

market health insurance, including the Medical Savings Account, in your State. However, your medical condition of", and then you could fill in the blank, in this case they said diabetes, "would not be one that falls within our underwriting guidelines. Therefore, we would be unable to consider you for coverage."

What this means, Mr. Speaker, is that Golden Rule's rule is only interested in the bottom line, while this individual, Alan, will remain in the traditional health insurance that will see increasing health care costs because of the further division in the health care pool. MSA's are not going to provide choice, they are just going to break the insurance pool.

The average elderly woman has an income of less than \$12,000 a year. MSA's will not benefit her, but part B premium increases will make it more difficult for her to balance her health care needs.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOKSEY). Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. GIBBONS] at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Reverend LeeAnn Schray, Georgetown Lutheran Church, Washington, DC, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Gracious God, we give You thanks for this day and for the opportunities and challenges that it holds for us. We thank You for the Members of Congress and their staff. Every one is unique with their own talents and abilities, strengths, and weaknesses, but together they make this body strong. Show each of us, O God, the way we may best serve You this day. Give us wisdom in making decisions, honesty in speech and in action, compassion for those we serve, and courage to do what is right, that we may seek the good of all people and work for justice and peace in our Nation and in our world. In Your holy name we pray. Amen.

JOURNAL

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

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

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I de-

mand a vote on agreeing to the Chair's approval of the Journal.

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

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

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. 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 pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5, rule I, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. PALLONE led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

DISPENSING WITH CALL OF THE PRIVATE CALENDAR ON TODAY

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the call of the Private Calendar today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

WELCOME TO THE REVEREND LEEANN SCHRAY

(Mr. PETRI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, we are privileged to have the Rev. LeeAnn Schray of Washington, DC as our guest chaplain today. Pastor Schray is the minister of the church my family and I attend during the weekends we are in the District of Columbia: the Georgetown Lutheran Church. This past year we have enjoyed getting to know LeeAnn and her husband, Bob Tuttle.

Pastor Schray was born in Bethlehem, PA. She received her bachelor of arts degree from St. Olaf College in Northfield, MN, and her master of divinity from the Lutheran School of Theology at Chicago. She moved to Washington, DC in 1991 to take her first call at St. Paul's Lutheran Church, where she served as the assistant pastor. For the past year, she has been serving as the pastor for Georgetown Lutheran Church, and the Lutheran campus pastor for Georgetown and American Universities.

Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure and privilege for me to welcome the Reverend LeeAnn Schray to the House

lectern and to offer her our heartfelt thanks for serving as our guest chaplain.

GOP FAVOR WEALTHY OVER AVERAGE AMERICANS IN BUDGET AGREEMENT

(Mr. PALLONE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, last month I voted in favor of the balanced budget resolution, but as the details of this budget become known, I am more reluctant to support the final budget product.

The Democratic tax cut plan targets the bulk of the tax cuts to working families and to those who need assistance. The Republican plan does not. Their proposal would actually increase taxes for those with incomes below \$15,900, while those making nearly \$250,000 and beyond would receive over half of the tax cuts. Not only is this unfair to low-income families, but it also leaves very little tax relief for the average working family.

In addition to the skewed Republican tax scheme, Republicans have also abandoned their agreement to help low-income seniors pay for rising Medicare premiums.

Mr. Speaker, the Republicans are putting the balanced budget agreement at risk by insisting on only helping their wealthy friends.

TAX CUTS FOR WORKING AMERICANS

(Mr. BALLENGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, what do we call a tax cut for people who do not pay taxes? I call it welfare. And once again, the Democrats want more welfare spending instead of tax cuts for working Americans.

It has been 16 years since working Americans got their taxes cut. We tried in the last Congress to pass tax cuts, but the President vetoed our efforts. This year, with the budget agreement, we seem to have paved our way to lower taxes. But now some folks want to give people who do not pay taxes a tax cut.

It is this kind of logic that drives working Americans crazy about Washington. It is like giving a car to someone who cannot drive or a drowning man a drink of water.

Mr. Speaker, let us give tax cuts to people who pay taxes. America deserves a tax cut now.

THE CASE FOR AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

(Mr. SCOTT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to address the issue of affirmative action. It is my understanding that a bill is being introduced today which will prevent the Federal Government from taking affirmative steps to remedy the still widespread discrimination that we have in employment, contracting, and education.

Today, discrimination is still rampant. A recent study conducted by the Fair Housing Council found that minorities are discriminated against 40 percent of the times that they seek to rent an apartment. Repealing affirmative action will, therefore, have the practical effect of resegregating America. The repeal of affirmative action programs in both Texas and California gives us a peek at what happens when we eliminate affirmative action.

So we must ask the opponents of affirmative action if they achieve their goals when minority admissions to law schools in Texas and California dropped precipitously in spite of evidence that shows that minorities, when given the opportunity, will perform as well as their majority counterparts.

