

deadbeat parents in egregious interstate cases of child support delinquency and enable Federal authorities to go after those who attempt to escape State-issued child support orders by fleeing across State lines.

Under the Child Support Recovery Act sponsored by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] and enacted with broad bipartisan support in 1992, a bill which I cosponsored with the gentleman from Illinois, parents who willfully withhold child support payments totaling more than \$5,000, or owing for more than 1 year, are presently subject to a misdemeanor punishable by not more than 6 months imprisonment. A subsequent offense is a felony punishable by up to 2 years in prison.

The law that we are introducing today addresses the difficulty States frequently encounter in attempting to enforce child support orders beyond their borders. The Deadbeat Parents Punishment Act would augment current law by creating a felony offense for parents with an arrearage totaling more than \$10,000 or owing for more than 2 years. This provision, like current law, would apply where the non-custodial parent and child legally reside in different States.

In addition, the Deadbeats Act would make it a felony for a parent to cross a State border with the intent of evading child support orders where the arrearage totals more than \$5,000 or is more than 1 year past due, regardless of residency.

Mr. Speaker, this House has articulated in the welfare bill that we passed, in the act sponsored by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE], and other legislation, that we expect those who have children in America to take responsibility for those children, to ensure, whether or not the family unit stays intact, that those children have adequate resources to be housed, to be clothed, to be fed, to be nurtured.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress cannot force or mandate by law that parents will love their children. We hope that they will do that. We know that that is critical to a child's welfare. We know as well that the failure of some parents to do that has led to a crisis in this country when it comes to crime committed by children, teenage pregnancy, and other activity that we lament being perpetrated by young people. But, in fact, it is parents who we should expect and, yes, demand that they meet their responsibilities, first to their children, but then as well to their communities.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge my colleagues to cosponsor this act with me, and I hope that we have early hearings and early passage of this act.

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

[Mr. SMITH of Michigan addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

[Mr. TIAHRT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

LANDOWNER IGNORED IN MONTANA LAND TRANSACTION

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

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, this evening I want to visit with my colleagues about the New World Mine. Some of my colleagues may recall that on August 12, 1996, the President announced that he wanted to pay \$65 million to purchase a mining interest that is close to Yellowstone Park.

Mr. Speaker, this agreement, or deal, if you will, was negotiated in secret. It was negotiated in the back rooms, in the corridors, in the boardrooms of the White House and environmental groups and a mining company. Who was left out? Who was not consulted?

Mr. Speaker, the Governor of Montana was not consulted, and therefore the citizens of Montana were not consulted. The Montana congressional delegation was left out. Local government officials were never consulted. Land management agencies were not consulted. Congress itself was left out. But most surprisingly, Mr. Speaker, the owner of the land was left out, too.

Mr. Speaker, the President first proposed that we give \$65 million worth of public lands in Montana to this out-of-State, out-of-Nation mining company, and that caused a great uproar in Montana. Montanans feel a great attachment to the land. They hunt on it, they fish on it, they camp on it, and they enjoy it immensely for hiking and berry picking. Many Montanans, Mr. Speaker, make their living off the land.

That uproar caused the President to change his mind. Then he proposed giving \$100 million out of the CRP program, the Conservation Reserve Program, to buy out this mine, and that created even a greater outrage. Environmentalists and sportsmen and farmers said, "No, don't do that, Mr. President."

So then the President asked that we give him a blank check. Mr. Speaker, the House said no. The reason that the House said no is because the President had decided to ignore two very important parties in this transaction. One is the State of Montana and the citizens of Montana but, more importantly, the property owner, Margaret Reeb.

It turns out that Margaret Reeb owns the mineral interest that the President had entered into an agreement secretly to buy out. The problem is that they never contacted Margaret Reeb, they never consulted with Margaret Reeb, and they never entered into any agreements with Margaret Reeb. It would be like, Mr. Speaker, having a neighbor come to you one day and say, "I sold

my house to some people who came along, but the only way they'd buy it is if I sold them yours, too, so I sold them your house, too." That is how Margaret Reeb feels.

