are paying in payroll deductions go up to the high of 27.96 percent. If we go with their prescription drug program that says, look, here is prescription drugs that taxpayers are somehow, some way, some time are going to have to pay for, then we end up with a payroll tax that goes as high as 47 percent.

Let us look at a program where one gets better investment from some of that money going in, where government cannot mess around with those benefits by letting at least part of that payroll tax equivalent go into personal investments. Let us not mess around with the trust fund. Let us keep the trust fund growing.

But let us take some of this surplus on-budget money and use it to make this kind of transition that is going to keep probably America's most successful, maybe America's most important, program continuing and keep it solvent.

□

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOBSON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PALLONE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

□

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

□

WE NEED ''POWER'' TO CONTROL UNSCRUPULOUS ENERGY PRODUCERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, as our colleagues are going off to their home districts for the weekend, I want to remind them all of the crisis that is going on in my district in San Diego, California. They are the first city in California and, perhaps, the first in the Nation that has experienced full deregulation of its electricity prices. The cost of electricity to the average consumer, small business person, big business person has doubled, tripled in 3 or 4 months alone.

I want to remind my colleagues about what is going on in San Diego because San Diego is the harbinger of things to come for the rest of California and possibly the Nation. We are the poster children for what happens when deregulation of a basic commodity like electricity takes place in a monopoly situation.

Those who control the commodity can charge whatever price they can get. In fact, deregulation and the restructuring of the electricity industry is so flawed in California that electricity producers are allowed to charge wholesale prices four to five times higher than they were just a year ago. This is criminal, Mr. Speaker, and I use the word advisably.

Energy producers are making obscene profits on the back of our senior citizens, our schools, our hospitals, our libraries, our businesses. Our whole economy in California is threatened.

The electricity generators and marketeers have just in the last 4 months alone sucked almost $5 billion, that is billion with a ''B,'' from our State economy, more than $450 million from San Diego alone.

Now these generators claim that the high rates are simply the result of supply and demand forces in a marketplace. That is nonsense, Mr. Speaker. The facts are that Southern California has been using less energy than last year, but wholesale prices have gone up from highs of $50 per megawatt in 1999 to $300 and $500 and even higher at the sharpest spikes in the year 2000.

The energy producers have figured out how to manipulate the market and set artificially high wholesale prices. They withhold power until the last minute. They launder power throughout out-of-state companies, they overload transmission lines, all to cause prices to rise to unprecedented levels and to raise their obscene profits. They already have killed off many small businesses in San Diego, caused unbearable suffering among those on fixed income, and robbed our whole community possibly of our future.

I have introduced a bill, H.R. 5131, the HELP San Diego Act, which means Halt Electrical Price gouging in San Diego, with bipartisan support of the gentlemen from California (Mr. HUNTER and Mr. BILBRAY), my San Diego colleagues. Because although the State legislature has removed the gun from our head in capping retail prices, those prices are merely deferred for the next couple of years. Those bills will become due, and those debts will have to be paid. 5131 says that the wholesale generators and marketeers of electricity should pay that bill. They should refund the overcharges that they have made over the last 4 or 5 months.

Now, as I said, this bill has bipartisan support. Yet the Republican leadership of this House will not schedule on the agenda a bill that is necessary to save the economy of San Diego.

I call on the Republican leadership of this House to help San Diego, to put that bill on the agenda with bipartisan support, so we can, in fact, make sure that the future of San Diego's economy is secure.

I have also introduced a bill today that we call the POWER Act. Quite simply, the POWER Act protects our communities by imposing 100 percent excise tax on windfall profits that are the rule of market manipulation and price fixing.

If we cannot pass H.R. 5131, which directs the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to roll back the wholesale price and refund the overcharge to consumers, the POWER Act says that 100 percent tax on windfall profits shall be assessed.

This does not affect legitimate profits. It does not jeopardize any electrical producer. But it protects our senior citizens, our children, our small businesses, and our economy from the predatory actions of some unscrupulous companies that are taking advantage of their monopoly on the production of this vital and indispensable resource.

I ask my colleagues, as they return to their districts, to keep a close eye on San Diego.

□ 1500

We need your help in this last week of Congress. We need to pass H.R. 5131, a bipartisan bill to roll back wholesale prices in the western electric market, and to refund the consumers the obscene overcharging and profiteering they have been subject to.

