

seems that the more time passes, the more troops we lose and the more questions surface about the current program.

The relationship between the Department of Defense and BioPort, the only company that produces the anthrax vaccine, is beginning to draw concerns. BioPort is not even licensed by the Food and Drug Administration to manufacture the anthrax vaccination. Now despite its financial failings, the Department of Defense has doubled the amount of its original contract with BioPort. This aspect of the program alone has caused concerns among those who must take the shot.

Madam Speaker, the need to protect our United States military from potential chemical and biological warfare is critical, but we cannot accept the risk of exposure as the only reason to mandate the shot and ignore the lack of information on the long-term safety of the vaccine. If the anthrax vaccine is safe and can effectively combat the threat of anthrax for our military, the Pentagon has failed to convince the very people it is trying to protect. The questions being raised are serious, legitimate questions that must be addressed in order to ensure our military receives the answers it needs.

I introduced legislation this summer to make the current anthrax vaccine program voluntary. My colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), introduced a bill to institute a moratorium on the program until more testing can determine it is long-term safety.

Madam Speaker, we are becoming more reliant upon our reserve force to help defend the security and interests of this Nation. If these men and women are concerned that the shot is unsafe, the morale and readiness of our military is severely threatened. Then we stand to lose more of the bright, capable, and trained individuals who represent the very strength of the country. I cannot stand by and watch this happen.

Let me assure our men and women in the military that I will continue with my colleagues to pursue the issue until we can be sure that the anthrax vaccine is safe, effective and necessary.

#### THE POST OFFICE COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased by the national attention to ways to make our communities more livable by this I mean our families safe, healthy, and economically secure; and ways to give our citizens a real voice in the decisions that impact their communities; and a special emphasis on simple, low-tech, low-cost but high impact solutions.

The Federal Government can make a huge difference in the liveability of our

communities without new rules, regulations, fees and taxes for Americans and business. We can do so by having the Federal Government simply lead by example; work that is being done by the General Services Administration, for instance, and how they manage over 300 million square feet of office space in our inventory. Another area with tremendous potential is the Post Office which touches over 40,000 different areas across the country and more Americans six times a week.

Momentum is growing with over 100 House cosponsors for H.R. 670, the Post Office Community Partnership Act. Last week before the Senate Government Affairs Committee, there was a hearing, and I could not agree more with the testimony provided by the National Association of Home Builders. They stated, and I quote: As home builders, our members abide by local zoning, permit, and building code laws in order to develop responsibly and preserve the integrity of communities. The United States Postal Service, however, is currently not required to adhere to State or local codes when relocating, closing, consolidating, or constructing facilities.

This noncompliance undermines the economic and social well-being of communities by permitting the Post Office to build new facilities or modify existing facilities without regard to local plans for growth or traffic management, environmental protection, and public safety. The National Association of Home Builders strongly believes that the Federal Government should follow the same rules as it expects the American public. That is why we support the Post Office Community Partnership Act.

I could have quoted from similar testimony from the Sierra Club, sort of a strange partnership that we do not see too often between the home builders and the Sierra Club, or a coalition composed of the National Association of Counties, League of Cities, Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers, Conference of Mayors, Preservation Action, American Planning Association and the International Downtown Association, the National Trust for Historic Preservation and the National Alliance of Preservation Commissions. They stated as recently as last year the Post Office attempted to evade local clean water standards in Tallahassee, Florida and ignore local laws put in place in Ball Ground, Georgia, which were an attempt to meet Federal clean air standards. These actions would be criminal if they were attempted by a private company but are merely shameful when pursued by the Postal Service.

Comedian Lilly Tomlin's annoying and sadistic telephone operator, Ernestine, made popular the notion we do not care because we do not have to, we are the phone company. Well, the laughter that that provided was a bit bittersweet in part because of the grain of truth that was embedded. In today's competitive world with higher citizen expectations, it is time for the Post Of-

fice to care because they want to and because they have to start leading by example.

I strongly urge my colleagues to join me and over 140 House cosponsors of H.R. 670, the Post Office Community Partnership Act.

#### SAY NO TO COMMUNIST CHINA'S ENTRY INTO THE WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Madam Speaker, who is watching out for America? That is the question of the day. Supposedly that is our first responsibility as elected officials, watching out for the United States of America. Today, however, too many Americans with power and influence do not consider watching out for our country's interests and the well-being of our people to be their priority. Today we constantly hear about globalism, and we constantly hear the words world economy as if the development of this new world order is the goal of America's leadership. Madam Speaker, that is their goal, and sometimes that goal is antithetical to the best interests of the people of the United States. But our leaders move forward blithely as if they are part of an altruistic historic movement in which leaders throughout the planet are shepherding all of human kind into a homogenous world.

It is not working according to plan. The world is not becoming this one world place where idealism reigns and people are acting together in a peaceful manner and an honest manner. It just does not seem to be acting according to their plan. The dream of our globalists is becoming a nightmare, especially for the national security interests of the American people and the potential for the spread of real democracy and individual liberty throughout a substantial portion of this planet.

One of the problems the globalist dreamers in the United States refuse to acknowledge is that leaders of most of this world's power blocks are not playing the game. Surprise, surprise, surprise; those people, those leaders in other parts of the world, are basing their decisions on what is best for their own countries and their own peoples and not with some overall view of the planet.

America's relations with Communist China, with the Communist Chinese dictatorship, is a disgrace. It is a total rejection of the ideals upon which our country is founded, but again reflect the ideas that are the basis of our decision-making towards China. The fact that we have treated China in a way in order to harmonize our relations with the world with a new world order in order to make China part of a world

trading organization, the fact that we have treated them in this way, which is often quite irrational for the moment, has this made us and made the world any more prosperous? Has it made peace any more likely? Is China any closer to democratic reform?