The secret deal was made behind closed doors, and it cut out the public. There were no hearings, there was no authority, there was no appropriation. And, Mr. Speaker, the President even cut off the National Environmental Policy Act in the process.

Montana was hurt, too. Four hundred sixty-six jobs, Mr. Speaker, will be lost; \$45 million in tax revenues to the State of Montana; even Park County, MT, lost \$1.2 million.

What should we do? Mr. Speaker, the Denver Post wrote an editorial on September 8. It says this:

The Clinton administration goofed when it ignored a private landowner during negotiations to block a proposed gold mine near Yellowstone National Park. Even a first-year law student would know that to do a land swap, the landowner must be consulted. That the White House didn't do so is inexcusable.

It goes on to say:

But as it explores all lawful alternatives, the Clinton administration should avoid acting heavy-handedly. It was Clinton's minions whose omissions left the landowner out of the loop in the first place. It's now their job to fix the problem.

Mr. Speaker, that obligation is to Margaret Reeb, and that obligation is to the people of Montana. I have proposed an alternative to this mechanism, and that alternative would save taxpayers tens of millions of dollars. It would protect the property rights of Margaret Reeb, and it would deal with the concerns of the people of the State of Montana. I would urge my colleagues to support me in this effort to propose an alternative that is fair and it is responsible, it is fair to the parties who are involved, it is fair to Margaret Reeb, and it is fair to the State of Montana.

GOLD MINE PACT BUNGLED

The Clinton administration goofed when it ignored a private land owner during negotiations to block a proposed gold mine near Yellowstone National Park.

The original proposal, involving a land swap, was put together more than a year ago by the White House, an environmental group and a major mining company.

Crown Butte wanted to develop its New World Gold Mine just 3 air miles from Yellowstone. An environmental impact statement was being prepared because the mine needs the approval of federal agencies. Although the mine's supporters claimed the EIS' publication was imminent, the document actually was behind schedule.

Meantime, the National Park Service vigorously campaigned against the mine on grounds that the operation might harm Yellowstone's ecological balance and potentially disrupt its geological wonders. A rift developed between the Park Service and other federal agencies over whether the EIS would adequately address these concerns.

The White House intervened and offered Crown Butte the chance to swap the controversial property for another parcel elsewhere. That deal later unraveled, so now the

Clinton administration is trying to persuade Congress to approve a cash buyout of the mining claim.

However, during this lengthy process the Clinton team apparently forgot to ask the private land owner, who had leased her property to the gold mining company, if she would be willing to sell the acreage.

She insists the land isn't for sale.

At the very least, the Clinton administration wound up with egg on its face. Even a first-year law student would know that to do a land swap, the land owner must be consulted. That the White House didn't do so is inexcusable.

This gaffe is unfortunate because it supplies new ammunition to Clinton critics who charge that the president rushed the land swap proposal to win points with environmental groups in the midst of an election campaign.

The issue now, though, is whether the Clinton team can make amends.

One possible solution would be to offer the land owner a cut of the cash.

But as it explores all lawful alternatives, the Clinton administration should avoid acting heavy-handedly. It was Clinton's minions whose omissions left the land owner out of the loop in the first place. It's now their job to fix the problem.

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

[Mr. MANZULLO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

MEMBER RESPONDS TO
MENENDEZ PRIVILEGED RESOLUTION

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

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this time to do something that I was not allowed to do, because I was given no time in the debate concerning our friend Bob Dornan and the banning of Bob Dornan from the House floor under what I would consider, in the least, a very flawed hearing, if you could call it that, a gathering of Members who heard the prosecutorial statement, heard the statement by the gentleman who claimed that he was wronged, with absolutely no defense allowed to be given, no time for a defense, and then a vote and a punishment.

Mr. Speaker, all we can do is give our own perspective of events from our own experience. I want to do that right now.

Bob Dornan came in here the other day, a couple of days ago, walked over to a bunch of us right here at the majority leadership table, and had small talk with us. He did not lobby for any cause, much less for his cause. He chatted with us. In fact, he said at one point, "I know I can't lobby here. I just want to see how you guys are doing."

