

process they avoid immigration and labor laws that their U.S. competitors must obey.

In addition, foreign operators benefit from foreign government subsidies designed to encourage capital investment overseas and provide employment for their citizens.

The real issue at stake in the proposed repeal of the Passenger Services Act is who gets the American vacation dollars; a U.S. or a foreign business? No one would dream of letting Toyota, Sony, or some other foreign corporation set up shop within our boundaries and escape U.S. taxes, immigration and labor laws, but this is exactly what we are allowing in the vacation cruise line industry.

The U.S. passenger vessel industry deserves our support. There are some 3,600 passenger carrying vessels in the U.S. fleet, 20 or more of which are in overnight service. These U.S. passenger vessels employ thousands of Americans and make a significant economic contribution to their local communities. In addition, the owners of these vessels obey U.S. laws, pay U.S. taxes, and employ Americans. Instead of repealing the Passenger Services Act, we should be exploring ways to increase the viability and the strength of the American cruise line industry.

I would propose that we put an end to our practice of subsidizing foreign cruise lines. Mr. Speaker, Americans are sick and tired of paying over half of their income in taxes and then letting big foreign corporations get tax breaks and other preferential treatment.

The truth is that the foreign cruise lines have powerful lobbyists who have been able to get their ships favorable treatment for many years, but the American people deserve a change, they deserve better.

It is not going to be easy to fix all of our problems and close tax loopholes like this one. Opponents will throw up every roadblock they can, but the duty of the Congress is clear.

THIS HOUSE NEEDS TO GET ITS BUSINESS IN ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I think today was one of those more unique days in the U.S. Congress, particularly this House, and I think it deserves an explanation to the American people, for the real issue today is that this House needs to get its business in order.

I join today on one of the very rare occasions with the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] along with many other women in this House, Congresswoman PELOSI being the ranking member on the Committee on National Security, to raise the question of fairness and the irony that we are supposed to be here to work things out. Those who might have seen the con-

stant rising might have wondered what the business of this House was today. The business was to indicate to those who control this House, my Republican friends, that bipartisanship is something that they called for and that we called for but they are not acting upon. How disturbing to find that in foreign operations where an amendment was worked out dealing with international family planning, and some may say, "How small an issue," but the issue bears on many concerns that this country has; one, its international relations with helping many, many countries formulate in a fair manner the treatment of women who are interested in family planning.

If you really want to promote families, then you will promote women having the choice to plan families and to have the knowledge and understanding which, in fact, may avoid abortions, of which many of my colleagues to the right are so vehemently opposed to, then promote family values and work with countries like China and the continents of Africa and South America in promoting family planning. But yet the bipartisan amendment that was worked out was thrown aside and discarded. Women who have worked on this issue for so long, it was substituted for by a Republican amendment that just a couple of weeks ago had failed badly.

What is the intent of that? To dash the hopes of those who would work fairly in this House to pass an amendment that would work fairly on behalf of the international community and support family planning, and, yes, to dash the hopes of anyone who would think that we would work together in a bipartisan manner. How tragic.

It is important that this House gets itself in order, and I hope that by rising today and voting time and time again to adjourn this Congress the message got out that women stand for something. Democratic women in this Congress; we stand for fairness and, yes, we stand for bipartisanship. We stand for understanding that the way to solve the world's problem is working together, training people on the way to manage their families and to be successful.

Then, as we proceeded in discussing this issue called tax reform and tax cuts, let me also acknowledge that our Republican friends need to get their House in order. I do not know. For some reason it seems that the schoolteacher and the police officer, the fire fighter, the bus driver, and the single working mother on the Republican tax plan do not deserve to get a tax cut when just 2 years ago, 3 years ago in 1994, when almost a majority of the Republicans signed the Contract on America, they agreed that those who either paid income tax received an earned income tax credit; those are the working poor, or paid payroll tax were deserving of a child tax credit. Today their memories have faded them. These people are not around to lobby, they

are not out in the hallway. So they have forgotten the bus driver, they have forgotten the schoolteacher, they have forgotten the single working mother, they have forgotten the police officer.

