

disposed leader of a sovereign country, could not be carried out without full U.S. military and financial support. Since we are the only world superpower, the U.N. court becomes our court under our control. But it is naive to believe our world superpower status will last forever. The precedence now being set will 1 day surely come back to haunt us.

The U.S. today may enjoy dictating policy to Yugoslavia and elsewhere around the world, but danger lurks ahead. The administration adamantly and correctly opposes our membership in the permanent International Criminal Court because it would have authority to exercise jurisdiction over U.S. citizens without the consent of the U.S. government. But how can we, with a straight face, support doing the very same thing to a small country, in opposition to its sovereignty, courts, and constitution. This blatant inconsistency and illicit use of force does not go unnoticed and will sow the seeds of future terrorist attacks against Americans or even war.

Money, as usual, is behind the Milosevic's extradition. Bribing Serbian Prime Minister Zoran Djindjic, a U.S.-sponsored leader, prompted strong opposition from Yugoslavian Prime Minister Zoran Zizic and Yugoslavian President Vojislav Kostunica.

A Belgrade historian, Aleksa Djilas, was quoted in *The New York Times* as saying: "We sold him for money, and we won't really get very much money for it. The U.S. is the natural leader of the world, but how does it lead? This justifies the worst American instincts, reinforcing this bullying mentality."

Milosevic obviously is no saint but neither are the leader of the Croates, the Albanians or the KLA. The NATO leaders who vastly expanded the death and destruction in Yugoslavia with 78 days of bombing in 1999 are certainly not blameless. The \$1.28 billion promised the puppet Yugoslavian government is to be used to rebuild the cities devastated by U.S. bombs. First, the American people are forced to pay to bomb, to kill innocent people and destroy cities, and then they are forced to pay to repair the destruction, while orchestrating a U.N. kangaroo court to bring the guilty to justice at the Hague.

For all this to be accepted, the press and internationalists have had to demonize Milosevic to distance themselves from the horrors of others including NATO.

NATO's air strikes assisted the KLA in cleansing Kosovo of Serbs in the name of assisting Albanian freedom fighters. No one should be surprised when that is interpreted to mean tacit approval for Albanian expansionism in Macedonia. While terrorist attacks by former members of the KLA against Serbs are ignored, the trial of the new millennium, the trial of Milosevic, enjoys daily support from the NATO-U.S. propaganda machine.

In our effort to stop an independent-minded and uncooperative with the

international community president of a sovereign country, U.S. policy was designed to support an equally if not worse organization, the KLA.

One of the conditions for ending the civil war in Kosovo was the disbanding of the KLA. But the very same ruthless leaders of the KLA, now the Liberation Army of Presovo, are now leading the insurrection in Macedonia without NATO lifting a finger to stop it. NATO's failed policy that precipitated the conflict now raging in Macedonia is ignored.

The U.N. War Tribunal in the Hague should insult the intelligence of all Americans. This court currently can only achieve arrest and prosecution of leaders of poor, small, or defeated nations. There will be no war criminals brought to the Hague from China, Russia, Britain, or the United States no matter what the charges. But some day this approach to world governing will backfire. The U.S. already has suffered the humiliation of being kicked off the U.N. Human Rights Commission and the Narcotics Control Commission. Our arrogant policy and attitude of superiority will continue to elicit a smoldering hatred toward us and out of sheer frustration will motivate even more terrorist attacks against us.

Realizing the weakness of the charges against Milosevic the court has quietly dropped the charges for committing genocide. In a real trial, evidence that the British and the United States actually did business with Milosevic would be permitted. But almost always, whoever is our current most hated enemy, has received help and assistance from us in the past. This was certainly the case with Noriega and Saddam Hussein and others, and now it's Milosevic.

Milosevic will be tried not before a jury of his peers but before a panel of politically appointed judges, all of whom were approved by the NATO countries, the same countries which illegally bombed Yugoslavia for 2½ months. Under both U.N. and international law the bombing of Serbia and Kosovo was illegal. This was why NATO pursued it and it was not done under a U.N. resolution.

Ironically, the mess in which we've been engaged in Yugoslavia has the international establishment supporting the side of Kosovo independence rather than Serbian sovereignty. The principle of independence and secession of smaller government entities has been enhanced by the breakdown of the Soviet system. If there's any hope that any good could come of the quagmire into which we've rapidly sunk in the Balkans, it is that small independent nations are a viable and reasonable option to conflicts around the world. But the tragedy today is that no government is allowed to exist without the blessing of the One World Government leaders. The disobedience to the one worlders and true independence is not to be tolerated. That's what this trial is all about. "Tow the line or else," is the message that is being sent to the world.

