

her guilt to the police at the time of her arrest and offered to atone for her mistake by cooperating fully with the authorities. She has repeatedly admitted that she is guilty and has turned in several professional drug traffickers from Peru who arranged for this crime. At every opportunity over the past year, Jennifer has fully cooperated and has helped to lock up professional drug runners.

Her willingness to cooperate and admit her guilt has gotten Jennifer nowhere. A year after her arrest, she sits in a jail with no trial or sentence. In fact, Jennifer has been punished because of her cooperation. Her trial has been repeatedly delayed because under the strange legal system in Peru her case is tied to the provisional drug runners who she turned in. They have repeatedly delayed Jennifer's trial. And if any of them appeal their sentence under this strange system, Jennifer's case will go through appeal, too, this despite her willingness to admit her guilt.

The Government of Peru offers weak and unconvincing excuses for this delay. We have repeatedly found out that the officer who arrested Jennifer was later arrested himself for drug trafficking. He has already had a trial, has been sentenced, served 6 months, and is already out on the streets, all this while Jennifer sits in jail awaiting a sentence. It is clear to me that someone in high places in Peru wants inaction. One year without a sentence is completely inexcusable.

I again call on the Government of Peru to move forward with this case. It is time that people in high places in Peru give action to this young lady. The conditions which Jennifer is being held in is inexcusable. The prison was built to hold 300 but has 700 women in it. There is no running water, inadequate nourishment, including no fruits or vegetables, disease is rampant and health care inadequate. Sick animals, roaches, and rats abound in the prison.

Jennifer has lost over 20 pounds during the years she has been held. The prison conditions violate dozens of internationally recognized standards for the treatment of prisoners, standards to which the government of Peru has agreed to comply.

I have tried to convey my concerns with the Peruvian ambassador to the United States, Mr. Luna. He has refused to meet with me and other Members of Congress to discuss the case. I am inserting in the RECORD a copy of a letter I received from the ambassador in which he refused our request to meet with him.

□ 2230

This issue has attracted attention in this Congress, but unfortunately the Government of Peru does not seem to care one iota about due process of law. Both the House and the Senate have passed sense of Congress resolutions calling for the Government of Peru to

respect due process of law. The House Appropriations Committee has adopted language raising concerns about the matter, and the full Senate has adopted an amendment cutting foreign aid to Peru. The American people are beginning to question why this country should continue to send about \$100 million in aid to Peru every year when the country has no respect for our laws. I will continue to raise a question in Congress and remind my colleagues that Ambassador Luna could not care less about the U.S. Congress.

Mr. Speaker, on this 1-year anniversary of Jennifer Davis's arrest, I call on the Government of Peru to start treating prisoners like humans and start respecting the right to due process of law. I call on the United States Secretary of State to personally bring this important matter to the highest officials in Peru.

EMBASSY OF PERU,
Washington, DC, June 17, 1997.

Mr. THOMAS W. EWING,
Member of Congress, Rayburn House Office
Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN EWING: I refer to your letter requesting a meeting for June 19th in order to discuss the cases of Ms. Jennifer Davis and Ms. Krista Barnes, two American citizens who were detained in Peru with 6.4 Kgs. of cocaine.

Although I appreciate your kind invitation, I must remind you that this is an internal domestic matter that involves the Peruvian Judicial branch which is separate and independent from the Executive branch. Therefore, as the representative of the Head of State, and the Executive in particular, I am not authorized to discuss the issue with foreign authorities. All information I have about these cases has been provided to you and some of your colleagues in a letter dated June 9th.

Finally, I understand that on May 1st, you and the Congressional Caucus on Human Rights organized an informal conversation about prison conditions and the judicial system in Peru. This Embassy attended the meeting and presented an informal paper on the issue.

Sincerely yours,

RICHARDO V. LUNA,
Ambassador.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 16, 1997.

Ambassador RICARDO LUNA,
Embassy of Peru,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. AMBASSADOR: We are writing to respectfully request a meeting with you so that we may personally discuss the matter of two Americans being held at the Santa Monica de Chorillos women's prison in Peru, Ms. Jennifer Davis and Ms. Krista Barnes.

