

THE PUBLIC ENTITLED TO EXPRESS VIEWS ON THE KAIPAROWITZ PLATEAU

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Utah [Ms. GREENE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. GREENE of Utah. Madam Speaker, it now appears more likely than not that tomorrow the President will announce that he has unilaterally decided to make sweeping changes to the management of nearly 2 million acres of Federal land. What process has brought us to this change?

There has been no environmental impact statement, there has been no compliance with FLPMA, there has been no compliance with NEPA, there have been no public hearings, there have been no congressional hearings, there has been no notice in the Federal Register and no public comment period to allow the people of this Nation the opportunity to comment on the President's proposal.

Instead, the President proposes to lock away nearly 2 million acres of land in Utah by Executive fiat by invoking the provision of the 1906 act known as the Antiquities Act to declare the largest national monument in the lower 48 States, and in doing so, the President will render worthless over 200,000 acres of Utah land belonging to the schoolchildren of Utah since 1896, set aside by this Congress to help finance the public education of the schoolchildren of Utah, not to mention what this decision will mean to other easements and rights-of-way existing in other lands in the area.

What is the President doing? It appears that the President is going to announce the creation of a new national monument on the Kaiparowitz Plateau of Utah. A national monument is a hard thing to argue against, and indeed the Utah delegation is not necessarily opposed to the idea of creation of a national monument in the State of Utah on the Kaiparowitz Plateau. The Kaiparowitz Plateau in places is beautiful, it is a unique environment, and it is for that reason that portions of the Kaiparowitz Plateau were included in the wilderness recommendation submitted by the Utah delegation in both the House and Senate this year.

Our disagreement with the President, however, is that it is not right, it is not democratic, with a small "d," it is not American to simply decide by one individual's decision to take 2 million acres of land and change the way it is used and managed for this generation and for generations of the future without an opportunity to allow the public to express their views. If the situation were reversed, if the President was announcing that 2 million acres of Federal land by his decision would be thrown open to development tomorrow, we would be outraged, and rightfully so.

My question to the President tonight is what is the President afraid of? What is he so afraid of in his proposal that he

has not allowed the Governor or the two Senators and the elected Representatives of the people of Utah to even see this proposal less than 24 hours before he intends to make it? Why will not the President allow the people of this Nation, the people of Utah, the people of the Kaiparowitz Plateau the opportunity to at least find out what it is the President proposes?

If the President can do it to Utah, he can do it to anyone, and, Madam Speaker, I would suggest to my colleagues in the House and in the Senate and the people across this country that the way to make decisions about our Federal resources, the way to make decisions about what kind of country we want to live in, the way to make decisions that impact the schoolchildren of this Nation is not to do it by stealth, is not to do it without involving the elected representatives of both parties in the decision.

Madam Speaker, regardless of what the terms of the President's announcement tomorrow may be, regardless of whether he has particular boundaries in mind or simply announces his intention to move forward, the point is that the President has done this more in the style of the old Soviet Union than in the tradition of democracy in America. It is the wrong way to make public policy and, Mr. President, I call on you to let the people have a chance to decide what to do with the lands we own.

FUTURE OPPORTUNITY FOR OUR CHILDREN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MICA. Madam Speaker, I come before the House tonight to and I spoke earlier today about the lack of a national drug policy or strategy and failure of this administration to protect our young people. We now see skyrocketing drug use and abuse, and tonight I am here to talk about another thing that affects our young people, and that is their opportunity for the future, their opportunity to have jobs, their opportunity to have employment, their opportunity to have income in our society which has always provided such great opportunity.

You know, we have heard from this administration about the 10 million new jobs that are created, and in fact we need to just take a minute and look at those 10 million new jobs because I have talked to people that have 2 and some of them 3 of those 10 million new jobs. They are part-time jobs, they are low paying jobs, they are service jobs, and what in fact has happened they are not telling us.

The fact is that during the years from 1993 to 1995 we lost 8.4 million good paying jobs in this Nation, people who had good paying jobs in technical areas that paid a good living wage, and those jobs were destroyed, and they

have not been replaced. They have been replaced only by these part-time low paying jobs, and that is what I hear when I go back to my district; and that is not what I want for my children or for the children of America.