I hope this Congress can act and act quickly. We must help San Diego.

□

THE FOUR CORNERSTONES OF MY SEASON IN THE CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SMITH of Michigan). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentlewoman from Idaho (Mrs. CHENOWETH-HAGE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mrs. CHENOWETH-HAGE. Mr. Speaker, I rise on this occasion to give a very special sort of address. I am not here today to talk about a specific piece of legislation or to discuss any one thing in particular that the administration is doing or failing to do, but my message here today is both personal in nature and something that I hope that my colleagues and future Members of this great body will find useful in times to come.

Mr. Speaker, I am here to talk about the experience that one very average American citizen has had over the course of the past 6 years in being a part of what has been termed the greatest deliberative body on earth: The United States Congress. And although people call me Congressman, or sometimes Congresswoman, I am very much simply an average American citizen, an American citizen who took leave from her ordinary, average American life to serve for a time as an advocate for over half a million people in a State 2,000 miles away. And that can only happen in America.

Now, after serving here for 3 terms, I am fulfilling a pledge that I made in 1994, and I am leaving this body of my own will, returning to a life of an average American citizen to live under the laws that I hope that we have made a little bit better here.

I want to share with my colleagues and for the record some of my observations about this great government of

ours, the daunting responsibilities we hold here, and my hope for the future. So I want to talk about several things.

I want to discuss the purpose of this mighty Congress and what its proper role is in the lives of ordinary Americans. I want to discuss how certain matters become very real and very practical matters in our everyday life, matters that may have at one time been theory but have become reality. And I want to raise some real questions and concerns about the future.

First, however, I would like to say a few words about some of the people who have worked for me and assisted me over the years. I feel that I have an extraordinary staff. I have been blessed, not through my own skill but I think it was just a blessing, that I was able to pull together a staff that I think are unusually brilliant and unusually fine Americans and who, within themselves individually, the flame for liberty and freedom beat within their hearts and, therefore, we were able to accomplish much together, this Chenoweth team.

My staff consisted of: Lois Anderson, Judy Boyle, Chris Caron, Doug Crandall, Georgia Golling, Ann Heissenbuttel, Chad Hyslop, Dave Kroeger, Dean Lester, Lisa Lovell, Matt Miller, Linda Mullin, Nathan Olsen, Karen Roetter, Keith Rupp, Valerie Schatz, Elizabeth Schwarzer, Tereasa Sinigiani, and Rhonda Tilden. And to all of them I just want to say thanks so much for the wonderful job.

There is a great deal of personal affection and admiration that I hold for my office staff, and there is among all of us the thing that has always bound us together and given purpose to our days here on Capitol Hill, which has been our shared commitment to a vision, a vision of our Nation and our government here in America. Let me tell my colleagues a little bit about that vision.

My vision as a Congressman for the first district of Idaho has been that America would continue to be a land where people live in peace with one another; that they respect each other's individual rights and property; and that people are free to advance as far as their individual talents and commitments to work hard will take them.

I believe that the rights of the people are not derived from government but, rather, the inalienable rights of the people to life, liberty, property and the pursuit of happiness are God-given rights that existed prior to the formation of any government. It is because these rights exist that governments are created by the people to help protect these rights that are God given. My vision is for a government that is keenly aware of this relationship between the governed and the governors, and which views its primary role as a protector of people's rights as opposed to a protector of people's persons or what they may think, and which views itself as the servant of the people and never the people's master.

I envisioned a congressional office staff which recognized the primacy of the citizens over the government, and I insisted that my staff recognize that they work for the constituents in Idaho's first district and across America, not the government; and that advancing the vision of freedom and individual liberty and providing service to constituents is the first priority in our office.

Most people who serve in this institution, I daresay, have a vision for the country and for their constituents. Those visions must be larger than our own personal ambitions and they must spring from a sense of purpose not necessarily for ourselves at all but for our fellow Americans and future generations. But what is the source of that purpose? To ponder that question is to ponder the purpose of government itself.

Since the beginning of time, man has wondered how to live together in harmony. Volumes have been written about it. It certainly has never been easy to figure out. There has always been a tendency for people to equate might with right. The philosopher Thomas Hobbes famously argued that man tends to be self-serving and to have a natural tendency to strive against and to plunder his fellow man. This is the basis of why we have government. People exist, people are born with certain natural rights. They have a right to continue to exist, and no one has a right to harm or kill another.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, if the gentlewoman would yield for just a moment, I just wanted to say, on behalf of many of us in the United States House of Representatives, I would like to thank the gentlewoman for her very diligent and hard work not only in representing the gentlewoman's district but in helping the United States of America. It is not easy. The gentlewoman has sacrificed, like many of us, a great deal.