These are the families that the Republicans are saying are looking for welfare. They are preschool and kindergarten teachers, teachers aids, sales clerks, carpenters, rookie police officers, in-home caregivers. They are the millions of people across America who work hard and struggle every month to pay their bills and to provide for their children. Most of them would be pretty surprised to find out that the Gingrich Congress does not think they deserve tax breaks like everyone else, even though a big chunk of their paychecks go to paying Federal taxes.

So, I think that we need to know why we are here. First, to put forward legislation that works, the family planning amendment that women negotiated under the leadership of the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] and got an agreement to be passed.

And then, if we talk about tax reform and tax breaks, go outside these halls and look at the everyday working American and tell me that they do not deserve the \$500 a year tax credit because they are a rookie police officer, a teacher, a bus driver.

Let us get our House in order, and let us plan to work so that the legislation that comes out of this House speaks the right language, and that is for all of America and not special interests.

NATIONAL MONUMENT FAIRNESS ACT

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

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, on September 18, 1996, President Clinton went out to safety on the south rim of the Grand Canyon and stood there and declared 1.7 million acres of Utah as a national monument. He had a right to do that. It is called the antiquity law that was passed in 1906, and the reason it was passed is Teddy Roosevelt and others could see that we were ruining many of the prehistoric things that were around. We were finding all these things that had been there for years and destroying them. So he had a right to do that. I do not object to the right.

What I do object to is the interpretation of the law. The law is very clear. It says that the President of the United States will do this for two purposes, and he will state these purposes. First, is to protect the archeological part of it, and another, historic site. This President did not declare either one.

And the next part of the law is the key, and it says he shall use the smallest acreage available to protect that particular thing—1.7 million acres—bigger than Delaware and Rhode Island combined; and no one told us what was there, except we know that there was

tons and tons of coal that is low-sulfur coal, high-Btu coal, and what would inure to the children who are educated in the State of Utah is 5.6 billion acres; money, billions of dollars, excuse me, that would inure to them. Also, a lot of the coal would be exported that would help people in other areas.

But the President had a right to do that. However, when they talk about protection, that is a misnomer. There is very little protection in the antiquities law.

Since that time Congress wisely has determined. The park bill has gone in since that time. The National Environment Protection Act has gone in. The Wilderness Act, the FLPMA Act. All of these acts, Wild and Scenic River Act, do this.

We go back and we check what other Presidents have done, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, President Kennedy, President Carter, but from time to time some extreme environmentalist says we have got to protect this, really not realizing it does not protect anything. What it really does is it takes away the protection of the management plans of BLM and Forest Service.

So we find ourselves in a position where the President protected nothing, he abused the power of the Presidency, he hurt the people of the West, and I cannot understand why he would do it. But he has the right; I would agree with that.

Now, I have introduced a bill, which is H.R. 1127, called the National Monument Fairness Act. What does it do? A lot of people, after he introduced the 1.7 million acres, Senators, Congressmen, came to me as chairman of that committee and said, "Well, I don't want that to happen to my State. I want a law that takes it away so it can't happen," and they name their State.

I think the President should have the right to do some of these things in a small amount as the law brings it about, so I have introduced this with 50,000 acres. He cannot go into these millions and millions of acres for political purposes.

□ 1600

The nice thing about our President, he was fast to say that he did it for political reasons. If we look at the idea all the way through it, I have been subpoenaing papers from the White House and the Department of the Interior, and every one of them says that "We are doing this for political reasons. How will this play with the environmental community? How will this play with the rich movie stars? How will this play with the celebrities?"

When they finally decided to do it, they did not do it in the Oval Office, they did not do it in Utah, they went to the Grand Canyon, safely in Arizona. The nice thing about it there is one of the things I subpoenaed said, we do not want mainstream Utah there, we want the environmental community there.

That is a great thing to say to our people.

Anyway, carrying that on, what does my bill do? The bill allows the President to do up to 50,000 acres, much as the law originally intended. Over that he would have to confer with the Governor and the legislature of the State, and as the Constitution gives the right of the lands of America to this House and the House over there, that is what they would have to do, is go through Congress.

