove agricultural sanctions, and we must continue to press hard on this issue.

The bottom has been knocked out of the domestic oil and gas industry as well. Thirty thousand wells have been shut down in Kansas alone due to declining prices. Employment in Kansas' oil and gas industry is down from a high of 40,000 jobs to under 13,000 today. According to the Kansas Geological Survey, if prices remain at their current levels, oil receipts in Kansas will drop 900 million and our State will lose an additional 5000 jobs.

As a country, we have spent billions, even gone to war to protect foreign petroleum sources. Should we not do something to preserve our domestic industry as well? We now import two-thirds of the oil consumed in this country, and this reliance only continues to grow. Unfortunately, again, the President's budget is little assistance. Energy research and development is cut. No funding is included for additional purchases for the strategic petroleum