

colleagues and ask them to join me in the effort to repeal the AMT on individuals by co-sponsoring this bill.

APRIL IS PREVENTION OF
CRUELTY TO ANIMALS MONTH

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1999

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, April is Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Month. At this time each year, parents, teachers, and humane educators in small towns and large cities across America teach young people to take proper care of their family cats and dogs. They also teach them to spay and neuter their pets to prevent unwanted litters. The American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals has for more than 130 years taught us and our children these important lessons. Today, I ask the Congress to join with families, educators, veterinarians, and fine organizations such as the Prevent-a-Litter Coalition and the ASPCA, in urging the Postmaster General to issue a spay/neuter stamp so that this important message will appear on millions of pieces of mail in the year 2000. Millions of stamps means millions of messages, which will save millions of lives.

Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Month is also a most appropriate time, Mr. Speaker, for all of us in the Congress to support pending legislation which will help alleviate pain, fear and suffering in animals. I urge my colleagues to support HR 443, The Downed Animal Protection Act, which would require the euthanization at stockyards, feedlots, and auctions, of farm animals such as cows, pigs and sheep, if they have been so badly injured or weakened they can no longer walk on their own. I also urge for HR 453, the Pet Safety and Protection Act, which would make it more difficult for family pets to be stolen and illegally sold to research facilities. More and more of our constituents are writing and asking for improvements in the way animals are treated. Accordingly, supporting humane legislation is a wonderful opportunity for all of us to be responsive to the American public in a positive, bipartisan way.

HONORING AND ANSWERING THE
FOURTH DISTRICT OF COLORADO

HON. BOB SCHAFFER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1999

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about Colorado's Fourth Congressional District and the opinions of my constituents concerning the direction their country is taking. Recently, I surveyed thousands of citizens about issues important to them. I would like to report to you the results of that opinion survey.

The survey asked, "What is the single most important issue facing our country today?" Respondents came back with a whole host of answers including tax relief, preserving social security, need for an effective missile defense system, the failing farm economy, too much

government, high taxes, improving our children's education, etc. But the prevailing concern is a "lack of moral leadership," "honesty," "corrupt administration," "moral deterioration," "decline in ethics and morals," and "moral decay." This message was repeated over and over again. The people of Colorado understand the qualities our Founding Fathers identified in order to continue the stability of our Republic, requiring the cultivation of personal morality and responsibility, and courage to stand up for those values.

The number concerned for our country's moral leadership was followed closely by their outrage over President Clinton's decision to involve the U.S. military in Kosovo. Folks support a strong military but they urged our troops' return from the civil dispute in Kosovo. To date, I have heard from no one supporting this recent military venture of the President's.

The second question asked, "What is the single most important issue to you or your family?" The answers to this question mirrored those they believe are important to the country. They are demanding honorable and moral leadership of this country, believing it will cause a renewal of responsibility, morality and liberty in our society.

The survey continued, asking what people think is the biggest challenge for our schools. Responses included funds not reaching the classrooms; class sizes too big; worries over drugs and violence; Federal Government involvement in our local schools; lack of discipline and parental involvement; curriculum not teaching the basics; ridding the classrooms of the teachers union; need for school choice; and demand for more local control. While the concerns are varied, it is unanimous that people are concerned about the quality of education their children are receiving.

Fourth District Coloradans, more than two-to-one, oppose partial birth abortions and overwhelmingly oppose second amendment gun rights being restricted. But, perhaps the most compelling and almost unanimous response comes in support of requiring Congress to balance the budget and reform taxes.

The 105th Congress provided Americans with the first balanced Federal budget and the first budget surplus since 1969. Since the Republican Congress proved we can balance the budget, people want us to ensure we will balance the budget permanently. It is for this reason I am proud to sponsor H.J. Res. 1, the Balanced Budget Amendment Resolution of 1999. With a permanently balanced budget, the Federal Government will be forced to prioritize money for programs important to Coloradans.

Respondents differ on whether a flat tax or consumption tax would be best, but folks are almost unanimous in believing the IRS tax code should be abolished and Americans given much-needed tax relief. Without exception, no one asked for new taxes or new government programs.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for the response I received to the opinion survey. I shall consider this valuable input and share it with colleagues. Americans should keep in close touch with their elected officials. This way, we as public servants know our every move is being watched, and the measurement of our achievement depends upon the betterment of their life, and that of their families.

REGULATORY FAIRNESS AND
OPENNESS ACT OF 1999

HON. ALLEN BOYD

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1999

Mr. BOYD. Mr. Speaker, crop protection tools are necessary for family farmers to provide a safe and reliable food supply to the consumer and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) must use sound science to evaluate and determine which products are dependable and safe. If this is not accomplished, safe and useful crop protection products will be unavailable for use by the family farmer and the quality and affordability of wholesome food supply will be jeopardized.