We have arranged our schedules to accommodate a meeting with you at 3:15 p.m. on Thursday, June 19 in the office of Rep. Ewing, 2417 Rayburn Building. We hope this time is convenient for you. Please let us know as soon as possible whether you will be able to participate in this meeting by contacting Eric Nicoll in the office of Rep. Ewing at 225-2371.

Other members of Congress have expressed an interest in this case and may participate in this meeting. We will provide you with a list of attendees prior to the meeting. Thank you very much for your continued attention

to this matter and we look forward to meeting with you.

Sincerely,

THOMAS W. EWING,
Member of Congress.
RICHARD DURBIN,
U.S. Senator.
HENRY J. HYDE,
Member of Congress.

HOUSTON NEEDS NONSTOP SERVICE TO TOKYO

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

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, the United States is currently negotiating a new bilateral aviation agreement with Japan. It is vitally important that the United States press for the broadest possible agreement that would open up nonstop service to Tokyo from Houston, TX. Priority must be given first to providing service to those major U.S. cities, including Houston, that have no nonstop service to Tokyo at all currently.

There is ample traffic to support daily nonstop service between Houston and Tokyo. In addition, more competition is needed between new United States gateways and Japan rather than additional increased service from existing United States-Japan service points.

Why does Houston deserve nonstop service? Houston is the fourth largest city in the Nation and is a huge market which is currently unserved by nonstop service to Japan. The addition of nonstop air service will result in substantial economic benefit to Houston as it would increase annual output by over \$800 million, provide over 5,600 new jobs, and increase incomes in Houston by \$170 million.

Here are more facts to back up this argument. Houston is the largest city in the United States without nonstop service to Tokyo. Houston is also the second largest United States metropolitan area in terms of Asian population that does not have single plane service to Asia. Houston is the second largest international traffic gateway without single plane service to Asia.

Two hundred seventy-three Houston firms currently trade goods and services with Japan. Nearly 540 other Houston companies do business with East Asia as a whole, including Japan. Japanese companies have almost 90 subsidiaries in Houston as well as the largest concentration of Japanese specialty chemical companies outside of Japan. That is also in Houston. Houston is the Nation's second leading city for international business.

I am proud to have joined the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER], the chairman, and my other Houston colleagues in a letter to the President earlier this year on this issue. As negotiations continue with Japan, consideration should be given to the fact that new service between unserved United

States cities and Japan is more competitive and more preferable than additional service from cities that already have service to Japan.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I thank the gentleman from Texas, particularly for his effort. I simply want to join in his remarks and acknowledge as a representative for the downtown business community one of the strains on expanding business and expanding trade is a lack of a direct route from Houston to Tokyo. I would encourage the negotiators to seriously look at the importance of the fourth largest city in the Nation having a direct route from Houston to Tokyo, and particularly with respect to Continental Airlines and other airlines that are looking at that issue.

Mr. GREEN. In reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, and I know it is a bipartisan effort by both Republicans and Democrats, because I am honored to represent the Intercontinental Airport now that the Federal court saw fit last year to give it to me from district 18, having lived there for many years. It is important to the whole business community and all of Houston because of the port and the trade we already do with Japan to have that nonstop service. I hope those negotiators understand that.

MONTANA MINING DISPUTE

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, I rise this evening to tell a story to my colleagues about a place called Cooke City, MT. Cooke City, MT, is an isolated community in south central Montana. It is located about 3 miles northeast of Yellowstone Park. It is surrounded by a historical mining district where there has been active mining for well over 100 years. It also happens to be the home of a place called the New World Mine.

Some of my colleagues might recognize the name the New World Mine. On October 12, 1996, a little over a year ago, President Clinton announced that he had entered into an agreement with a foreign mining company and an environmental community to stop the process of proceeding with the development of a new gold mine at the site of the New World Mine. He did so based upon concerns that had been raised by members of the environmental community that mining at that site might pose some risk to Yellowstone Park. However, in the process of interrupting the process of the mine, the President also interrupted the environmental impact statement that would have given us for certain an understanding of what the real risks would have been. So in secret the President, a foreign mining

company and an environmental community agreed to give away 65 million dollars' worth of public land in Montana in exchange for this mine.

