

This is Congress. There are 435 people, and I think it was an okay deal that we dealt with. But as we moved out of this tax cut and moving into the areas of having to pay debt, increase our debt and look at deficits, we have to reevaluate some of the things we need to do. And one of the things, the biggest drag on our economy is debt payment and deficits. I think that that is agreed to by many economists, and I think that is very important. And what does that do in the whole ball game? Because I believe the most important tax cut that we could possibly have that everyone enjoys is keeping interest rates low; interest rates on your house, interest rates on your credit cards, interest rates on your auto loans. And that is what I think we need to continue to be mindful of as we move through, I think, a very, very, very important and critical crossroads as we are starting to develop the 2003 appropriations bills and the other bills that we are going to be dealing with for spending.

But I think it is important that we have a plan, a plan that puts fiscal handcuffs on us, to save us from ourselves sometimes when we are having to spend and wanting to make sure that we are providing the best kind of services for our constituents back home, whether it is roads or education or health care or veterans' benefits. But at the same time trying to do it in a very frugal way to make sure that we are spending the taxpayers dollars the best we possibly can. And that is what the Blue Dog plan does. It has been laid out very nicely tonight by my friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SANDLIN), and my friend, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PHELPS).

And maybe just to recap it very quickly because my time is running out, it is again the ABC's. It is honesty and accountability in budgeting. It is balancing the budget without raiding Social Security. It is climbing out of the deficit ditch by making sure that we have limits and abide by those limits; and, D, of course, is defending children from paying our bills and our debts that we are accumulating over these few years, and that would require a supermajority to borrow dollars. So those are the ABC's the Blue Dogs are going to continue to push until we get a plan together that makes sense, that brings us into the next century, that brings us through this war time and times of great difficulty as we are having to deal with issues we did not dream of dealing with just a few months ago.

I thank the Speaker for this very lively hour of debate, and I just beg that the American people and the majority and this Congress look at the Blue Dog plan, take it for what it is worth. It is not just rhetoric. We have bills that are in the hopper that identify the ABC's of how we get out, bring fiscal sanity back into this Congress.

#### SUPPORTING THE UNITED STATES LEAVING THE INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL COURT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRUCCI). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I look forward to our discussion this evening. There are a couple of things I want to talk about. But first of all, I think it is important to address some of the comments that have been just made in the last hour.

First of all, we ought to point out that the Blue Dogs who spent the last hour criticizing the administration, criticizing the majority party, never bring out in these comments that the Blue Dogs, in fact, are all Democrats. This last hour was a very partisan, one-sided point of view. This is exactly why we run into budget difficulties.

Now, I agreed with some of the points that were brought up by these gentlemen. But I was amazed to hear these gentlemen, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PHELPS), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SANDLIN), and the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JOHN), talk about how we have to control spending. We have got to stop the pork. We have to make sure we, as the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JOHN) said, lay everything out on the table. We have got to watch these spending programs that are outrageous.

So I was curious. I decided to see how all three of these gentlemen voted on the farm bill, which is probably the biggest budget buster we have had up here in a long, long time. Now, clearly, somebody who spends an hour advocating a balanced budget, who spends an hour advocating these so-called Blue Dog ABC's about avoiding pork, about accountability and honesty in government, about voting here as you talk to your constituents back there, certainly you would expect that these gentlemen would be the first to stand up to a bill like the farm bill which, although it has a nice-sounding name, helps very few farmers in this country. It helps a lot of corporate farmers in this country. And take a look at where this bill started; take a look at where it started and where it ended up.

How many billions of dollars more were added to it as it went through these Chambers? So you would expect these three gentlemen to, of course, vote "no" on a project like this. But all three of these gentlemen who spent the last hour attacking the administration, who spent the last hour attacking the majority understand this Blue Dog which means Democrat concept, all three of them voted for that program. All three of them voted for "yes" on what is, and I say it again, the largest budget buster we will have up here this year.

Now, look, maybe their constituents wanted them to vote that way and maybe they are representing their con-

stituents. I am assuming they probably are. If they come from a farm community maybe they are. But for gosh sakes, do not vote one way and talk the other way.

I once had somebody tell me, if you want to stay elected in Congress, especially when you get outside the Northeast where it is solid Democrat, but out where most of the country is and that is moderate to conservative, go ahead and vote liberal in Washington but when you come home vote conservative. Go ahead and talk about a balanced budget when you are back in your district, but at the same time make sure you bring the pork home. And in my opinion that is what has been reflected in the last hour.