You know I heard the most startling news. First I hear the news on the drugs for our teens that are offered up by this administration. Now I see the trade deficit. This is the headline in the Washington Times: "The Trade Deficit Worse in a Year, Productivity Crawls Higher." Trade deficit, startling trade deficits; they are running \$10 billion a year.

That means every single month we are sending more and more money overseas and we are losing a trade war, and at the end of this session it galls me to see this happen, because we had a proposal, a good proposal, to reorganize our trade activities, our international trade activities, in Washington at the Federal level. Right now we have 19 agencies dealing with Federal trade.

This is the flow chart. This is the most disorganized, disjointed, unorganized mess you have ever seen: 19 agencies, right hand not knowing what the left hand is doing, spending \$3 billion taxpayer dollars, and we are getting our pants beat in the trade war. And this they reject, the President helped defeat it, the new Secretary of Commerce helped defeat it.

Instead you know what they have done for us? They negotiated lousy trade deals, and then I see in my district what those lousy trade deals have done.

You cannot see this very well, my colleagues, but this is an auction notice to sell equipment in my State near my district in Florida. It is because they have wiped out through negotiating a bad NAFTA agreement, giving up the opportunity for this Nation to produce agriculture to sell to its own people, and internationally we once led in agriculture. This is selling the equipment.

And do you know what the farmers told me that went to this sale? They did not buy the equipment; they were selling equipment. That there were people with cellular phones speaking in Spanish, and this equipment is being shipped to Mexico.

So here we see the fruits. They destroyed a good plan for organization to have some sense made out of our trade effort. Now we are selling through their bad efforts our equipment at nickels on a dollar overseas.

□ 1930

Madam Speaker, this is a national tragedy. What hope does this hold for our children: Lower-paying jobs, service jobs, part-time jobs, jobs without benefits? Here they are talking about \$5.15 an hour. That is what their goal is, to pay \$5.15 an hour, when in my State you get \$8.75 an hour for not working on welfare, and you get medical benefits in addition.

So these are the choices that have been before this Congress. This is what we see this administration has done.

You have seen what we proposed. I proposed an organization to have our trade financing, to have our trade assistance, to have our trade negotiation together so we could help our businesses, rather than hurt our businesses and send our opportunities overseas.

Instead of building a bridge for tomorrow, we are building bridges to Mexico and to other countries, with our assistance, so our goods and services cannot be shipped there, but their goods and services can come here. We are shipping those opportunities overseas, because they will not listen. Do Members know why they will not listen? They cannot stand a new idea. It drives them crazy.

If they have done it this way, if it is disorganized this way, you keep it disorganized this way. If you have 33,000 people in the Department of Commerce and 20,000 plus are in Washington, DC, my God, we need every one of them here in Washington, DC.

Madam Speaker, I have had it and I hope the American people have had it, too.

UPCOMING HEARING IN THE COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HUNTER. Madam Speaker, I wanted to comment a little bit about the upcoming hearing that will be held tomorrow by the Committee on National Security, myself and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON], who is here, the chairman of the Committee on National Security, the gentleman from South Carolina, [Mr. SPENCE], and our other members.

We will have before us the Secretary of Defense and a number of other military leaders to explain some of the issues that have arisen from the bombing in Saudi Arabia that took place June 25 of this year, the bombing of the Khobar Barracks, in which 19 Americans were killed and several hundred, more than several hundred, were wounded.

Madam Speaker, I think this bombing and the way it took place is symbolic of the way the Clinton administration conducts national defense, at least the American preparation. And the situation we placed ourselves in, that our military leaders placed our uniformed people in, I think is symbolic of the weakness of the Clinton administration on defense, the naivete of the Clinton administration on defense, and the fact that they tend to be, time and again, taken by surprise in this very dangerous world.