The answer is no, no, no; and yet we still have people here who are pushing to put China into the World Trade Organization, the equivalent of putting the local Chicago gangster into the Chamber of Commerce hoping that that would change that gangster's ways. Well, we do not need Al Capone in the Chamber of Commerce, and we do not need Communist China in an organization that will make the decisions about trade and commerce the production of wealth throughout the world.

But even our relations with our democratic European allies are working against us with China, with our relations with China because we have had a decision-making process based on some sort of global concepts rather than the interests of the United States. The people of the United States are being put at a disadvantage by trade and our national security is being gravely threatened.

□ 1245

But as I say, even our relations with our democratic European allies are working against the interests of the American people. Because as much as America's elite refuses to recognize it, our European friends are watching out for their own interests. They are not watching out for us; they are not watching out for the world. Our European allies are treating us like we are suckers, and, of course, we are.

Through NATO, we are subsidizing the defense of a portion of this planet that has a higher standard of living and higher gross national product than our own. We are fighting their battles. And, while we give most-favored-nation status to developing countries like China, and actually to the detriment of our own people, our European allies through the European Union are raping other countries, other developing countries, especially in Eastern Europe.

Madam Speaker, I would suggest that we need a new way of thinking in Washington that watches out for the interests of the people of the United States.

#### LET US NOT REIGNITE THE ARMS RACE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARKEY. Madam Speaker, the American public deserves a full, deliberate, considered, informative debate on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. Instead, the Republican Senate is conducting a caricature of a debate structured to obscure understanding

and to maximize political gamesmanship by springing the subject on to the Senate calendar and forcing a momentous vote on a moment's notice.

The Republican leadership is giving jack-in-the-box treatment to the ultimate black box subject of nuclear annihilation. Where is the statesmanship? Where is the sober and solemn consideration of the special role that the United States must play in the stewardship of the world's nuclear stockpiles? If we rush to judgment, we will crush the confidence of our cosigners and spur the proliferation of nuclear weapons in an unpredictable world.

We must not reignite the arms race. We must not let the nuclear bull out of the ring to run wild through the streets of the world.

The Cold War is over. This is a time to de-alert and dismantle nuclear weapons. Instead, the Republican leadership is bent on destroying the treaty to control them. This is not brinkmanship; this is not statesmanship. This is irresponsibility on a global scale.

We no longer test nuclear weapons in the United States. George Bush stopped the nuclear testing. So if we are not going to test nuclear weapons in the United States, which we have not, why in the world should we not sign a treaty 7 years later that allows us to monitor every other country in the world to guarantee that they are not testing nuclear weapons?

Madam Speaker, the reality is that without this treaty there can be clandestine tests that allow other countries in the world to catch up with us. The signing of this treaty ensures that we have hundreds of monitoring devices around the world strategically placed to ensure that there is no testing because, in fact, the treaty mandates on-site inspection. That is right.

If we detect, through the seismological equipment or any other means, that there is a suspicious activity taking place in any country in the world, that country must allow us and the world to go in and to look at what they are doing, if they are testing. Then, the United States, which has decided unilaterally during the Bush administration, and has continued right through the Clinton years, not to test, will have the ability to ensure that there has been a technological homeostasis, a technological stay which has been put in place where we keep our lead.

Madam Speaker, there is no more important issue which we can debate than whether or not at the end of the millennium, the gift which we can give to the next millennium, is that we have resolved this issue of whether or not the countries of the world will continue to test nuclear weapons. The disease, the famine, the wars of this millennium should be something which we do not pass on to the next millennium.

We should be trying to find ways of ensuring that we are going to deal with the AIDS crisis in Africa. We should try to find ways in which we are going to deal with the debt crisis of the Third

World, and we should try to find some way in which we end the specter of nuclear weapons which has hung over this planet for the last 50 years of this millennium. There can be no more important issue.

So, Madam Speaker, let us hope that today in the Senate that enough Members stand up to be recognized in support of a treaty which will allow us to continue to spread a regime of controls which will limit, if not eliminate, the likelihood that we will face the day when we stand here and face the fact that a nuclear accident or a nuclear weapon was used.

The least that the Senate should be able to say, the least that all of us should be able to say when those nuclear weapons are about to be used is that we tried; we really tried to put an end to this nuclear threat which hangs over the world. Let us hope today that the United States Senate does the right thing.

#### CONGRESS MUST NOT ROLL BACK TRUCK INSPECTION SAFETY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. Madam Speaker, today I stand up for the 5,374 families who have lost loved ones in truck accidents last year, and to note that the Congress could be about ready to walk away from them. If we take a look at this photo, it is a photo of an accident involving a truck whereby individuals were seriously injured and perhaps killed.

This House voted overwhelmingly for the Transportation Appropriations Conference Report, which included a provision requiring change in the way the Federal Government conducts oversight of the trucking industry.

Each year, more and more commercial motor vehicles are driving more and more miles and more people are dying. Currently, these vehicles are involved in 13 percent of all traffic fatalities, even though they represent only 3 percent of all registered vehicles in the Nation. Whether one is concerned about this issue or not, I would hope that Congress would direct itself to what activity it may very well be unknowingly doing later on this afternoon.

Madam Speaker, 20 percent of the trucks on our roadways today, one in five are so unsafe that if they were stopped and inspected, they would be taken off the road. This problem is equally more serious at our southern borders where, on an average, 44 percent of these trucks are placed out of service. The Department of Transportation's IG has raised serious concerns about the vigor of our Nation's truck safety program. In the past 8 months, he has testified about the poor job that the Office of Motor Carriers has done to oversee truck safety. The Office of