So if you want to talk about accountability, if you want to talk about lay everything out on the table, my three colleagues should have probably said, oh, by the way, the only exception we have to the comments and the attacks we are making on the majority party, the only real exception we have that does not apply to our rules that we have just told you about for a balanced budget and fiscal responsibility is our own farm bill. Now, understand we are going to vote for our farm bill, but aside from that everything else ought to be scrutinized.

That is the problem back here. I mean, all of us, that is where you have got your problem. But I have sat here for the last hour, most of the last hour, and was amazed that first of all my colleagues stand up and make it sound as if they are some independent organization out here when, in fact, your Blue Dogs are comprised solely of Democrats and the attack was solely against the Republican majority. It was a partisan hour. That is fair game. That is what the House floor is for: debate. But somebody has got to stand up and say, wait a minute, just as they said should be done, let us lay everything on the table.

And that is why I was curious and went back and looked at the actual voting record to see how one would speak on the floor but how one would vote outside the presence of the speech that they were giving. And I saw an inherent conflict. In other words, the vote that was taken on the farm bill certainly did not at any point in time in the last hour match the comments of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PHELPS), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SANDLIN), or the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JOHN). And they are all gentlemen. Do not get me wrong, they are colleagues of mine. They are professionals. I would assume they represent their districts well.

My point here is not an attack on these three individuals. But I believe in what they are saying and that is accountability. And if you are going to talk about a balanced budget; if you are going to talk about getting rid of pork; if you are going to talk about avoiding budget buster bills, then you ought to talk about that farm bill. And

you ought to say to your constituents, look, I talk about this budget buster, the balanced budget, the pork stuff; on the other hand, I voted for you on this farm bill.

I think a balanced budget is important, but the only way we will break this is for you to take some tough votes, even when those programs apply to your particular district.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to spend the majority of my time this evening, I actually had an interesting visit with a constituent and good friend of mine. His name is Mr. Stroobants. And we got to talking about world jurisdiction and the United Nations. You know, the action taken by the President in the last few days, I felt obligated to come and speak about that action.

The action was that the United States intends to pull out of the United Nations Criminal Court or the International Criminal Court.

I want to spend the next 30 or 40 minutes talking about what is the international court. How does that compare to the court system we have in the United States? What does it do to our sovereignty? What are the political ramifications of conceding sovereignty or conceding authority over the American people, the United States Government of ceding our judicial authority over our people to other countries? For example, to a court that is primarily dominated by our friends in Europe, by the European Union. By a court that allows countries like Cuba, Libya and some of these other countries the same vote as the United States of America. By a court that, in my opinion, despite what the United Nations propaganda might say, despite the push that they are making out there, that a court here, instead of being one that would pursue actual criminals, like the likes of bin Laden and people like that, would over time be used to pursue American citizens.

The United States of America is a sovereign country. The United States of America does not cede any authority of how we run our government, of how we elect our public officials, of how we have our court systems or our executive branch, of our judicial branch, of our legislative branch. That authority is determined by the Constitution of the United States of America. And our Constitution does not contain anywhere within its four corners a provision that allows the United States of America to give its authority to a worldwide power.

The United States of America, to remind ourselves of a little history, was created because we wanted to become an independent Nation. We wanted to be a Nation that had its own people, a Nation of its people by the people and for the people; a Nation that stood for what we have thought was good. But what has happened is that we were seen more and more with the European Union more and more we talk about the European United Nations, more and more talk about a one-world gov-

ernment; a government where all laws will be decided by one authority; a government that would have a military under one authority; a government that would decide what your environmental regulations within the boundaries, within your own borders would be decided by. That is a socialistic type of approach.

It is very clear that in Europe most of those countries are headed towards a socialistic type of approach with the European Union-type of adventure, so to speak.

Now some parts of the European Union may make sense. I think it makes sense for the United States to join with Mexico and to join with Canada under our NAFTA agreements so that we are an economic bloc. And so I see why countries in Europe want to join together. So I understand why countries in Europe want to form an economic bloc, come together for the sake of economics. But it is a long way from coming together as an economic bloc and that of ceding your sovereignty to another country.

□ 2030

Mr. Stroobants pointed out to me very clearly, he came to this country from Belgium, and he came to this country because this country was a capitalistic country. It was a country of democracy. It was a country that had its own checks and balances within its own borders.