NATO and U.S. leaders insist on playing with fire, not fully understanding the significance of the events now transpiring in the Balkans. If policy is not quickly reversed, events could get out of control and a major war in the region will erupt.

We should fear and condemn any effort to escalate the conflict with troops or money from any outside sources. Our troops are already involved and our money calls the shots. Extricating ourselves will get more difficult every day we stay. But the sooner we get out the better. We should be listening more to candidate George Bush's suggestion during the last campaign for bringing our troops home from this region.

The Serbs, despite NATO's propaganda, will not lightly accept the imprisonment of their democratically elected (and properly disposed) president no matter how bad he was. It is their problem to deal with and resentment against us will surely grow as conditions deteriorate. Mobs have already attacked the American ambassador to Macedonia for our inept interference in the region. Death of American citizens are sure to come if we persist in this failed policy.

Money and power has permitted the United States the luxury of dictating terms for Milosevic's prosecution, but our policy of arbitrary interventions in the Balkans is sowing the seeds of tomorrow's war.

We cannot have it both ways. We cannot expect to use the International Criminal Tribunal for Yugoslavia when it pleases us and oppose the permanent International Criminal Court where the rules would apply to our own acts of aggression. This cynical and arrogant approach, whether it's dealing with Milosevic, Hussein, or Kadafi, undermines peace and presents a threat to our national security. Meanwhile, American citizens must suffer the tax burden from financing the dangerous meddling in European affairs, while exposing our troops to danger.

A policy of nonintervention, friendship and neutrality with all nations, engagement in true free trade (unsubsidized trade with low tariffs) is the best policy if we truly seek peace around the world. That used to be the American way.

INTRODUCTION OF LOWER LOS ANGELES RIVER AND SAN GABRIEL RIVER WATERSHEDS STUDY ACT OF 2001

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to bring forward legislation that I want to introduce regarding the Lower Los Angeles River and the San Gabriel River Watershed Study Act of 2001.

Mr. Speaker, I grew up in the shadow of one of the largest landfills in the country, communities exposed to high levels of smog, and one of the largest Superfund sites in the region. All this has inspired my passion to preserve our remnants of open space.

Today, children in my district are still living next to this landfill, and their playgrounds are often small concrete slabs with little green space. With this knowledge, today I introduce the Lower Los Angeles River and San Gabriel River Watershed Study Act of 2001. The bill will study the Lower Los Angeles River and the San Gabriel

River and portions of the San Gabriel Mountains for potential inclusion in the National Parks Service system.

The bill will direct the National Park Service to study the area and its natural, historic, scenic, recreational, and national significance.

If deemed appropriate, I plan to introduce a bill that will officially designate the area. Thus, laying the groundwork for open space preservation, environmental revitalization, curbing urban sprawl, and giving communities of color the option of experiencing more than car horns and sky-scrapers.

Currently, there are only five national recreation areas near urban centers. Such urban parks combine scarce spaces with the preservation of significant historic resources and important natural areas in locations that can provide outdoor recreation for large numbers of people. The population growth in California, as you know, is projected to double in over the next 40 years. It is of critical importance to plan for the future of open space.

Study after study find that open space creates high property values, more community-oriented events, and safer environments for our families. It is estimated that there are less than one-half acre square space per 1,000 residents in low-income areas, and up to 1.7 acres in West Los Angeles. Yet, three to four acres of open space per 1,000 residents is what is recommended by our Park Service.

After the 1992 riots in Los Angeles, nearly 77 percent of neighborhood residents when asked what they felt was most important felt that improved parks and recreation facilities was absolutely critical and important to the restoration of their communities.

There is a growing concern that poor planning has resulted in the loss of too much open space in the San Gabriel Valley and in the foothills of the San Gabriel Mountains. The threat of the total buildout of the last remnants of open space has increased concern about the cumulative impacts of that buildout on what little remains of our natural resources.

This concern has reached a critical mass, sparking community action to form local conservancies. In fact, I was a partner in helping to establish one of the largest urban conservancies in the State of California effecting well over 6 million people.

There is a need out there to provide open space. People in my community and across the country want to see that there is some preservation and some area for families to recreate. As a California State Senator, I was proud to have introduced that piece of legislation last year.

There are over 30 local community governments and organizing groups that are now waiting for us to move ahead at the Federal level to create this park service area.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert the following editorial published on

May 30, 2001 of the San Gabriel Valley Tribune.

It is time for the Federal Government to offer the next step for protection and revitalization in the San Gabriel Valley. This study is the first step in accomplishing that venture.