So I thank the gentlewoman very, very much for her tremendous contribution that she has made in the last 6 years.

Mrs. CHENOWETH-HAGE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan, and I will always have very fond memories of landing in the gentleman's office and asking him to help me go over an appropriations bill and help untangle the mystery of the appropriating process here. The gentleman has been a great teacher.

I want to remind my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, that liberty is something that people have a right to their own freedom and they may not be held in bondage to one another. That is what liberty means. It is so important that we remember people's property rights. People simply do have a right to own things, and we have a responsibility to make sure that we respect the ownership rights of others.

The philosopher John Locke expounded on this notion when he said labor, in and of itself, is the origin and justification of property, according to Locke. And whatever a man ''mixes his labor with'' is his to use. It is his property. So in the state of nature, men have a right to protect their natural rights and to punish transgressors. So civil society arises when men agree to delegate this job of protecting their rights to an unbiased entity: A government. So because men establish this entity, government, they have the right to set limits on its authority, to modify it, or even to dismantle it should the need arise.

Now, a century later, this served as the rational foundation for our own Declaration of Independence. It is that very doctrine that gave us Americans the very moral authority to rebel against the tyranny of the British Crown. Why, my colleagues might ask, am I going over all this ancient history? Well, it is very simple, Mr. Speaker. It is because people forget. People forget across this Nation, but people forget in this body as well.

Mr. Speaker, if during one of my colleagues' town hall meetings that we all hold in our respective districts, they were to ask their constituents why we have a government, people would be likely to stare at them like a tree full of owls and they would probably experience an uncomfortable silence. Then, suddenly, some wiseacre might pipe up and say that he has been trying to figure that out all of his life. But then, usually, someone will say, well, we have government because we need to provide for the national defense. Well, they are on the right track, but that is not all there is to it.

Seldom will we hear one of our constituents recite those vitally important words of Thomas Jefferson, those words that he wrote in the Declaration of Independence, which states: ''We hold these truths to be self-evident: That all men are created equal, and that they are endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights, rights that among us are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. And that to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.''

Oh, I hope that that will become emblazoned indelibly on our souls and our spirits and our minds; that government receives its just power from those who are governed. But to secure the rights of government, governments are instituted among men, and the reason our government exists is to secure the inalienable rights of the American people. No more, no less.

That has been my message over the past 6 years. It is very simple, it is very old, but it works for freedom and liberty. And while I am certain that a poll of our colleagues would find universal agreement and sentiment for that very sentiment that I just expressed, we have differing opinions on how we turn those eloquent words into action. It has been my experience that turning those values into real action

seems to be one of the hardest things for some people to really, truly understand.

Sometimes my colleagues seem to think that little things are unimportant. But, Mr. Speaker, the little things are so vitally important. I think every schoolchild has heard the poem about the importance of little things by George Herbert when he wrote that: ''For the want of a nail, the shoe was lost; For the want of a shoe, the horse was lost; For the want of a horse, the rider was lost; For the want of a rider, the battle was lost; For the want of a battle, the kingdom was lost!''

Yes, Mr. Speaker, little things matter. Little nails in horses hooves matter. They matter to all of us. And these little things are very important in the fight and the maintenance of our freedoms.

Some of my colleagues have certainly scratched their heads in wonder over some of the positions that I have taken over these years, and they wonder why I make such a big deal about language affecting private property rights or over some language that some might consider obscure issues, like the primacy of State water rights. My insistence that these rights be protected has certainly inconvenienced some Members of this House and served to annoy some Members and their staffs. And though it is sometimes an inconvenience, I hope that all who love freedom can understand how much more inconvenient it would be if we carelessly neglected the little nails and just began to give away our freedoms and liberty.

□ 1515

If the first job of government is to protect the rights of the freedoms of its citizens, then that is the standard by which we must first measure every single act we undertake.

I would like to discuss how I have attempted to apply these ideals to certain legislation in the hope that it might help some understand the importance of these issues, and perhaps some of my colleagues might take up this banner and continue to carry it forward as I leave this fine institution.