We have a very well-defined system as presented by our forefathers under the Constitution and under the Bill of Rights, but what is happening in the international community is they want to form an authority that has oversight, that is a higher authority for the people of America, than their own government in America. The United States people should not cede one inch of sovereignty because let me tell my colleagues how they draw it in.

Take a look at the United Nations and the propaganda that they use to talk about how great this World Court is.

Number one, it is a permanent structure. It is not like the Nuremberg trials where we convened an international authority for a short period of time to try a very defined group of war criminals. That is not what this is. This is a permanent court, a worldwide court that will exercise authority over American citizens. How did we ever get there?

President Clinton signed it on the last day he was in office. This does not ratify it. President Bush has given notice that the United States of America will not participate in this World Court, but how did we get there? That is the answer. On the last day of office, about the same time that the Mark Rich pardons were signed, President Clinton signed this deal as one of those who agrees with the World Court. That is not the exact buzzword, but that is in essence what happened.

Fortunately, this week, the White House, President Bush, has given noti-

fication to this so-called World Court, to the United Nations, that the United States of America will not participate, will not participate in an exercise that deviates in any way or subtracts in any way the rights of American citizens.

The authority for judicial oversight of American citizens belongs to the American people. It does not belong to the people of Cuba. It does not belong to the people of France. It does not belong to Germany or Belgium or Russia or China.

The judicial authority over American citizens belongs to the government and to the people of the United States of America. This is their government. In our country, this is our government. This is not the government of the French. This is not the government of Belgium. This is not the government of some other country out there.

Let us talk a little bit about what this so-called World Court does. First of all, remember, that every program out here, earlier in my comments we talked about the farm bill, for example, every proposal here, every bill that starts here has a good sounding name to it, and frankly, some of these start with pretty good intent, but once we create it, it is like a government program. Once we create this bureaucracy, we will never again disassemble it, and that bureaucracy will only grow and grow and grow.

Think about it. Take a look at the United Nations as an excellent example. Fortunately, before the United States entered into being a partner with the United Nations we reserved to ourselves that overriding authority of the power of a veto. Four countries have it. We have one of them. So, at any time we feel that we are ceding sovereignty to the United Nations, we can exercise our veto, but what happens with these organizations?

They start out with a good attempt. They are not about to tell us they are going to exercise their authority going after Americans who they think may have violated crimes against humanity because their gas tanker spilled on an interstate and had fuel going into the water or because they decide that for some reason that there has been a criminal violation by some elected official in the United States. That is not what they are telling us now.

That is their goal. The goal here by the European Union, the goal by the other countries in this world is to exercise an authority over the United States, the likes of which has never been accomplished in the history of this country. This is a critical, critical issue for us. This is a sleeper. This is one of those things that sounds good, and sign on the dotted line, we will read the fine print later.

We better look at the fine print today, and thank goodness, over on the executive side of this city the President, George W. Bush, did look at that fine print and did notify the world, look, United States is not going to enter into this arrangement. We are

not going to enter into an agreement into which, I, as the President of the United States, cede the sovereignty of this country, to which I give someone else one iota of authority other American citizens from a judicial perspective.

Let us talk about the details of this World Court so that my colleagues have a pretty good idea of exactly what they are asking for.

The United States court system, as we all know, in our government, we have the executive branch, the legislative branch and the judicial branch. I am not trying to be talked down or be repetitive about history or how the political structure in our country is, but there is a fact that in our Constitution, our forefathers looked into the future and said in order for this system of capitalism, this system of democracy to work, there has got to be checks and balances. There has got to be a way that everything is filtered through before the final process.

Those checks and balances, they designed it into our system, first of all, with that wonderful document called the Constitution and then that document in the Bill of Rights, and then the document in creating a Supreme Court, and in our court system in this country, unlike some countries, but like many other countries, in this country, the courts do not make the laws. The courts are there to interpret the laws, and it is a very clearly defined separation of powers between the legislative branch, which does create the laws, and the judicial branch, which enforces and interprets those laws created by the legislative branch.

In other words, a judge in a District court or in a municipal court, let us say in Glenwood Springs, Colorado, the municipal judge there has no authority on their own to create law. They have no authority on their own to just out of their own conjuncture, say all right, this ought to be against the law, I am going to make it against the law.

We have accountability of those. Not only do we have accountability that the Justice Department does not create laws, we have accountability within the Justice Department and within the judiciary branch, and that is the process of election. For example, the municipal judge that I just spoke of, that municipal judge answers to the local city or the local authority. For example, the municipal judge in Glenwood Springs is held accountable to the city council of Glenwood Springs, and the city council of Glenwood Springs is held accountable to the voters, and it goes that way all the way up to the United States Supreme Court.

