

Smokies think it is huge. Yet I am talking about forests that cover more than 300 times the Great Smokies, and this does not count any of the land in our national parks or the land the Bureau of Land Management controls.

The Federal government owns over 30 percent of the land in this Nation today. State and local governments and quasi-governmental agencies own another 20 percent. Half of the land is in some type of public ownership.

What is most disturbing, though, is how government at all levels has been taking over private land at such a rapid rate in the last 30 years, and perhaps even more dangerous, putting so many rules, regulations, restrictions, and red tape on the shrinking amount of land that still remains in private lands today.

Yet, there are some of these environmental extremists who are not satisfied with half of the land and want even more.

There is something known as the Wildlands Project, which I first read about in the Washington Post, which advocates taking half the private land in the U.S. and placing it in public ownership.

This may sound OK until some bureaucrat comes and takes your home or your property.

Also, we could not emphasize enough that private property is one of the main keys to our freedom and our prosperity. It is one of the main things that has set us apart from countries like Russia and Cuba and other socialist or communist nations.

These national forests are not national monuments. They are natural resources, renewable resources.

Whenever some of these extremists are confronted by loggers who have lost jobs or communities that have been devastated, they always say just promote tourism.

Well tourism is an industry filled with minimum or low wage jobs. Even more importantly, it is just not possible to turn our whole country into tourist attractions or base our whole economy on tourism.

I know these environmental groups have to scare people and continually raise the bar so that their contributions will keep coming in.

I know, too, that many big companies, and particularly big multi-national corporations are helped by extreme environmental rules because they drive so many small and medium-sized businesses out of business or force them to merge. So many contributors for these groups come from these big companies, often headquartered in other countries.

But, Mr. Speaker, if we want to continue having a strong economy, with good jobs and half-way reasonable prices, and especially if we want to have a free country, we must use our natural resources in an environmentally balanced way.

We cannot stop cutting trees, digging for coal, and drilling for oil and continue to have the good life that we fortunately enjoy today.

LIVABLE COMMUNITIES AND SAFETY FOR PEDESTRIANS

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. Mr. Speaker, my goal in Congress is for the Federal government to be a better partner in making our communities more livable, to make our families safe, healthy, and economically secure.

One of the indicator species of a livable community is the pedestrian. Earlier this week, people in Montgomery County were shocked, I am sure, to read that in their community pedestrian deaths were as high as homicides. In 1998 and 1999, 25 people were killed in pedestrian accidents, the same as those that were killed in homicides.

Really, this is not news. The statistics are that Americans are 160 percent more likely to be killed by a car than to be shot and killed by a stranger. It is the equivalent of an airline crash every 2 weeks in this country, and for every person who is killed, there are another 20 who are injured; 6,000 dead in all, and 110,000 injured.

The seniors of our community are at the highest risk, almost twice as likely to be killed or injured. Walking for them is more important, not just as a form of exercise, but it is an important part of their transportation system, because many of them no longer drive.

Mr. Speaker, it is important because everyone at some point in their journey is a pedestrian. But there are lessons to be learned from our experience. We are finding that some of the sprawling unplanned communities that are primarily auto-oriented are the most dangerous places for people to walk, places like Fort Lauderdale and Miami; Atlanta, that we have talked a lot about on the floor of this House is sort of a poster child for unplanned growth and sprawled; and Tampa, St. Petersburg, and Dallas, Texas.

Ironically, many of the older, more pedestrian-oriented are the safest. Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, by one account, is the safest place to walk in America.

It does not have to be this way. There are opportunities for us to plan for people, not just for cars; to put uses closer together, not mandate that they be separated from where people work, where they live, and where they shop.

The Federal government itself can be a partner by not taking an historic Post Office in downtown small town America and locating it by a strip mall out at the edge of town without even paved sidewalks.

There is a whole philosophy that has developed, an engineering approach that is called "traffic calming" that we had great success with in our community in Portland, Oregon, to be able to make a difference for the way that people live.

The Federal government in the ISTEA-T-21 legislation has set aside significant funds for traffic safety, but sadly, many of the States are not using those resources in ways that will make pedestrians safe. Fourteen percent of all motor vehicle-related deaths are pe-

destrians, yet only 1 percent of the highway safety money from the Federal government is used for pedestrian safety.