There are four areas in which I have seen the struggle most closely and I felt it most deeply. These have been the four cornerstones of my work here in Congress; and that is protecting the Constitution and protecting the rights of citizens, protecting our property and the wealth of our people, and protecting our national sovereignty.

Mr. Speaker, each of us swears an oath to uphold the Constitution of the United States of America and to protect it. But, Mr. Speaker, there are so many Americans, and I daresay a few of our colleagues here in this House, who seem to think that this is a matter of evolving and galloping interpretation.

But I remember when I first came to Congress in 1995, during those heady days of the Contract with America, one of the first matters that was considered in the Contract with America was granting the President line item veto authority. The power, in effect, would grant to the President the power to rewrite our legislation by eliminating certain specific provisions in the bills that we sent to him and then immediately signing that legislation into law.

I felt that that was unconstitutional. But this was an issue that had been championed by the people, especially Republicans, and it was a proposal favored by my favorite President, Ronald Reagan.

But I broke ranks with the leadership of my own party to oppose the line item veto. I did oppose it. I did vote against it because I believed that it constituted an unconstitutional shift away from legislative power to the administration.

So, Mr. Speaker, I can remember that it was difficult to go home after that vote, and I can remember a lot of my fellow Republicans criticizing me for that position. Who was I but a freshman Member, just an ordinary woman from Idaho, from a small western State, to oppose this kind of gigantic reform.

But I must confess that it gave me some small degree of satisfaction when the United States Supreme Court ruled that it was, indeed, unconstitutional for the President to have the power to rewrite legislation by vetoing part of it and struck down the line item veto.

Likewise, I have always thought that one aspect of the Endangered Species Act was especially silly, and I have fought against the ramifications of the Endangered Species Act since I first came to Congress.

But it was a legal tradition that held under the Endangered Species Act in and of itself that people did not have legal standing under the Endangered Species Act.

In fact, the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals ruled that humans are not within the realm of jurisdiction under the Endangered Species Act. So if your private property was taken under the Endangered Species Act, you had absolutely no recourse for the damages. The only way a person could be an advocate in court under the Endangered Species Act, according to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, was if they went in there and sued on behalf of an endangered species. They had to represent the species, not the human.

So, Mr. Speaker, I offered legislation to correct this obvious flaw in the law. And my colleagues should have heard some of the hoots offered up when I did that. Some people assumed that I was being facetious when I argued that people should have at least the same legal rights as the bugs and the snails and the animals and the plants.

But while my bill was working its way through the system, the United States Supreme Court beat me to the punch and ruled that, yes indeed, people do have legal standing under the Endangered Species Act. So, once again, I felt vindicated by the United States Supreme Court.

Mr. Speaker, I want to remind my colleagues that the genesis of the Constitution has been proven by the test of time as well as the genius of that great document. It has succeeded when others have failed. The United States is now the longest running democracy in the history of the world, but it will only continue to be so if we jealously guard and protect the Constitution and if we do not give in to the political expediency of the day and begin to weaken it.

I think about the political correctness that is now beginning to drive public policy in this Nation, and I have to remember what Charlton Heston just recently said, and this was that ''political correctness is simply tyranny with manners. Oh that we would have the courage to do that which is unpopular but that which we feel is right and constitutional.''

Heston went on to say that ''political correctness is today's pocket change, but that courage is the currency of history.''

So if we give in to political expediency, we will be crying out in this Nation for the want of another nail, the little things that can bring down a nation. Which brings me to the second issue, protecting the rights of our citizens.

The Constitution is the document free men wrote with the central purpose in mind of protecting God-given rights. And let us never weaken in that defense. Because the most important of these rights to be protected by government is the right to life.

And this is why have I been such a staunch defender of the rights of the unborn children. That child, that weakest citizen among us, is the most important and most needy when it comes to having a fair and impartial government to protect his or her life.

Simply put, that is why I speak out in defense of the unborn. And if you believe that life begins before birth, then government has a responsibility to protect that life. It is the first rule of law.

Mr. Speaker, I am also a very outspoken defender of the second amendment. I am a defender of all of the Bill of Rights, but it seems to me that the second amendment is the one that is actually under political attack most often. It is under political attack through political correctness, through massive marches, and just through the shear emotionalism that is reigning today.

No American takes lightly the threat of violence, and no American can ignore the issue of crime and personal safety. No American can dismiss the violence that has erupted in our schools. But to say the problem with crime and violence is the availability of guns is to cop out with an easy answer.