In our country, the United States Supreme Court justices must be confirmed by the United States Senate. So we have lots of checks and balances. That is a very important element of the United States judicial system, and we will find that system is completely absent, completely absent from the World Court once they put that court

into place. Once they put that prosecutor into place, they can create their own. They have no checks and balances. They answer to no supreme authority above them.

In this country if a district court or a municipal court or a county court or some other type of quasi-judicial process out there, ultimately they would have to answer to the United States Supreme Court and the United States Supreme Court justices answer to the United States Senate and the United States Senate answers to the voters, and it goes on and on and on. That is absent. Those checks and balances are absent from this proposed World Court.

So here is the U.S. court system. Checks and balances. Again, very critical in our system. Another check and balance, by the way, the rights of the defendants, the rights of the victims. Those are a constitutionally guaranteed right. The Miranda warning, for example.

I used to be a police officer. When we had somebody who was a suspect, we arrested him as a suspect, we had to give them constitutional rights. Why were those constitutional rights in place? Because it was a check and balance, designed in the system to protect the system from abuse, but this World Court has none of those kinds of rights. They are not required to advise anybody of their rights. There is no right to demand a jury trial in this World Court. There is no right to demand an accuser in this World Court. It is in our Constitution. None of those rights will we find in this new proposed World Court. In other words, we are losing a big check and balance there.

Let us move on. The authority. The U.S. court system has authority. Clearly, they have authority to issue subpoenas. They have authority to conduct trials. They have authority to bring together a jury pool. They have authority to interpret the laws, but their authority has checks and balances, and the authority of the courts of the United States of America are reserved for the people of the United States of America.

In other words, this judicial system is designed for the United States of America. It is not a custom designed court system for any other country in the world. It is ours, and the authority over the American people does not rest with the Chinese courts. The authority over the American people does not rest with the courts Fidel Castro puts together down there in Cuba. The authority over the people of the United States of America does not rest in Paris or in Rome or over in Germany or in Belgium. It rests with the courts of our country.

We should not under any condition give the authority that our courts have over us, over the U.S. citizens, over this geographical location, over this Nation. We should not at any time give even a small sliver of that authority to an international organization that is permanent in structure, that in fact

claims higher authority over our citizens than our own court system is allowed by our own Constitution.

Jurisdiction. Think of the jurisdictional issues. This World Court wants jurisdiction, for example, over World Heritage sites as designated by the United Nations. The reason there is so much momentum right now for the World Court is we all want to get bin Laden. Bin Laden is a terrible, terrible criminal, but the fact is that bin Laden will come and go. He will over a period of time be eliminated, and this court will be looking for new ventures, new venues under which to exercise its authority, and I will tell my colleagues where they are moving next.

The next place they are going to move is on the environment. Now, we all want a clean environment. That is not the issue we are talking about here. The issue is should we allow a court in Rome, a World Court, the jurisdiction to charge somebody say in Lynchburg, Virginia, with an environmental violation as a crime against humanity?

For example, let us say that a gasoline truck driver is driving recklessly. He wrecks his tanker and the gasoline spills on the interstate near Lynchburg, and it goes into the water and causes some harm in the water. Should that person be subject to the courts of the United States of America? Well, of course. That is our Constitution. That is our Criminal Code. That is what the court system is designed for.

When that truck driver, for driving recklessly and causing an environmental spill, when that truck driver is arrested, he or she has certain constitutional rights, and they have a right to a jury. They have a right to their Miranda warnings, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera. Well, under this proposal of a World Court, we cede that authority, and over time we will give more and more or maybe not give it, they will claim they can take more and more authority because we signed the treaty creating it.

The next thing we know the World Court is going to be sending investigative enforcement officers to Lynchburg, Virginia, to take a look at this accident and decide whether or not the World Court should indict that truck driver who had that environmental spill. This is not exaggeration. This is exactly where this thing is headed.

I am not trying to cry wolf here. I have just seen programs like this created. Take a look at the birth of the United Nations. If we did not have that veto power, take a look at the authority the United Nations would try and exercise over the United States of America.

□ 2045

Take a look at how many members of the United Nations voted on a consistent basis against the interests of the United States or opposite of the United States over the last several years. You will be astounded.