For this reason, I joined several of my colleagues today in introducing the Regulatory Fairness and Openness Act of 1999. This bipartisan legislation will give EPA the ability to address potential problems with the registration and re-registration processes for crop protection tools during the implementation of the Food Quality Protection Act of 1996. This bill ensures that the EPA has the capability to adequately evaluate and analyze all available, accessible data and information and to use the best science to determine which crop protection tools will be available for the family farmer. This Act does not change the FQPA standards for pesticide evaluations, it clarifies the processes employed for evaluation in order to allow for full and scientifically correct compliance with the requirements of the FQPA.

Without the Regulatory and Openness Act of 1999, many crop protection tools will be eliminated for use by agriculture, putting the farmers in the United States at a competitive disadvantage with foreign imports. These imports do not have to meet the strict regulatory requirements that our farmers must follow.

Further, if the EPA eliminates crop protection tools without allowing time for the development of new alternatives, family farmers will lose crops to pest infestations and the consumer will lose the quality and quantity of food available to them. This bill encourages and supports research into expanded information gathering on the use of crop protection tools and research into the development of new alternatives for managing pests in agriculture.

I urge my colleagues to support this very important legislation. The Regulatory Fairness and Openness Act of 1999 is important not only for agricultural America, but for all Americans. Through complete and thorough risk assessments of crop protection tools using actual and relevant data and sound science, the EPA and family farmers can continue to provide our country's citizens with the safest, most abundant food supply in the world.

THOUGHTS ON KOSOVO

HON. MARSHALL "MARK" SANFORD

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1999

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share with you thoughts on Kosovo from a friend back home, retired Vice Admiral Al Baciocco. His insight as a military man speaks

powerfully to the U.S. actions in the Balkans. I hope we will take the time to think through the lucid thoughts he offers.

To: HON. MARK SANFORD

From: Al Baciocco, VADM, USN (Ret), 747 Pitt Street, Mt. Pleasant, SC

DEAR MARK: As you reconvene in Washington, DC, and begin debate on many important issues, I hope that you will consider the current KOSOVO situation an issue of critical and major National Security importance. I have taken the liberty of providing you a copy of an item I wrote to other senior retired military friends a few days ago, reflecting on my feelings about this engagement we have become involved in. I have also provided a copy of one of the responses, this one especially poignant, which I received from other retired senior Admirals. I thought these items might be of interest to you—and perhaps useful in guiding your thoughts.

My somewhat wordy epistle follows:

"To all of John's (and my) Friends—

I worry that I am somewhere out in left field on this Kosovo disaster that we seem to be marching further into, despite continued opportunities for someone (anyone!) to speak up and bring the country to its senses! What we hear and see the Serb military and their leadership engaged in is grossly, morally wrong—beyond the limits of civilized toleration! Given that, it is correct that the United States and the rest of the civilized world be engaged in correcting this outrage—politically, at least; militarily, if necessary! However, the actual endeavor in which we are currently engaged—and the manner in which we have chosen (or allowed ourselves to be eased into) to carry out this endeavor is troubling.

Despite my long professional association with and personal respect for NATO—a mutual defense alliance with a proven track record for deterring aggression—I anguish that we are now engaged in a rather ambiguous mission to "deter with destruction" and to "punish" an offending European leader who clearly has no moral conscience or standards of conduct, with the United States virtually abdicating its visible position of leadership and allowing itself to be represented by a European (NATO) presence, with political and military leadership only vaguely understood by the American people and demonstrating only rather vague definition, judgment and experience. I am offended to find that briefings and statements describing this very dangerous situation are being provided by "glib" NATO political and military "spokesman", not by the elected and/or appointed, potentially-respected ranking officials of the United States. Granted, we have allowed ourselves to become involved and engaged in this NATO (European) show—albeit with some 75-80% of the resources, combat troops, munitions, and "target for ultimate blame" provided by the United States—but, in fact this engagement is truly in the vital National Security interests of the United States of America, then the nation should hear this from its leaders, both political and military, every hour and every day of its duration. We must clearly understand why we are there; we must clearly be on the field exercising bold and realistic military judgment and direction; and we must be willing, in fact, must demand—through our processes—that our national leaders, both political and military, act and be held accountable for their Constitutional and moral responsibilities!