The problem is not the inanimate or the things or the guns or the knives or

whatever else, it is a person who will casually use these objects to plunder or hurt or kill other persons.

To diminish our right to keep and bear arms by entangling us in more gun control is to want to loose yet another nail that may ultimately destroy our Nation.

It was precisely that danger that George Mason in 1788 wrote about and addressed this Nation when he addressed the Congress then and he said, ''When the resolution of enslaving America was formed in Great Britain, the British parliament was advised by an artful man, who was governor of Pennsylvania, to disarm the people, that it was the best and most effectual way to enslave them, but that they should not do it openly but just weaken them and let them sink gradually.''

Well, is that not the picture of gun control? But addressing the human factor is much more difficult than taking things away.

I find it amazing, for instance, that some of these same people who make the most noise about limiting their fellow American's second amendment rights are those same entertainment industry leaders who produce music, movies, and video games that glorify violence and debase our values. They, in essence, pit one basic right, one freedom of expression against another.

I find it amazing, Mr. Speaker, and I find it amazingly cynical. And yet where is the outrage over this? Rather than simply control themselves, the Hollywood moguls and the product they produce, they want to take the constitutionally guaranteed rights away from all their fellow men. It is cynical. It is selfish. It is short sighted, Mr. Speaker.

Let us seek solutions to our problems, but let us do it in a way that respects the rights of all of our citizens. Those rights are so essential.

Another early debate in which I became involved is centered around the efforts to reform the writ of habeas corpus and the rights under habeas corpus, that great writ.

It pained me, Mr. Speaker, to take a position in opposition of some of those great committee chairmen, some of my colleagues for whom I have enormous respect. But I fought against a proposal that sought to punish terrorists but which would cause ordinary citizens to lose their constitutionally guaranteed rights against search and seizure.

So the rights to speak and assemble freely, to be ensured of due process of law, and to be protected against false imprisonment belong to all Americans. We cannot allow ourselves to be frightened by one issue into giving up all of these freedoms or taking them away from our citizens.

So what Thomas Paine said in 1795 is as true today as it ever was before. Thomas Paine said, ''He that would make his own liberty secure must guard even his enemy from oppression.''

I remembered that expression by Thomas Paine when I joined my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to protect this profoundly important right of Americans.

To protect our rights, we give the government very powerful law enforcement powers. These powers are what enables society to move away from the concept of making might right.

A fair and responsible authority is supposed to act to protect our rights and to punish transgressors. But what happens when these law enforcement agencies themselves abuse the law or act in ways that cause distrust in the minds the very people they are supposed to be serving and protecting?

And this is what happened in a remote part of my district shortly before I was elected. It happened in a place called Ruby Ridge. Men who were supposed to protect people's rights and their lives instead perverted their mission into a bizarre siege of a man and his family.

Admittedly, the man held some unpopular opinions. But in a land where a person's right to his own opinion constitutes the first amendment, that is no justification for the killings of Randy Weaver's young son and the killing of his wife, Vicky, who held nothing more threatening in her arms than her infant 10-month-old daughter.

Mr. Speaker, this was a sad day in America; and this is an outrageous abuse of law enforcement power. And it did much more damage to us than the personal tragedies of the killings in this incident. It began to kill the trust and the respect that many Americans had for their government, and we reaped the whirlwind in the years that followed.

I think of Waco and I think of the seizure of Elian Gonzales, and it all amounts to the fact that we are beginning to numb America's senses to the outrage against the intrusion of Federal law enforcement in our homes and the security of our properties.

In the years ahead, Mr. Speaker, it is one of my most fervent hopes that my colleagues will continue to be ever vigilant against the possibility of anything like that ever happening again.

□ 1530

Mr. Speaker, as important as it is to protect the rights of our people, it is also important to protect their property. The right to own property, to keep that for which you labor, is perhaps the essence of a really truly free society. And it is one of the most essential roles of government, to protect private property. In fact, John Adams said that property is as sovereign as the laws of God, and that there must be a force of law and justice to protect property. Without property, Adams said, liberty cannot exist. And now with this Nation owning or controlling in the 40 percentile of this entire land base, we have to ask in this generation what has happened to our property rights? To own our property has been something that has allowed America to grow, to become a Nation that has been able to produce for its people the greatest standard of living in the history of civilization.