You see, the United States of America, this kind of system, United Nations and this kind of system, an international court, will be used as a political tool, and thereupon lies the threat. That is why we have to be very careful that the jurisdiction over criminal activity, over civilian activity by U.S. citizens or within the borders of the United States of America or its territories, that we keep that jurisdiction in our country; that that jurisdiction rests with the citizens of the United States and not with the citizens of some world court, which is comprised of countries throughout the world, who probably, most of the time, do not have the best interests of the United States of America or, more importantly, its citizens in mind.

We may very well find a world court that decides they are going to launch a criminal investigation into the City of Denver because the City of Denver, Colorado has air pollution coming from vehicle emissions that pollutes the air to an extent that they think it is a violation against humanity.

And there is no definition of how far this world court can go. That is exactly why President Bush has withdrawn from that court. The President recognizes that there are issues of sovereignty; that there are issues of politics; that there are dramatic issues involving jurisdiction. We are not a one-world government. This world court, maybe it will work for the European Union, maybe those countries, the countries of Belgium or France or some of the other members of the European Union, maybe they want to give their national sovereignty and their national jurisdiction to a one-unit court that is a world court, but the United States of America does not want to do that. And, fortunately, the President stood strong on this.

Now, many of my colleagues will be reading in the next few days a lot of criticism coming from, guess who? Of course, the special interests, the world court, the European countries, and the other countries that know they have an opportunity to gain a huge advantage over the United States if they can get the United States to join this world court. These nations will know that for the first time in the history of the United States, our system of government has ceded its jurisdiction or its sovereignty, or at least a portion of those two, over to other governments. They will be elated if we sign up and participate in this so-called world court.

Now, keep in mind, this differs from the United Nations. In the United Nations, colleagues, we have retained the power of veto. So no matter how many times those other countries vote against us, no matter how absurd or focused or politically motivated they become against the interests of the United States, we always retain the ability to exercise a veto. In the world court, the United States, in the creation of it, and the judges that are

elected, there is no oversight once they are in. But in the initial authority, the United States has as much authority in this world court as does the country of Cuba, as does a country like Syria or some other country that wants to join it.

This is not a court that some in the United Nations would like us to believe is intended to pursue the criminals that have taken such horrible and devious actions against the United States of America. This is a court that will assist those people. And I read an excellent article by a gentleman named Tom DeWeese, and I want to give Mr. DeWeese credit, colleagues, for this. He says U.N. criminal court threatens U.S. soldiers, threatens U.S. soldiers, in the fight against terrorism.

Now, I do not like to read written comments. I am not going to read this article verbatim in whole, but I am going to take some excerpts from this article because I think this is excellent and I think it solidifies and supports the point that I am making here this evening.

The United Nations sells the version of the ICC. Now, the ICC is the world court. He says ICC, I am going to put world court in there. The United Nations sells the vision of a world court as a tool for bringing international criminals like Saddam Hussein and Libya's Qadhafi to justice. The truth is the court is more likely to be used as a tool for those criminals against the United States.

Let me go on. The world court defines as a war crime any attack by our soldiers with knowledge that inescapable collateral deaths or injuries, quote, to civilians or damage to civilian objects or widespread long-term damage to the natural environment, meaning if we are engaged in a war and we cause long-term damage to their environment, in other words when we bomb Afghanistan, if we, as a result of our bombing we damage the environment on a long-term basis, and it was clearly excessive in relation to the concrete and direct overall military advantage anticipated, then we are subject to a violation of their criminal code.

In other words, you can have a war, as Tom says, but do not break anything and do not hurt any civilians and do not hurt the environment.

Let us go a little further. He says, and he is accurate, war is not a video game. It is not an Olympic event. You are going to have innocent people killed in a war. You try to avoid it, but in every war ever known to man there has been collateral damage. And how would you attack Afghanistan without doing some damage to the environment? How would you sink a ship without doing some environmental harm to the ocean? You have a ship that has sunk into the ocean. How would you intercept a missile coming over the skies without damaging the environment by exploding the missile in the air?

Now, some would say that that kind of thing would not happen. I want to tell you, colleagues, how many programs have we seen created back here or worldwide where when they initiate the program they assure you over and over again, that is not going to happen; that is an exaggeration; we are not going to go that far; that is overreaching. Then, pretty soon, that institutional memory of what was originally said was overreaching in fact comes within reach, and the next thing you know, it has been gathered and put in the nest. That is a concern.