After a few minutes, we walked back to the cloakroom. As we sat down in the cloakroom, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MENENDEZ] came rush-

ing out on the floor and proceeded in a very pointed way to attack Mr. Dornan. He did not attack him by name. He asked the Speaker to tell him what the rules were with respect to whether or not a former Member could lobby Members of Congress on the House floor, come out here and lobby.

Of course, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MENENDEZ] being an old hand at this, knows you cannot lobby. He also knows that Mr. Dornan had just been on the House floor and was the only person there, and it was a very pointed attempt to embarrass Mr. Dornan, and it worked.

So Mr. Dornan rushed back on the House floor and talked to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MENENDEZ] right over here and told him what he thought of him. Maybe he should not have told him what he thought of him. Maybe he should not have used harsh words, but on the other hand, Mr. Speaker, we have had Members of Congress grab each other, mug each other, put each other in headlocks, punch each other, do all kinds of things, and that includes members of the leadership, Mr. Speaker, and we have never banned any of them from the House floor.

I just want you to consider that when a former Member comes out here, he cannot defend himself. The one thing all of us can do if another Member takes us on, especially if they take us on personally, is we can get time at the mike and we can get up and defend ourselves.

But a former Member who comes out here, who is embarrassed and humiliated by a sitting Member who stands up and starts to imply that he is out there lobbying, which is not legal or against our rules on the House floor, that former Member can do nothing. He has to sit there and take it and be humiliated.

Interestingly, in all of these other cases that have come before us when Members have grappled, punched, and done other things to each other, we have always looked at the full context of the case. We have never just taken a snapshot and said, "You shouldn't have done that." We have said, "What happened? What provoked it?" Was there a provocation?

In my assessment, Mr. Speaker, there was absolutely a provocation. Mr. Dornan was provoked to do this. The other Member did this simply to embarrass him. He knew what the rules were. He did not have to learn the rules anew. He knew darned well you cannot lobby on the House floor. He also knew that everybody who had seen Mr. Dornan on the House floor would realize that those pointed remarks were directed to him. He knew it would embarrass Mr. Dornan, and he did it, and then he proceeded to say, look what has happened to me, and to reap the benefit of that, which is this precipitous move to ban a former Member from the House floor based totally on what the prosecutorial side says happened.

□ 1930

None of us who wanted to defend Mr. Dornan had a chance to defend him. We did not have any time. I got up to make my statement, and we were out of time, because we were only given 20 minutes apiece.

So, Mr. Speaker, this has been a sad chapter in the House of Representatives, a sad chapter for people who talk about due process, talk about letting everybody have a fair hearing, talk about people being able to present their part of the evidence, present their views, their opinions. There was none of that. There was a self-serving statement by the prosecution, and then we all voted. It was a mistake, Mr. Speaker.

IN MEMORY OF MAJ. GEN. HENRY MOHR

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

Mr. TALENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in honor of Maj. Gen. Henry Mohr, a personal friend, an honorable man, a devoted husband, father, grandfather, great grandfather, patriot, soldier and hero, who passed away in St. Louis on September 7, 1997.

Henry Mohr's entire adult life exemplifies in the most profound manner what it means to be a "citizen soldier." He enlisted as a private in September 1941 and was stationed at Pearl Harbor on that day that will live in infamy, December 7, 1941. While most of us know of Pearl Harbor from movies and books, Private Henry Mohr was there.

In August 1942, he earned the gold bars of a second lieutenant by completing Army Officer Candidate School. As a field artillery officer, he served throughout World War II, participating in amphibious landings in New Guinea, the Philippines, and service in Korea.

Following the war, Captain Mohr left active duty, but continued to serve in the Army Reserve until 1950. After North Korea's attack against the South, he volunteered for active duty and served throughout that conflict as well.

Following the cessation of hostilities in 1953, Captain Mohr returned to Reserve status, serving in a variety of command and staff positions as he worked his way up through the ranks. He also participated in studies designed to improve the role of Army Reserve Forces, paving the way for the seamless integration of Active and Reserve components, years prior to Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird's formal implementation of the total army concept in the early 1970's.

Throughout the early to mid 1970's, colonel and then Brigadier General Mohr served as chief of staff, deputy commander, and then as commander of the 102d Army Reserve Command, or ARCOM, in St. Louis.