Over the centuries, many students of human nature have commented on the tendency of man to ignore other people's property rights if it suits his own individual interests. One of the philosophers whom I most admire was a Frenchman named Frederick Bastiat. If one of the signs of genius is to be able to distill complex ideas into a short, easily understandable form, then Bastiat was, by definition, a genius because in 1850 he published a little book, it is only 75 pages long, called ''The Law.'' It is such an influential and important work that I actually require anyone who wants to work in my congressional office to read this book and to write an essay or a book report on their reactions to it so I can read their essay before I interview them. Bastiat was able to distill what the relationship between the governed and the governors really should be.

With regards to property, Bastiat wrote this:

''Man can live and satisfy his wants only by ceaseless labor; by the ceaseless application of his faculties to natural resources. This process is the origin of property.

''But it is also true that a man may live and satisfy his wants by seizing and consuming the products of the labor of others. This process is the origin of plunder.

''Now, since man is naturally inclined to avoid pain —and since labor in and of itself is pain—it follows that men will resort to plunder whenever plunder is easier than work. History shows this quite clearly. Under these conditions, neither religion or morality can stop it.''

Bastiat continues:

''When, then, does plunder stop? It stops when it becomes more painful and more dangerous than labor.

''It is evident, then, that the proper purpose of law is to use the power of its collective force to stop this fatal tendency to plunder instead of work. All the measures of the law should protect property and punish plunder.

''But, generally, the law is made by one man or one class of men. And since law cannot operate without the sanction and support of a dominating force, this force must be entrusted to those who make the laws.

''This fact, combined with the fatal tendency that exists in the heart of man to satisfy his wants with the least possible effort, explains the almost universal perversion of the law. Thus it is easy to understand how law, instead of checking injustice, becomes the invincible weapon of injustice. It is easy to understand why the law is used by the legislator to destroy, in varying degrees among the rest of the people, to destroy their personal independence by slavery, to destroy their liberty by oppression, and to destroy their property by plunder.

''This is done by the person who makes the law, and in proportion to the power that he holds.''

Well, those were very interesting words by Bastiat, words that really go deep in my soul. And so you see in a representative democracy such as ours, we are more insulated from the whims of a single person or a single class of people than were the citizens of France in the mid-19th century. Yet I think it is foolish if we ignore human nature, and I think it is even more foolish if we ignore the nature of government to by nature grow more powerful and bigger and more oppressive. There are certain classes of citizens who, still today, seek to gain political power in order to take advantage of the labor of others, and they use the power of big government to do just exactly that.

Bastiat goes on to argue that men naturally rebel against the injustice of which they are victims. ''Thus,'' he says, ''when plunder is organized by law for the profit of those who make the law, all the plundered classes try somehow to enter, by peaceful or revolutionary means, into the making of laws. According to their degree of enlightenment, these plundered classes may propose one of two entirely different purposes when they attempt to obtain political power: One, either they must wish to stop lawful plunder; or, two, they may wish to share in it.

''Woe to the Nation when this latter purpose prevails.''

Mr. Speaker, we see today American citizens being plundered by other American citizens for a wide variety of purposes. We see Americans paying higher cumulative taxes than ever before to sustain programs that channel wealth from one class to another, or from one person to another. We see some of the leaders of this Nation proclaiming that some Americans are just too wealthy and that they do not deserve to be treated fairly and equitably under the law. We see class warfare motivated by personal envy. We see some citizens who live in populous parts of the country decide they want to take land from some people in the less populous western States and they argue that they want this land not for personal wealth but for aesthetic purposes or aboriginal purposes. But the end result is still the same: They are actually taking something from someone else and they are locking other Americans out of their beloved land.

We see a concerted, shortsighted effort on the part of some to seemingly attack the sources of original wealth in this Nation. And we know that it is a combination of land, labor and capital, only land, labor and capital, that creates original wealth. Yet that is being exploded apart with the seizure of our land.

In a time in which the new economy provides fabulous wealth overnight based on the trading of information, we are forgetting that all original wealth originates in the land. Wealth is created by the proper combination of land, property, and labor and capital, no more, no less. Wealth comes first from the things that we mine or mill or harvest, and without those things there can be no stock markets and no information superhighways and no bridges to the future.