Here I continue with this article. The court can prosecute anyone who violates United Nations treaties. This world court can prosecute anyone who violates United Nations treaties, including environmental agreements, like the Biodiversity Treaty and those covering world heritage sites. For example, if we had entered into the Kyoto Treaty, and there was a company or a business, let us say a printer, a printer had some ink and put the ink in the wrong garbage can and it was a violation of some type of international treaty, even a Kyoto Treaty; or a U.S. company based in, let us say, Connecticut, had emissions that violated Kyoto, they could find themselves in front of a criminal court that is a worldwide court. That is the absurdity of what we are talking about here.

My reason for speaking this evening, and I will go through these other points, but my reason in speaking this evening is to give some support to what the administration has done. I think of any action I have seen the administration take, next to proposing to get rid of that death tax, but any policy I have seen them take, from the judicial system point of view, it is the administration's decision to back out, not to join in this effort or this new configuration of a world court. Kudos to the administration.

I think it is our obligation, every one of us, to join the President in that effort. Anybody in these Chambers who would vote for the creation or for the entry of the United States of America into this world court, they need to go back to their constituents the weekend after they vote and explain to their constituents that they just ceded over to a world court, to wipe out checks and balances of our judicial system and cede over the authority that belongs, and has belonged throughout the history of this Nation, since this Nation was created, the authority that belonged to this Nation, that as a congressman or congresswoman they felt it necessary to share that authority with other world governments and jurisdiction.

My colleagues need to go to their constituents and say to their constituents, look, I decided to support the world court. I have decided to give jurisdiction over so-called criminal activity, which could become civil activity, but is originally proposed as criminal activity, I have decided to cede

that authority to other governments in the world and, for the first time in the history of our country, take that authority which was reserved solely for the United States, the body of the United States Government, that was reserved solely for this government, and as an elected leader of this country have decided that it would be better placed in the hands of a foreign country, in a foreign world court.

That is what happens if we do not support the President on his decision not to join the world court.

Let me go on. Another right. The United States, since day one of our history, has always recognized the inherent right of self-defense. Nowhere in the documents that I read of this so-called world court, nowhere in the documents that I read about this world court is there an inherent reserved right to self-defense. It does not exist, to the best of my knowledge.

Let us talk about sovereignty again. For those of my colleagues who think they can support or think they are going to oppose the President's decision, remember the President's decision is that the United States will not join an international world court, but for those that object to that decision, they need to be prepared to explain to the American people and, frankly, to explain to their colleagues, I think, why they are willing to give up sovereignty that has always been reserved not for this court down here but for the government and for the people of the United States.

And let us talk about the political aspect of it. Take a look at what happens with politics. Now, I had a very vigorous discussion with my very good friend Mr. Stroobants. I have had a vigorous discussion with many of my colleagues. But take a look at how the propaganda in this world, the worldwide press can turn propaganda into a media-eating machine. They can present a picture that may or may not be accurate. And the best example is to pull out *The New York Times*, pull out any of the major newspapers in this country and take a look at any European country, take a look at the BBC, take a look at CNN, take a look at any news media you can find that has worldwide reporting, say about 4 weeks ago, and see what kind of political propaganda they were putting out there about the massacre at Jenin. Take a look at it. Take a look at what they talk about, the massacre that took place over on the West Bank.

Well, guess what happened? You know what happened? No massacre took place. Sure, there were soldier deaths, there was some collateral damage. I can assure you we have had collateral damage in Afghanistan. But all of a sudden, the media has become quiet. In fact, there was no massacre. In fact, one of the most liberal organizations in the world, that apparently sent their own investigators out, came back and said, well, we did not like what they did, but there was no massacre that took place.

Well, that example is the same kind of thing that a world court can do. A world court condemnation, for example, of things that are the business of the United States, they can turn worldwide opinion against the United States. This worldwide court could be manipulated so easily. Why could it be manipulated? Because it has no checks and balances.

Now, every court system can be manipulated, but the way you minimize that manipulation is to have checks and balances. You have weights and counterweights. So in the United States, where a court may be manipulated, and there are arguments on that, for the most part it is the best system that the world has ever devised because it has those checks and balances. But in the world court system, what check and balance exists? Nothing. What kind of restraints are on the prosecutors? Nothing. What can the prosecutor decide to do? Anything he really wants to do, as far as criminal prosecution. And I think, over time, it will be turned into civil prosecution as well.