It is important for us to use the tools that we have available, that we are sensitive to putting people into the planning process to make our communities more livable and make our families safer, healthier, and economically secure.

KOSOVO AND BOSNIA

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago the United States and many of our NATO allies were engaged in an air campaign against Yugoslav forces. Next month will mark the 1-year anniversary of the agreement providing for the withdrawal of Yugoslavian troops from Kosovo and the deployment of international peacekeeping forces.

Mr. Speaker, it is vital that we not forget the American troops who continue to languish in Kosovo, or those in Bosnia, and other fellow citizens scattered throughout the world on various deployments. We should also consider the cost of these deployments both in dollars and in reduction of our military capability.

President Clinton's decision to attack Yugoslavia and to maintain peacekeeping forces in Kosovo were based upon the mistaken notion that military forces can turn ethnic and religious hatred into peaceful coexistence.

As a participant in the Kosovo peacekeeping operation known as KFOR, the United States has 5,000 troops in Kosovo, 450 in Macedonia, and 10 in Greece. While working to achieve this harmony, U.S. troops have been fired upon and assaulted in many instances.

Census figures collected by the U.N. High Commission for Refugees and the Yugoslavian government indicate that 93 percent of the population of Kosovo is ethnic Albanians now and 5 percent Serbs. In essence, American troops are in Kosovo to protect the Serbs from an angry majority. This makes the President's plan to build a peaceful, multi-ethnic state all the more daunting.

This situation begs the question, when will our troops leave Kosovo? If the Clinton administration has its way, the answer is, no time soon. All we need to do is to look at Bosnia to explain this conclusion.

Remember Bosnia? In 1996, the United States sent 16,500 troops to Bosnia and some 6,000 support troops to neighboring nations. The President stated that the deployment would last about 1 year. Mr. Speaker, the troops are still there, and the administration has requested \$1.4 billion for the next fiscal year to continue this 1-year mission to Bosnia.

Mr. Speaker, it seems that much the same is expected for Kosovo. Two

American camps in that region are being expanded to house and support American soldiers for at least 3 to 5 more years.

More troubling is the assessment of the top U.S. commander in Kosovo. According to the Boston Globe, that commander, Brigadier General Sanchez, stated that the mission will require NATO peacekeepers to remain there for at least a generation. Can we expect some of these NATO troops to be American?

We should also consider the cost of these deployments. Up to last year, \$9.08 billion has been appropriated for Bosnia operations. With the expenditure for this fiscal year and the next, the Bosnian mission will accumulate costs exceeding \$12 billion.

According to the Department of Defense, the Kosovo operation costs \$3 billion last year, and the estimate for FY 2000 is about \$2 billion. Our peacekeeping operation in the Balkans is approaching \$20 billion in total expenses.

In reading a Heritage Foundation report on this issue, I discovered that "The Pentagon believes that it missed its procurement targets for the past 5 years because of unexpected costs associated with the military operations in Kosovo and Bosnia."

This means that we have not met our goals for modernizing our weaponry because of our peacekeeping operations in the Balkans. By making Bosnia and Kosovo safer for their citizens, we have made America less safe for our citizens. Is that really the policy results this administration is seeking?

Congress must take steps to ensure that America's national security interests are paramount in conducting our military and diplomatic missions.

CHINA TRADE

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

Mr. PASCARELL. Mr. Speaker, this morning I would like to address something we started to talk about last evening, and that is the vote we will be taking probably tomorrow on China and our trade relations with China.

The minority leader wrote a book last year, *An Even Better Place, America in the 21st Century*, where he dismissed as ludicrous the contention that expanded trade fosters democracy in China. "America has to stand for something more than money," the Minority Leader said, and I agree with him wholeheartedly.

It seems to sum up what we have been saying, we opponents. We are not or do not wish to cut off relationships with China and the Chinese people. In fact, our argument is not with the Chinese people, our argument is with the authoritarian government which has tortured, which has beaten down any dissidents, any opposition.

Strictly on the issue of security, the proponents of permanent trade relations with China, normal relationships, whatever we wish to call them, they have been talking first about the jobs that would be created, and then when they could not win that battle, they switched to the issue of national security.

Three points.