But, Mr. Speaker, we are today turning our backs on this original wealth. To hear the way some would talk, you would think that mining minerals from the Earth or harvesting crops, including timber and raising livestock, are somehow morally reprehensible and wrong. Instead, our natural resources are the sources of our economic strength which built this country, which in turn became magnified and powerful through the strength of our economy.

President Theodore Roosevelt, commonly referred to as the father of today's environmental movement, said in a speech to the American Society of Foresters way back in 1903:

''First and foremost,'' Roosevelt said, ''you can never afford to forget for one moment what is the object of our forest policy. That object is not to preserve the forests because they are beautiful, though that is good in and of itself, nor because they are refuges for the wild creatures of the wilderness, though that, too, is good in itself; but the primary object of our forest policy, as of the land policy of the United States of America, is the making of prosperous homes. It is part of the traditional policy of home-making of our country. Every other consideration comes as secondary. The whole effort of the government in dealing with the forests must be directed to this end, keeping in view the fact that it is not only necessary to start the homes as prosperous but to keep them so.''

He went on to say, ''Your attention must be directed to the preservation of the forests not, as an end in and of itself, but as a means of preserving and increasing the prosperity of this Nation. Forestry is the preservation of forests by wise use of the forests.''

But those who call themselves environmentalists today would have turned their backs on Roosevelt's vision. What has happened when we impose an extreme and narrow political policy on our natural resources? We have this year experienced catastrophic wildfires, burning more board feet this year of timber than we have ever logged off our national forests. That is sheer waste. That is sheer destruction.

We must not cut off our noses to spite our face, Mr. Speaker. We must responsibly use and promote these industries. We must be wise stewards of our Earth and our resources. But those resources are there for us to use.

Just as there are some citizens who would plunder other citizens, there are other nations in this world who would seek unfair advantages from us, this great Nation. We must protect our Nation's interests and our national sovereignty. Sovereignty forms the fourth cornerstone of the policies that I have advocated. Just as with any community, there is a global community, and we should and do try to be a good and responsible neighbor in that community. Yet there are those who would argue that we are such a part of this global community that we can lose our identity and that people in other nations should have a voice in such matters as our own land policies or consumer protection laws or our judicial systems. That goes beyond being a good neighbor into becoming the neighborhood's doormat. Let America never become the global doormat.

That is why I and some of my colleagues put up such a fight over such seemingly small issues as World Heritage Site designations and the Man in the Biosphere programs of the United Nations. These are the neighborhood's busybodies, offering their opinions on the state of our yards and gardens. Everyone welcomes praise, but when the praise starts to turn into a sanctioning of what we may and may not do, a bright line has been crossed, a bright line has been crossed and an invasion into our sovereignty.

In the recent film about the American Revolution entitled ''The Patriot,'' I saw that and I think everyone, Mr. Speaker, in this body should view the movie ''The Patriot.'' It would remind everyone here in this body why we are here. The main character in that film rose and asked a body of his compatriots, ''Would you be ruled by one tyrant 3,000 miles away or by 3,000 tyrants one mile away?''

Mr. Speaker, we now seem to face the prospect of thousands of would-be tyrants trying to rule us from all around the world. Nowhere is the fight to preserve our national sovereignty more important than in preserving our national security. I have often said that in my heart of hearts I really am a dove. But I want America to be the best armed dove on the planet. George Washington said it more eloquently when he said, ''To be prepared for war is one of the most effectual means of preserving the peace.'' And Ronald Reagan carried that out effectively.

□ 1545

Sadly, we have allowed the readiness of our military to deteriorate badly. Training missions are compromised by tight budgets, we have military families eligible for food stamps, and retention levels are becoming difficult to maintain. And we often fail to meet our duty to our past warriors, our veterans, those great Americans. We provide them with inadequate health services. We dishonor them with neglect. In my home State of Idaho, we have not even provided them with a specific field of honor in which to lie when they pass on to the next world.

I am very pleased to report, Mr. Speaker, that as one of my proudest accomplishments, it does look like we will have that field of honor for our brave military veterans soon under construction at a place in Idaho just outside of Boise.

But we must be very careful that we do not trade away our national sovereignty in some ill-considered effort

to become popular with the rest of the world. Our military exists to protect American land and vital American interests. We cannot bully the rest of the world into behaving like we do. But I just cringe when I think of American soldiers serving under foreign command, and I think that should never, never happen.