Mr. Speaker, first, a number of Americans, since the Middle East is in the headlines again, a number of Americans are asking what we are requesting to do in Iraq. They are worried

about what the administration has in terms of their plan, whether they have a goal, whether they have a military operation that really evaluates all the possible contingencies.

Many people we talked to throughout the country, our constituents, say to us, we think, if we have to, we will go in and do the same thing that George Bush did several years ago in Desert Storm.

I just want to report, Madam Speaker, to the House and to our constituents, that we cannot do today what we did in Desert Storm, because the Clinton administration has dangerously weakened our forces, your forces. They took your United States Army, that numbered 18 divisions, 8 of which we sent to Desert Storm, and they have cut that almost in half, to 10 divisions. So we cannot send eight divisions to Desert Storm if we have to, because that only leaves two left for another contingency that could take place.

They have cut our fighter airwings, our air power, and reduced them from 23 fighter airwings, so we have roughly 50 percent of the United States air power that existed just a few years ago.

They have cut our U.S. Navy from 550 ships to about 350 ships. So Madam Speaker, the Clinton administration has dangerously weakened the United States.

With respect to the attack on the Khobar Barracks on June 25, the analysis that is coming forth from General Downing's report strongly criticizes the way the Department of Defense and the Clinton administration handled the security measures that existed immediately prior to this bombing.

Let me just go through some of the criticisms: They strongly criticized U.S. central command for failing to support the enhancement of force protection measures under an increased threat. Remember, when we say increased threat, that last November, 6 months before the bombing in Saudi Arabia at the Khobar Barracks, we had a bombing with a 250-pound bomb at Riyadh. That was November 13, 1995. We should have learned something from that.

But the Downing report criticizes the U.S. central command for failing to support the enhancement of force protection measures under an increased threat, and they criticize them for creating a confused set of command responsibilities. That means that the so-called czar, this force protection czar that was put in place, that was put in place with such an undermanning of responsibility and had so little authority, that in fact that was nobody in Saudi Arabia who really was in charge of force protection.

They are also criticized for passively accepting Air Force manning and rotation policies. What does that mean? That means that in this fighter airwing the tours are approximately 90 days. That means that the command turns over, 10 percent of the command turns over. Every week, 10 percent of your

command is changed, so there is no continuity of leadership, such that a leader realizes he is going to be there for a while and has a chance to settle down, look at the security problems, and address those problems. So the rotation policy is an extremely bad policy and nobody addressed that.

Let me just say one other thing about the bombing, Madam Speaker, that took place in November, that should have warned us about the Khobar bombing. That was a 250-pound bomb. We should have known that there could be a similar bomb launched on our troops 6 months later at Khobar. That occurred. I hope people will watch the hearing tomorrow and follow this analysis in depth.

TWO MORE RIDICULOUS BIG GOVERNMENT TAXES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KINGSTON. Madam Speaker, two more ridiculous big government taxes have been put out by the Clinton administration this week. The first one is under the name of safety in the workplace as respects violence. This is an OSHA proposal, the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, megabureaucrats who love to come into small businesses and tell them what they are already doing.

This is what their proposal is. They have, through a study, detected that there is a lot of violence at night at convenience stores, restaurants, and hotels, and places that are open 24 hours a day.

So what do the Washington big government bureaucrats do? Instead of saying, maybe, that we need to address violence in society, maybe more police officers, maybe look into something that we can do, instead of going to businesses and saying, how can we help you with the problems of violence, they go to businesses and say, what are you going to do about it?

So the businesses now, through a new OSHA proposal, will be required, if this passes, to have bulletproof glass; cash registers only at street level, so if people are driving by they can see if they are being held up or not; video cameras, speed bumps, speed bumps in hotels and restaurants because that will cut down on the violence. I can just see some drug dealer saying, come on, do not rob that convenience store, they have speed bumps there; that will keep me from doing it.

There is a requirement also that you have no more than \$25 in your cash register at one time, and have paperwork and training for your employees.

This is what the Clinton administration's view of private businesses are about: We are from the government, we are going to go into the convenience stores, the hotels and the restaurants all up and down the interstates, and anywhere else they might be open 24