[From the San Gabriel Valley Tribune, May 30, 2001]

OUR VIEW: BUSH SHOULD JOIN SOLIS PARK PLAN

The president was in town this week visiting Camp Pendleton and meeting with Gov. Gray Davis in Los Angeles on energy issues. Some say President George W. Bush should use this visit to improve his standing on the environment, an issue dear to Golden Staters. Specifically, he should support Rep. Hilda Solis' idea to declare the San Gabriel River—and 2,000 acres around it—a national recreation area.

Solis, who has not formalized her idea, but rather is sending it up as a trial balloon, wants to siphon federal dollars into making the river a national park. Last year, \$1.38 billion was available through the National Park Service. While we support the preservation and maintenance of more traditional national parks, we believe the feds should change direction and provide for creation of closer-in, urban green spaces.

Efforts are under way to restore the 29-mile San Gabriel River, which runs from the Angeles National Forest to the beach. Our river, and our forest for that matter, are visited by just as many people as many national parks—eight million a year visit the Angeles, which includes the river's West Fork and the East Fork regions. Creating more urban recreation areas can be more important than preserving chunks of wild lands in remote parts of the country because these are closer to millions of people who need a green space to de-stress, relax and get away from the burdens of everyday life.

In addition, it seems as if the new San Gabriel and Lower Los Angeles Rivers and Mountain Conservancy started by Solis and Sally Havice is stalled, but it's nothing that a little federal momentum could not kick start.

We would like to see an education center, more bike trails and more river access for hikers, horseback riders, birders, mountain bikers, picnickers and all.

Likewise, to the west, the Arroyo Seco should be restored. The Arroyo Seco Foundation and North East Trees are working on a plan to make the river that runs through Pasadena, South Pasadena to Los Angeles a place of beauty instead of a concrete channel off-limits to visitors.

These are projects that are not about saving a species of frog or fish but rather, about saving a quality of life for almost 2 million San Gabriel Valley residents who increasingly spend more time in their cars in traffic than in nature. Many have come here from Mexico, as the new census figures show, living in poorer and middle-class neighborhoods of South El Monte, El Monte, Pico Rivera, Northwest Pasadena, El Sereno, Azusa and Duarte and rarely go beyond the streets where they live.

Most do not have the means to travel to Yosemite, Mammoth Lakes and other spots that are favorites of the Valley's more well-to-do population. Hence, more than 75 percent of those who visit the East Fork, Whittier Narrows, Marrano Beach and Santa Fe Dam are Latino.

The Bush Administration can't miss this chance to start working on an urban, national park that will benefit Latinos in California.

It's an opportunity for Bush to improve his image in the state and at the same time

work with Democrat Solis in a bipartisan effort. Sounds like win-win-win to us.

INTRODUCTION OF ABUSIVE TAX SHELTER SHUTDOWN ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, most of us can appreciate the feeling of the fellow who declared, "I am proud to be paying taxes, but I could be just as proud for half the money!"

Some taxpayers have, in fact, discovered a way to get out for half the money by exploiting abusive tax avoidance schemes, gimmicks, and tax shelters. For the millions of Americans who are paying their fair share of taxes, it is long past time to plug some of the loopholes and eliminate the tax inequities that threaten public confidence in our tax system.

Today, together with the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), the ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means and a number of my Democratic colleagues on the committee, I am introducing the Abusive Tax Shelter Shutdown Act to address these concerns.

With the Bush administration already dipping into the Medicare trust fund to pay for its many undertakings, we face a challenge. To implement a patients' bill of rights, to ensure that the dipping into the Medicare trust fund does not extend to an invasion of the Social Security trust fund, and to provide reasonable tax relief, we must ensure that lower tax revenues are offset. We must secure what are known around this House as "pay-for's" to pay for the enactment of any new initiatives.

With the bill that we are introducing today, we say: what better place to start than with the high rollers who are cheating and gaming our tax system.

This new bill represents a refinement of legislation that I originally introduced in 1999. The Washington Post, the Los Angeles Times, and several other newspapers have already endorsed that initiative. The abuses that it addresses were first brought to my attention by a constituent in Austin who directed my attention to this Forbes magazine. Forbes, which proudly proclaims itself "the capitalist tool," did a cover story called "Tax Shelter Hustlers" with a fellow in a fedora on the cover, and stated, "Respectable accountants are peddling dicey corporate loopholes." Inside, that cover story begins, "Respectable tax professionals and respectable corporate clients are exploiting the exotica of modern corporate finance to indulge in extravagant tax dodging schemes."

Forbes reported that Big 5 accounting firms require staffers, in one case, to come up with at least one new corporate tax dodge per week. The literal