And when it comes to protecting our sovereignty, we must not compromise our internal laws to suit foreign interests, nor must we allow our thirst for trade with other nations to allow us to ignore the aggressive and threatening natures of some of our other neighbors in this global community. And we certainly must not casually give away any more of our important strategic assets, whether they be the secrets to our most powerful weapons, or important avenues for commercial and military traffic, such as the Panama Canal, which is now being run by the Red Chinese in violation of the Panama Canal Treaty. The Red Chinese are now piloting our ships through the Panama Canal.

Mr. Speaker, it is my belief and has been my work for the past years and will continue after I leave Congress, to defend these four cornerstones of freedom. This is the most important job that we have as legislators, to preserve the lives, the liberty and the property of our fellow citizens, and to protect our national sovereignty.

There has, however, been an almost inexorable trend against those unalienable rights. There is no mistake in my mind that those rights have weakened as our Federal Government has grown bigger and stronger. The efforts that work against those rights often come clothed in garments of good intentions.

When we seek to remedy some problem through the expansion or consolidation of power into a smaller set of hands, remember the words of Lord Acton, that power corrupts, and absolute power corrupts absolutely.

That corruption will twist and bend the law away from what our Founding Fathers intended and into something future generations will regret and future generations would suffer under.

So, Mr. Speaker and my fellow Members of Congress, it has been a great privilege to serve in this body, this great body representing this great land, this powerful government of the people, by the people and for the people. I hope that you will remember my words, and I hope that you will remember the lofty, yet very simple reason that we are here. And years hence, when some colleague takes the floor of this magnificent Chamber and speaks out for the cause of freedom and liberty, I hope that you will take those words to heart.

□

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOBSON). Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 49 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□

□ 2159

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PEASE) at 9 O'clock and 59 minutes p.m.

□

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 4461, AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

Mr. YOUNG of Florida submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 4461) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 106–948)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4461) ''making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes'', having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert:

SECTION 1. (a) The provisions of H.R. 5426 of the 106th Congress, as introduced on October 6, 2000, are hereby enacted into law.

(b) In publishing this Act in slip form and in the United States Statutes at Large pursuant to section 112, of title 1, United States Code, the Archivist of the United States shall include after the date of approval at the end an appendix setting forth the text of the bill referred to in subsection (a) of this section.

And the Senate agree to the same.

JOE SKEEN,
JAMES T. WALSH,
JAY DICKEY,
JACK KINGSTON,
GEORGE R. NETHERCUTT, Jr.,
HENRY BONILLA,
TOM LATHAM,
JO ANN EMERSON,
C.W. BILL YOUNG,
Managers on the Part of the House.

THAD COCHRAN,
ARLEN SPECTER,
CHRISTOPHER S. BOND,
SLADE GORTON,
MITCH MCCONNELL,
CONRAD BURNS,
TED STEVENS,
HERB KOHL,
TOM HARKIN
(Except for Cuba and drug reimportation),
BYRON L. DORGAN,
DIANNE FEINSTEIN,
ROBERT C. BYRD,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the House and Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4461) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, submit the following joint statement to the House and Senate in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

The conference agreement would enact the provisions of H.R. 5426 as introduced on October 6, 2000. The text of that bill follows:

A BILL

Making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and related Programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I

AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS

PRODUCTION, PROCESSING, AND MARKETING

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Secretary of Agriculture, and not to exceed $75,000 for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109, $2,914,000: Provided, That not to exceed $11,000 of this amount shall be available for official reception and representation expenses, not otherwise provided for, as determined by the Secretary: Provided further, That none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to pay the salaries and expenses of personnel of the Department of Agriculture to carry out section 793(c)(1)(C) of Public Law 104–127: Provided further, That none of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enforce section 793(d) of Public Law 104–127.

EXECUTIVE OPERATIONS

CHIEF ECONOMIST

For necessary expenses of the Chief Economist, including economic analysis, risk assessment, cost-benefit analysis, energy and new uses, and the functions of the World Agricultural Outlook Board, as authorized by the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1622g), and including employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), of which not to exceed $5,000 is for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109, $7,462,000.

NATIONAL APPEALS DIVISION

For necessary expenses of the National Appeals Division, including employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), of which not to exceed $25,000 is for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109, $12,421,000.

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND PROGRAM ANALYSIS

For necessary expenses of the Office of Budget and Program Analysis, including employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), of which not to exceed $5,000 is for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109, $6,765,000.