

busy working, they do not have time to demonstrate.

The American people ought to know that every household in America, because of the travel and tourism industry, pays \$652 less in taxes. That is right. If you live and own a home anywhere in America, yesterday, on tax day, you paid \$652 less in taxes because of this industry, because so many people are employed in this industry. The travel and tourism industry pays a total of \$54 billion a year in taxes, and that benefits all Americans.

What has this Congress done? This Congress has closed down the U.S. Travel and Tourism Administration. Travel and tourism is the second largest industry in America and we have stopped advertising. What does every small business person in America know? You have to do some advertising. But Congress said "We are going to save a few dollars," being very myopic, "and we are going to close down the U.S. Travel and Tourism Administration."

What I have done is introduce this legislation, and it does not cost 1 dollar in taxes. With this legislation will have the Government and private industry, travel and tourism, working together to let the world know what we have got to offer right here in America.

Every day we can see the benefits of travel and tourism. We had one of our Members here this morning talking about the environment and Earth Day. The money we spend on Earth Day, what will it do? It's just 1 day, where people work on a project, and speak to the TV news in the evening; but the next day it is all forgotten.

Not with travel and tourism. People in travel and tourism are environmentalists every day of the year. Why? It's their business. We want to have clean water. We want to have clean air. We want to make sure we have recreational areas for people to enjoy and to have a healthy environment: All of this means tourism.

I think the U.S. Congress, Mr. Speaker, is waking up to that message, and that is why we have 219 cosponsors on this bill. Very few bills ever get that kind of support.

But the flip side is we have 216 Members of Congress in the House who are not yet signed on. Do they not care about one out of every nine working people in America? I want the travel and tourism industry to contact these Members too. To let them know this is going to be an election issue, and that travel and tourism means jobs.

There are three industries that jobs for the American people will come from the rest of this decade and into the 21st century. What are they? Telecommunications, information technology, and travel and tourism. These are the three great job-producers in America's future.

So when we talk about travel and tourism, we are talking about an industry that is going to produce the jobs that our people need if we are going to have a strong economy.

The U.S. Congress is not going to produce jobs. Travel and tourism produce jobs for one out of every nine working Americans. In only 4 years, 661 million people will be traveling worldwide. Why is that important? Because that number of people will spend more than \$585 billion in the process. That is a lot of money to be added to the American economy.

Mr. Speaker, our Travel and Tourism Caucus is the largest caucus in Congress—304 Members. I ask all Members to join this caucus, because travel and tourism is the wave of the future.

THE 104TH CONGRESS AND THE ENVIRONMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be a cosponsor of the travel and tourism legislation of our colleague from Wisconsin, Mr. ROTH, and wish him much success with it. However, I do take issue with one comment that he made, and that is what he said about Earth Day, that it is a day we go have our press events, make some fuss about Earth Day, and then it is forgotten for the rest of the year.

Maybe that is the approach that some of our colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle, and I am not including Mr. ROTH in that, because I know that is not his attitude, but some of our more extreme Members on the Republican side of the aisle take to Earth Day, but that is not the appropriate approach.

As our colleague mentioned Earth Day, we are preparing for Earth Day, the 26th anniversary of the first Earth Day, which will occur next Monday. I think it is important to make some observations about what has happened in this 104th Congress when it comes to the environment.

The 104th Congress came to Washington with an aggressive anti-environment agenda promoted largely by industry and special interest groups who are determined to turn back 25 years of progress to protect public health, safety and the environment.

The budget cuts proposed by the Gingrich majority in Congress for the Department of Interior and the Environmental Protection Agency are aimed at the heart of our Nation's environmental protection. The two departments with the greatest environmental authority have become the prime targets in the current attack on the environment.

The proposed cut in funding for the EPA is 21 percent below last year's level, and this would seriously affect EPA's enforcement of clean air, clean water, and safe drinking water laws. The Interior appropriations bill included provisions to open Alaska's Tongass National Forest to increased logging and to continue the morato-

rium on the listing of new endangered species.

The funding for protection of our Nation's wetlands, endangered species, forests and the public lands, must not be sacrificed in favor of short-term profits for miners, grazers, and developers. Programs to protect our Nation's water and air should not be held hostage to budget antics that have left these primary environmental agencies limping through the 1996 fiscal year with only a fraction of the funding needed to function.

Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of our colleagues once again some of the impacts of the extreme Republican cuts on the EPA. Weakened enforcement of environmental laws, including a 40-percent reduction in health and safety inspections of industrial facilities; delayed new standards to protect drinking water, including tap water standards; delayed new and ongoing cleanups at toxic waste sites; rolled-back community right-to-know information about toxic chemicals; created barriers to developing new controls to protect rivers and streams from industrial water pollutants. The Republican approaches have delayed approving pesticides with lower health risks as a safer alternative for farmers, delayed new standards for toxic industrial air pollutants, delayed review of air pollution standards to ensure adequate health protection, delayed studies on how toxic chemicals may impair reproductive development, and studies on how pollution affects high risk populations.

I want to make two observations. The list goes on and on. I am just naming a few that affect EPA. There are others that affect the Department of the Interior and the Department of Justice's enforcement. I make two observations about that list.

One is, Mr. Speaker, as you know, as a colleague on the Subcommittee on Health and Human Services of the Committee on Appropriations, scientists have come before our subcommittee and said that you cannot separate personal health from the health of our environment. Pollution prevention is disease prevention. That makes these cuts foolish cuts, because they are not cutting the budget, they are reducing an investment in public health as well as environmental health.