So, Mr. Speaker, I ask, how far do we have to turn the clocks back to appease those that are disgruntled, because discrimination is being remedied?

IT IS HIGH TIME FOR AN INDEPENDENT COUNSEL

(Mr. CHABOT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, as James McDougal, former business partner of President Clinton, begins his prison sentence today, I think we should take a look back at some of the additions to the American vocabulary in just the last few years: Whitewater, Filegate, Troopergate, Travelgate, Lippogate, Pillowgate, Donorgate, Indo-gate, and who could forget Buddhist Templegate.

Goodness gracious, and Janet Reno says there is no need for an independent counsel? Yeah.

AMERICANS ARE FED UP WITH FEDERAL BUREAUCRATS

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, in Boston for the last 14 days the Sweeney family has literally barricaded their property, fighting the Federal Government who they say is trying to take their home. Now, I do not know who is right or wrong in this case, but one thing is for sure. Many American people are fed up with fat cat government bureaucrats.

Open your eyes, Congress. EPA, IRS, FBI, FDIC, ATF, intimidation, liens and seizures, technicalities, regulations, on and on, and every single day more messages and signals keep com-

ing to Washington; and no one here seems to be listening.

Mr. Speaker, it is not just Texas and Idaho, now it is Michigan, New York, and even the wealthy suburbs of Boston. I say, Mr. Speaker, what is next? Maybe another Tea Party? Do not be surprised when a nation that forgets their history is many times apt to revisit it.

TAX CUTS FOR PEOPLE WHO PAY TAXES

(Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, it should be a no-brainer that tax cuts should go to people who are taxpayers. Many Americans might well wonder how anyone could even think of, let alone give, a tax cut to people who do not pay taxes. But remember, this is Washington.

Words mean nothing. That is why tax cuts are still a defining difference between Republicans and Democrats. Republicans are for tax cuts.

Republicans believe that hard-working Americans deserve to keep and spend more of the money that they earn. For too long, Democrats opposed any tax cuts for working Americans as gifts from Washington to the so-called rich.

Now, some Democrats claim they support tax cuts. However, actions speak louder than words. It turns out the Democrats and the President's proposed tax credit for children would transfer more money from the pockets of taxpayers to the pockets of people who pay no taxes.

Americans are wondering, Mr. Speaker, why is the Democrats' child tax credit more like welfare spending than a tax cut?

REPUBLICAN TAX PROPOSAL IS DISAPPOINTING

(Ms. DELAURO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my disappointment in the Republican tax proposal. Under this plan, the majority of the tax benefits go to the wealthiest Americans, those making over \$250,000 a year; almost 58 percent of their tax breaks go to people making over \$250,000 a year.

I think that we ought to provide the bulk of tax relief to working, middle-class families in this country, to the families who are trying to figure out how to pay their monthly bills, put food on their table, send their kids to school, and provide for a secure retirement and be able to afford health care. These are the families who could use tax relief in this country today.

Let me just say that this is simply not a Democratic issue. One of my Republican colleagues, in a television ap-

pearance with me this morning, stated that providing big tax breaks for families who make over \$250,000 a year is not the right way to go. I encourage more of my Republican colleagues, speak out about the need to provide tax relief to those families who really need it: hard-working middle-class Americans.

□ 1415

INTRODUCTION OF THE ELECTRIC UTILITY NITROGEN OXIDE LIM- ITATION ACT OF 1997

(Ms. CARSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. CARSON. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill, the Electric Utility Nitrogen Oxide Limitation Act of 1997. In the current debate concerning the new EPA rulemaking for clean air, I trust that my bill will pass and provide an alternative for Members who want to vote for clean air.

My bill will reduce by 55 percent the nitrogen oxide levels emitted by fossil fuel-burning electric utility plants by the year 2000. It sets a simple standard of 0.35 pound per million Btu to be met by the electric utility plants by the end of the year 2000.

It will also ensure that electric competition encourages, not discourages, responsible, efficient emission control. It is a bill that is proconsumer and proenvironment. It will ensure competition for utilities, but not at the expense of air quality.

This bill will do all of this without amending the Clean Air Act. While the debate rages on concerning EPA rulemaking and the States debate standards that will not be in place until 10 years from now, I encourage my colleagues to join me.

AN IMMENSE AMBITION FOR POWER

(Mr. GOSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, "Attention turns to Aristide as the Haitian Government crumbles," says the news report this weekend. "An immense ambition for power" is responsible for insecurity and disorder in the Capital, Port-au-Prince. This is how one-time confidante Paul DeJean describes former President and his former friend, Jean-Bertrand Aristide of Haiti.

In fact, this sentiment is nothing extraordinary. If we peruse the weekend press on Haiti, it appears to be a mainstream opinion as Haiti drifts deeper into misery and despair. Reports from the wire and from Michael Norton of the Washington Post describe a litany of Aristide's increasingly obvious efforts to advance his own personal ambition at the expense of economic recovery and at the expense of democratization in Haiti.