I would hope people would realize that this is not an environmental bill at all. This is a bill on abuse of the President's power, which I think more and more people are coming to realize, whether they are Republicans or Democrats.

THE ECONOMIC DISASTER WAITING TO HAPPEN IN BRUSSELS

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call my colleagues' attention to the economic disaster that is waiting to happen in Brussels. At this time the European Commission Merger Task Force is meeting to discuss the impact of the merger between two American companies, Boeing and McDonnell Douglas. The taskforce has as its purview the judgment of whether the merger poses any adverse impacts on competitiveness in the world aircraft market.

But what is happening, Mr. Speaker, is that the European members representing governments who have directly subsidized the European aircraft consortium Airbus are using these discussions to extort trade concessions from Boeing in order to increase the market position of Airbus. This is truly an improper and unfair manipulation of the process.

Now that our own Federal Trade Commission has determined that there are no anticompetitiveness problems with the merger, it is time for the United States to stand firm against the European Community and demand a halt to this travesty.

Until 2-days ago, Mr. Speaker, the real intention of the Europeans was thinly veiled by their expression of deep concern over competitiveness. But on July 15, the EC's Minister of Competitiveness, Karel Van Miert, betrayed what I believe is the true motivation of the EC negotiators, to extract concessions out of Boeing through these merger talks that would directly assist Airbus.

Two days ago, on the Belgian radio, Mr. Van Miert made this statement following the breakdown of the negotiations with Boeing: "We cannot give our consent unless Boeing makes very serious commitments in order to, let's say, also further guarantee the chances of Airbus in this market in the future."

That, Mr. Speaker, is what this charade is all about, guaranteeing market

opportunities for Airbus. We cannot, as a free trading Nation, allow this to stand. Certainly in light of this outrageous statement, I believe that the President, the State Department, and our Trade Representative must clearly and unequivocally express the dissatisfaction of the United States with the progress of these negotiations, in addition to our intention of taking retaliatory action if the EC proceeds in this wrongheaded direction.

To make things worse, today Commissioner Van Miert

noted with satisfaction the fact that the advisory committee grouping the experts of Member States unanimously shares the European Commission's analysis whereby the proposals made by Boeing are not of a kind to dispel the serious doubts expressed by the Commission regarding the risk that will weigh upon competition because of the proposed merger between Boeing and McDonnell Douglas. . . . The commission showed it remained serene, and Mr. Van Miert hopes to firmly recall that the Boeing-McDonnell issue was treated strictly within the framework of the Regulation on mergers and that the Commission analysis was based on tangible facts and figures and not just on a political motive of some kind.

I think Mr. Van Miert should go back and listen to his radio tape in Belgium.

The spokesman then explained that the Commission will take its final decision on 23 July. . . . in order to leave the relevant services time to proceed to authentication of the documents comprising this issue.

I want to point out to my colleagues that Mr. Van Miert says that the

. . . European Commission decision in concentration matters is legally binding for the parties concerned and means, when it is a matter of veto, that the merged identity is illegal in law. The EC regulation on mergers moreover give the Commission instruments that are apt to dissuade those who do not respect such a decision. In particular, it has the power to impose fines up to 10 percent of the cumulated turnover of the parties, or daily penalties, as long as the infringement lasts.

So I want to point out to my colleagues, this is a very serious matter, one that could result in fines of up to \$4.5 billion against the Boeing Co. and the seizure of Boeing aircraft overseas. I say to the President and Vice President, members of this administration, we in the Congress want to support you in whatever actions are necessary in order to explain to the Europeans that if they do this, the United States will retaliate, must retaliate, in order to make certain that this merger goes forward and that we not be blackmailed by the European Commission and Mr. Van Miert.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD an article on the current status of EC negotiations.

The article referred to is as follows:

CURRENT STATUS OF EC NEGOTIATIONS

Discussions between Boeing and the European Commission Merger Task Force have reached an impasse. Boeing has offered significant remedies (see Attachment A) to allay the Commission's concerns regarding the merger, but the Commission continues to demand more. A team of Boeing executives and lawyers met around the clock with the