I want to also call to the attention of our colleagues the release of a report by the California State Senate on environmental protection. The report says, "Contrary to popular belief, environmental regulations are not a major cause of job losses and declining economic performance." The Senate report concludes that environmental laws are not a major cause for the relocation of businesses to other States or countries. According to the report, more jobs are lost from leveraged buy-outs and mergers than from controlling pollution.

The American people have the answer: They want a safe and healthy environment. We should follow their lead

and we should live up to their expectations that the Federal Government will ensure their health and safety at all levels.

Mr. Speaker, on that note, I would like to close by saying when we observe Earth Day this year, we should use it to make observations about how far we have come and what is at risk, and we should every day of every year work to protect the environment and health of the American people.

THE NEW LEGISLATIVE AGENDA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, today Congress returns from a 2-week break, and the Republican majority leader has announced what he calls a new legislative agenda for this Congress. But in fact it is the same old Republican agenda, dressed up with some new rhetoric. Their agenda still fails the fundamental test, which is helping working middle-class families cope with the challenges that they face in their everyday lives.

When I was home during the recent break, I met with constituents in my district who feel that this Congress is simply not doing the job that working families need.

Consider just two issues, health care and pensions. The House passed a health insurance reform bill that should have addressed, I repeat, should have addressed, the problems faced by the millions of Americans who cannot get health insurance because they suffer from a preexisting condition.

I have a preexisting condition. I am a survivor of ovarian cancer. There are not too many businesses that want to include me in their insurance policy because of my prior illness. It would raise the cost of premiums for everyone. So I understand this problem of preexisting condition.

Millions of Americans cannot get health insurance because they suffer from a preexisting condition, or they fear losing their coverage if they lose or they change their jobs. When Congress took up this bill, we had a real opportunity, a real opportunity, to help families in this country by modestly reforming the health insurance industry and meeting the needs of working families.

I was in Wallingford, CT, not too long ago, where I met with a group of construction workers. One of the gentlemen there said to me that he was very, very much concerned about the downsizing of businesses all over the country. He has a child with a terminal illness. He said, "I stay up nights worrying that if I lose my job, I lose my health care. What do I do about my child's illness and her health care?"

We had an opportunity, and, unfortunately and sadly, the bill that passed the House is a bad bill. It let the

American people down, and it will make the health care problem worse.

We had a bipartisan bill sponsored in the Senate by Senator KENNEDY and Senator KASSEBAUM, and in this body, in the House, by Congresswoman MARGE ROUKEMA of New Jersey, a bipartisan bill that took the first steps toward addressing these two very serious problems. Instead of passing that legislation as it is and as the authors thought it best, what happened was that under the banner of reform, the House passed the bill which includes extraneous provisions that raise costs, hurt consumers, and will increase the number of uninsured in this country.

For example, they added medical savings accounts, which are expensive, destructive and bad health care policy. Instead of helping working middle-class families, our Republican colleagues continue to cater to the special interests. The medical savings accounts are a creature of the Golden Rule Insurance Co., headed up by J. Patrick Rooney, who, not by my description, but by the description of a variety of others, including the Wall Street Journal, has indicated that he is the third largest contributor to Republican campaigns.

Medical savings accounts have been added to this bill, causing an enormous problem. Medical savings accounts will take the healthy out of the traditional insurance pool, provide them with a tax break, and leave the insurance pool with only those who are frail and sick, thereby driving up premiums for everyone else. With the rise in those costs of premiums, people will no longer be able to afford them, thereby increasing the number of uninsured.

The American Council of Actuaries, not a liberal group by any stretch of the imagination, indicated that there would be a 61 percent shifting of costs with the medical savings account to those who are now currently insured in a traditional insurance policy, a 61-percent shift in cost.

Working Americans know very, very well, very well, about cost shifting in health care. When people are not insured, that does not go begging, it does not fall into a black hole. Everybody else who is insured picks up the cost. We had an opportunity, and we missed it.

Watch carefully and listen carefully. Do not buy this new rhetoric. Understand what is going on here.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There being no further requests for morning business, pursuant to clause 12, rule 1, the House will stand in recess until 11 a.m.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 10 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until 11 a.m.)

□ 1100

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 11 a.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

As the rain nourishes the Earth, so may Your grace, O God, nourish us in the depths of our souls, our minds, and our hearts. We strive to learn and master new tasks. We absorb the facts and figures of today's world and we have all the resources of the intellect of the generations. Yet on this day we pray that we will heed the needs of our souls, strengthen our inner being in faith, preserve the hope and renewal of our hearts and by so doing walk in love and trust with You, our God, for ever and ever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 335, nays 67, answered "present" 1, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 118]
YEAS—335

Allard	Bishop	Castle
Andrews	Bliley	Chabot
Archer	Blute	Chambliss
Armey	Boehlert	Chenoweth
Bachus	Bonilla	Christensen
Baesler	Bonior	Chrysler
Baker (CA)	Bono	Clement
Baker (LA)	Boucher	Clinger
Ballenger	Brewster	Coble
Barcia	Browder	Coburn
Barr	Brown (OH)	Coleman
Barrett (NE)	Brownback	Collins (GA)
Barrett (WI)	Bryant (TN)	Collins (MI)
Bartlett	Bryant (TX)	Combest
Barton	Bunn	Condit
Bass	Bunning	Conyers
Bateman	Burr	Cooley
Beilenson	Burton	Costello
Bentsen	Callahan	Cox
Bereuter	Calvert	Coyne
Berman	Camp	Cramer
Bevill	Campbell	Crane
Bilbray	Canady	Crapo
Bilirakis	Cardin	Cremeans