My main thrust is jobs this morning. We know that in these past 10 years, China has targeted up to 18 intercontinental ballistic missiles at the United States.

Two, during this same period of time, we signed an export control waiver which allowed the top campaign fund-raisers in aerospace companies to transfer sensitive missile guidance technology to China.

Number three, during the same period we shifted the prime satellite export responsibility from the State Department to the Commerce Department. In the sequel to "sleeping with the enemy," I would imagine this is pretty consistent. This in no way is going to strengthen the security of the United States. This deal is a bad deal.

The worst part of the deal is for the American workers. As China seeks entry to the World Trade Organization, and as our trade deficit with China soars to record heights, \$70 billion by the end of this year, at least, our manufacturing jobs are being sucked from our shores away from our workers.

This is critical to understand, because if we are not going to help produce more jobs in America and sustain the economy, the robust economy that we have, then where will jobs be created, if not in America? These jobs are going to places like China, where there is no regard for labor, where there is no regard for human safety, and where there is no regard for environmental or health standards.

I find that it is best to take a step back and look at exactly what is happening. Granting PNTR to China would strip America's ability to keep check on the Communist regime. Granting PNTR to China says that China has gained our trust and approval, and I would be saying that I believe this trade deal is the best thing for the people of my district.

But as I mentioned last night, I did have a nightmare on Thursday evening, after standing with the 60 dissidents east of the Capitol here. I dreamt with horror that there was an uprising in China, as there are many dissidents who are afraid to speak up at this moment, and that this great country, this pillar of democracy in the world, the greatest democracy that the world has ever known, stood alongside of the authoritarian, totalitarian Chinese government to put this insurrection down. That is a horror show.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to start by thanking my colleague from Oregon, Mr. DEFazio, for his tremendous leadership, in standing up for working people worldwide. I am pleased to join him here today.

There is a reason that the proponents of this flawed deal have been touting the national security and "theoretical" reform benefits they see in this package. Because they know that the argument that this bill is good for our working families is just plain wrong!

As China seeks entry to the World Trade Organization, and as our trade deficit with China soars to record heights, our manufacturing jobs are being sucked from our shores, away from our workers.

Those jobs are going to places like China where there is no regard for labor, safety, environmental or health standards.

When dealing with issues such as this, I find that it is best to take a step back and look at exactly what we are doing. What does this vote mean?

Day after day I try to work with firms, be they manufacturing, or textile, or other small businesses, to see what I can do to assist the business in reaching its fullest potential.

How can I vote on Wednesday to send these businesses and jobs overseas?

Normal Trade Relations? This does not seem normal to me!

I cannot stress enough, the mistake we will make by passing this bill later this week. I understand that unemployment is at its lowest, and that the economy is soaring.

But workers are making less money than ever. After NAFTA, we saw tens of thousands of good jobs, with benefits, and security go South to Mexico. What has increased has been the number of temporary workers. Companies have been hiring people to work full time jobs, without health plans, without protections, not on salary.

The bottom line is that this is not a government in China that we have been able to trust. It has broken every commitment it has made with the United States of America.

It has broken every trade agreement it has signed with the United States over the past 10 years.

Supporters of PNTR claim that China will buy our imports. But I do not see the infrastructure or the wealth in China to accept any substantial amount of American merchandise. Business does not want to sell cars to China, they want to build cars in China.

Over the past ten years, our trade deficit with China has ballooned from 7 billion dollars to 70 billion dollars! There is currently a 6-to-1 ratio of imports to exports.

Supporters of this flawed bill claim that we need PNTR to see our economy grow. That fact is however, that China has had NTR over the past twenty years, and things continue to get worse. We are taking a bad deal and making it permanent.

In the United States, we have seen a dangerous shift from a production to service based economy. This deal threatens the tremendous creative spirit of our nation with the prospect of exploitation overseas.

I will not vote for a proposal that is downright dangerous to our society at large.

We can and will not surrender our manufacturing base, our production, our jobs.

Manufacturing is tremendously important to my district. There are 1,114 manufacturing firms who employ 57,000 workers in the Eighth District, and these firms are critical to our infrastructure.

Granting PNTR to China would strip America's ability to keep check on the communist regime in China. Granting PNTR to China