Mr. Speaker, that created outrage in Montana. Sportsmen's groups and environmentalists expressed outrage because Montanans feel great attachment to the public land. They hunt, they fish, they hike, they pick berries, they camp. Mr. Speaker, many of them actually make their living on public lands.

Sensing that outrage, the President changed his mind, and he decided instead of 65 million dollars' worth of public land, he would take \$100 million out of the Conservation Reserve Program from Montana and give that to this mining company instead. That created outrage, Mr. Speaker. Farmers, environmentalists and sportsmen, all of whom believe greatly in the Conservation Reserve Program, expressed their outrage.

So then the President said no, he wanted \$65 million from the Congress. And Congress said, whoa, wait a minute.

There are three big problems, Mr. Speaker, with the President's plan. First, the White House forgot about Montana. The General Accounting Office just issued a report that said that Montana is going to lose 466 jobs, \$45 million in revenues. In fact, local Park County will lose \$1.2 million in revenues in the first 5 years.

The second problem is that we have discovered the mine was not an asset, but rather a liability. There are serious water quality problems arising out of previous mining activities, and the President has proposed that the taxpayers assume those liabilities.

But, Mr. Speaker, the really big problem with this deal was that we found out that the mining company did not own the ore. There is a lady by the name of Margaret Reeb, who lives in Livingston, MT, whose mother was the first woman in the Cooke City mining camp, who over the years has acquired those mining claims, and she owns the ore. The problem was she was not consulted, she was not asked, she never signed. Margaret owns the asset.

Mr. Speaker, when the White House was asked about this, what will happen if Margaret Reeb does not want to sell her ore, which she said she does not, the White House said, "Well, there's more than one way to skin a cat." Mr. Speaker, we do not call it cat skinning in Montana, we call it claim jumping. It is wrong in Washington, and it is wrong in Montana.

Now the President has said that if we do not give him a blank check in the Interior appropriations bill, he is going to veto the Interior appropriations bill. What do we do? Some people say we should just walk away from this deal. Others say that we should just give the President the \$65 million and forget about it.

I think both of those options are wrong. I think that we have an obliga-

tion, Mr. Speaker, to pay a mining company for what its real interest and the real value of its assets are. I think we have an obligation, Mr. Speaker, to protect Margaret Reeb and her private property rights. I think we have an obligation, Mr. Speaker, to make whole the State of Montana by replacing the minerals that will be withdrawn with other minerals that might be developed. And so I have offered a fair proposal, a proposal that will protect those property rights, that will reimburse the State of Montana, and will help that local community that is isolated and needs those jobs and that economic impact.

I would hope that my colleagues will help me in trying to convince the President that there is a fairer plan than stealing Margaret Reeb's property rights. There is a fairer plan than denying Montana the jobs and the economic opportunities.

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

[Mr. MARTINEZ addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extension of Remarks.]

THE DEFICIT AND THE DEBT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN] is recognized for half the time until midnight, 40 minutes, as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to talk about the good news that we can bring from Washington, D.C., for a change and how much things have changed from the past to where we stand today.

I think to start this discussion, it would make sense that we talk about the difference between debt and deficit, much like folks in their own home understand the difference between a checkbook and borrowing a mortgage on a home. When we talk about the deficit in this Nation, what we are talking about is the amount of money that our Federal Government borrows each year more than what it takes in. That is how much it spends out of its checkbook each year more than what it takes in. That is the deficit. So the amount they overdraw their checkbook, it is not a lot different than in our own home. If you overdraw your checkbook, that is called a deficit.

What our Government does each year after they overdraw their checkbook is they go out and borrow money to make their checks good. When they borrow money, of course, each year, that amount that they have borrowed keeps adding up and up and up.

This chart I have brought with me tonight shows how the debt has been growing facing this Nation. As a matter of fact, in 1995 when I took office