What kind of geographical limitations will there be on this prosecutor? None, at least for the countries that sign up for this world court. What kind of claims can be made by this prosecutor against government officials? It is amazing. You know, if they decided that they felt that Henry Kissinger had not done a good job, this prosecutor could actually put out an arrest warrant and have Henry Kissinger arrested at an airport when he lands in Paris. This court actually has the jurisdiction to prevent U.S. citizens from going anywhere because of the concern for arrest.

Take a look at what this court would do to our American men and women fighting in our military.

□ 2100

If this court, comprised of all of these other countries, including Cuba, and other countries that we have on our terrorist list, if this prosecutor decides, he may say the American soldiers, I do not like what they did so we are going to charge them with criminal acts against humanity. That is what I mean by the political nature of this world court.

So the arrow that I have pointing down here means exactly that. We would dive it right into the ground if our government was to give up an inch of jurisdiction or an inch of sovereignty when it comes to the judicial system that this country has perfected.

Very briefly, America believes in justice and the promotion of the rule of law, and the rule of law is very balanced. The rule of law has been set by legislation, by statute, by precedent. It has been set by experience. The courts in the United States are not fresh created courts. These are courts with 200-some years of experience. These are courts which have been tested and have checks and balances. That is what the United States thinks is necessary.

Those that commit the most serious crimes of concern to the international community should be punished. We agree that the Hitlers, the bin Ladens that commit heinous crimes against people should be pursued. That is why the United States was the primary sponsor, underwrote it, played the major role in the Nuremberg trials; but those were trials of a temporary nature, and those were trials that had numerous checks and balances and which had sunshine transparency. Those trials and that system has a lot of differences from what is being proposed under the world court system, that states, not international institutions, are primarily responsible for ensuring justice in the international system.

Our belief in this country is that not an international government or an international court should have oversight over specific countries. Those countries have laws of their own. Every country ought to be able to have their own judicial system and not be subject to the whim and call of some prosecutor in a so-called world court.

But the best way to combat serious defenses is to build a domestic judicial system, strengthen political will, and promote human freedom.

Finally, let me talk about this world criminal court here, what is on this poster, because it is important. It undermines the role of the United Nations Security Council in maintaining international peace and security.

I am not a big fan of the security council, but the fact is that we are a part of it. The reality is that we do have control and a veto, and so we cannot be run over in an avalanche of countries that do not like the United States of America. But this security council is beginning to dilute its own authority. We can live with the security council authority because we have the right of veto. To get around that right of veto, we are finding countries that are getting the United Nations to say let us take that authority from the security council of the United Nations, and move it over here to the world court because in the world court the United States of America does not have a right of veto. We can finally get our hands on American citizens, or we can dictate what citizens of America, the laws that they will be subject to, even within their own boundaries. Thank goodness the President did not agree to this and stood tall and said that the United States will not be a participant in this world court.

It creates a prosecutorial system that is unchecked in power. This prosecutor of this world court will have more power than any other prosecutor, in my opinion, in the history of the world. This prosecutor will have the right to go past national boundaries, to go past state boundaries. This prosecutor will have the right to reach into small communities and villages, high atop the mountains in Colorado, or reach into the major cities of Moscow or Berlin or Brussels or Paris; his or

her reach will be unparalleled anywhere in history. Should we sign off on that? Should anybody in this Chamber agree to a world court system like this? This thing almost became a reality until the action taken this week by the President.

Let me go down here, a search jurisdiction over citizens of states that have not ratified the treaty that threatens U.S. sovereignty.

The United Nations claims under the World Heritage site, they have authority over what goes on at Yellowstone National Park or that under worldwide environmental laws that the United Nations has come up with, that they should have the authority to reach into the sovereignty of the United States. They can say whatever they want. The fact is that they have no authority. The United States does not recognize it. The United States has not ceded any of its authority to the United Nations; but if we sign onto a world court, we sign it away forever. That is the danger of this world court. That is the danger of that treaty.

It is built on a flawed foundation, this world court. These flaws leave it open for exploitation and politically motivated prosecutions. If we had a world court in place in the last 6 weeks, what do Members think, how many charges would have been filed by now against the country of Israel or against Yasir Arafat, who is a known terrorist, a lifelong terrorist? It would be so lopsided. Regardless of which side of the issue Members are on, it is very clear that the propaganda machine in the last month has been anti-Israel. Everything is Israel's fault. It has been completely ignorant of Arafat's history or the homicide bombers on Passover.