I am deeply troubled and honestly quite offended as an American that we are expected to feel good about seeing our forces calmly (and quite professionally) go about launching cruise missiles and bombs, however accu-

rately guided, against what is perceived by the world as—and in fact, is—a fundamentally civilian infrastructure of a small, rather poor country—albeit led by a ruthless thug! We have seen this happen before in recent months—most of the time with ambiguous results, at best. All too often today, the general populace and the media seem to view the deployment and use of such military force with the same interest, fascination and concern as they view a "video game"! In my view, cruise missiles are becoming—perhaps have become—"TOO EASY" to use! Their use does not demonstrate a clear commitment of our nation's soul—and a clear commitment to the fray of a nation's soul is the only sign that history demonstrates will deter and influence a tyrant to quickly stand down from his adventure.

The National Soul is demonstrated by a willingness to commit "warriors" to the field, and to shed the blood of our young, if necessary, to achieve justice, freedom and what is morally right! Our nation was founded on these principles—and they should be overlooked, blurred, or discarded only at our peril. None of us were brought up believing that we were a nation that was capricious in the use of our military might. We were brought up as, and are a nation and a people of justice, of honesty, of principle founded on high moral ground! Have all of our men and women in positions of leadership and responsibility within our political and military hierarchy forgotten this? Has "political correctness" clouded their recall of history and our heritage, their judgment, and their courage?

We should answer the question as to the fundamental importance to the United States of America of the current situation and of our current endeavor in the Balkans. If the answer clearly measures up to the standards and principles our nation stands for, then we should openly, proudly and aggressively take the political and military lead, and complete the task—however long it takes—with our Soul and our "warriors" fully committed! If it does not, we should depart the field!

So much for "Views from the Low Country"! I hope my stream of consciousness (and conscience) is not too far off the mark!

Warm regards,

AL"

The response from another retired senior Admiral follows:

"Dear Al,

Right on the mark in my opinion. I share your views and I believe that a large number of the active duty senior leadership does as well. The military power of our country is being applied to solve the world's humanitarian problems and we are creating more problems in the process. The United States of America is no longer perceived as a protector of freedom, but it is now an enforcer of "our way of life." The image of the GI slogging through the mud or riding in the back of a jeep sharing some candy with the children of a devastated community has been replaced with cruise missiles launched from ships that are 500 miles away or from aircraft that nobody ever sees.

We need to stop this madness and return to the values that have made this country great. Tom Brokaw's book, *The Greatest Generation*, talks about these values and the

men and women who not only believed in these values, but lived them as well.

Best regards,"

WE NEED TO DEFEND OUR FREEDOM

HON. BOB SCHAFFER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1999

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I have addressed this Congress a number of times regarding the very real and serious threat our country faces from ballistic missile attack. Very few citizens realize our nation, the world's only superpower, could not stop one single ballistic missile from striking American soil today. This is not due to a lack of technological capability, but rather, is a direct result of President Clinton's deliberate policy of vulnerability.

I have frequently and consistently engaged the President and his administration on this issue because I believe it is one of the most important ones facing our nation. No other issue deals so directly with the security and future of our democracy than one which concerns the very defense of our territory and our citizenry.

Today, I responded rather directly to a letter I received from Lieutenant General Lester L. Lyles, Director of the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization (BMDO), on March 12, 1999. In his letter, General Lyles acknowledged the clear and present threat to our nation, but failed to contradict, even once, the policy of assured vulnerability established by the Clinton administration.

In composing this response, I consulted many colleagues who share my concerns. They have asked that the final draft be distributed to all Members.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I hereby submit for the RECORD, the full text of the letter I have today posted to General Lyles.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
April 15, 1999.

LT. GEN. LESTER L. LYLES,
*Director, Ballistic Missile Defense Organization,
Washington, DC*

DEAR GENERAL LYLES: Your letter of March 12, 1999, and Defense Secretary Cohen's January 20, 1999 remarks regarding our ballistic missile defense program have made clear to the Congress the reluctance of the Clinton administration to defend the American people from the growing threat of long-range ballistic missile attack. Despite the clear and growing threat posed by long-range ballistic missiles, Secretary Cohen cannot even admit the need to deploy a ballistic missile defense.

The threats are obvious and commanding. On August 31, 1998, North Korea successfully tested a ballistic missile capable of striking the United States. In July 1998, the Rumsfeld Commission issued an alarming and erudite warning on the threat and proliferation of ballistic missiles. In April 1998, Pakistan's test of an intermediate range ballistic missile set off the May 1998 nuclear arms testing race between India and Pakistan. In July 1998, Iran tested an intermediate range ballistic missile, a step in its program for building long-range ballistic missiles to attack the United States.

During 1998, we learned China has 13 long-range ballistic missiles aimed at various American cities. We also learned China is