Mr. Speaker, that is my concern about this world court. The prosecutor and the judges of the world court, they have no supreme court that sits above them. They have no checks and balances that determine whether or not the course of action that they have chosen is an appropriate course of action, is a course of action that could be supported by the rule of law. They are not subject to anyone. They answer to no one.

Accountability in our judicial system is what gives the foundation of the judiciary its strength. If there are no checks and balances, no accountability, that is defined as a dictatorship; and the prosecutor would come as close to a judicial dictator as any we have ever seen in the history of the judicial system in a free country, in countries of democracy.

Let me just review a few key points about my comments this evening. The world court, the President of the United States in the last few days has issued a directive, which he has the authority to do, that the United States will not participate, will not be a participant in the world court. The world court is a new entity that is being formed, being primarily driven by the European Union. This court would be

given unparalleled jurisdiction over the territories of all countries in the world, purportedly even over the United States, even though the United States will not cede any of its sovereignty. They can say anything they want, but they will not have any jurisdiction unless we give it to them, and the President chose not to give them that authority. The President chose not to give up our sovereignty.

How did we get here? The reason is President Clinton in the last minutes he held office signed a sheet of paper that said we will go ahead with this treaty, sounds good to him. It is not good. The United States of America should maintain its own judicial system, a judicial system that cedes authority and power to no one but the people of the United States of America. The United States of America, our borders and our territories, should be ruled by the rule of law that our Constitution provides, that our Constitution, which gives rights to defendants and rights to the victims, which assures that somebody accused of a crime can face their accuser, which assures that somebody who is tried for a crime can have a trial by a jury of their own peers.

Those kinds of rights are fundamental in our Constitution, and they are fundamental for the judicial system being so successful, relatively speaking, to any other system known in world history over this last 100 years.

The United States does not belong in a world court. The President was correct, and the President and the administration should get a strong voice of support from every Congressman, keeping us out of a world court and keeping that authority within the borders of the United States. This is not partisan. The fact is, it is American. Americans should keep what they have. What they have is the greatest judicial system known in the history of the world.

Let me make my final summary. I began this evening talking with my respected colleagues from the Blue Dogs, and I listened with interest to their comments given over an hour period of time. Some of their comments had some validity, but I felt the remarks were so partisan and such a strong attack on the majority party, the Republicans, and such an attack on the administration and our President, but it was never pointed out by the Blue Dogs, they identified themselves as Blue Dogs. I think it is important to point out while they may belong to an organization called Blue Dogs, the fact is that they are all Democrats. There are no Republicans in the organization. It is a Democratic organization, and it is an election year, and the purpose of one party is to try to gain advantage over the other party in an election year.

Keep in mind that those Members in that 1 hour of attacking the budget and the majority and the administration, one, is not responsible for coming up

with a budget; two, is not in the majority; and, three, is doing it for partisan purposes, in my opinion.

The next thing I want to make very clear, I think if one were to stand up here and talk about how terrible it is that the majority has pork projects and how terrible that we cannot balance our budget, how we need to stand up and worry about the future of our kids, as if any Member of Congress does not care about the future of kids, and how senior citizens are being abandoned by Social Security, as if any Member thinks that we should abandon senior citizens, that is the tool of fear.

The fact is that one ought to vote as they speak. It would seem to me that someone who is talking about a balanced budget, who is talking about stopping the pork programs, about moving that money into education and where the money really helps us the most, should be amongst the most vocal opponents of the farm bill. The farm bill has some magic to it because it is called the farm bill. Take a look at the budget-busting numbers of that bill.

I thought it was very ironic that these three gifted speakers, very dynamic in their focus on controlling the budget and controlling spending, when we look at the voting record, each Member voted yes, yes, yes, on the biggest budget-busting bill we have had in a long time up here. That is the kind of transparency that we should have.

Mr. Speaker, look at this world court. I hope each and every Member can support the President in the President's move to pull the United States from participation in this so-called court. Keep in mind it is countries like Cuba, and any other country has the same authority that the United States does, that the prosecution has no oversight, there is no Bill of Rights, there are no constitutional rights. This would be the most powerful system, the most powerful political organization known to the world once it gets up and going.

□ 2115

#### ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRUCCI). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, tonight I want to talk about an issue of great concern to me. I hope it is of great concern to my colleagues. I know it is of great concern to a majority of Americans out there. I know that because I receive thousands and thousands of communications from people all over this country about immigration, about their concerns with regard to immigration. And I have certainly taken this floor many nights to discuss my observations, to express my concern, my own personal concerns about massive immigration into the United States and the effects thereof.