

breast cancer in this country. I am proud to work with the national breast cancer officials who are working on a cure and who are working to increase the funding, and I am working with them on the DOD funding, the Department of Defense funding, as well as the National Institutes of Health.

For me this is priority number one in this 105th Congress, to pass this legislation and all legislation which will lead to additional research funding so that in our lifetime we can have a cure, we can have a vaccine, we can have a discovery that will eradicate breast cancer in our lifetime.

Mr. Speaker, this is the number one cancer death causing disease to women in the United States: 44,000 a year. We must do whatever we can from a medical, legislative and public point of view to make sure we eradicate this disease in our lifetime. Tomorrow is not soon enough.

So I thank my colleagues for sponsoring and cosponsoring this legislation and for working for its passage.

#### LEGISLATION TO ALLEVIATE CONSEQUENCES OF WELFARE REFORM BILL ON ELDERLY NON-CITIZENS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to alleviate the harsh consequences that many of our elderly noncitizens are experiencing as a part of the Welfare reform bill enacted last year.

At age 94, one of my constituents is now being threatened with the loss of food stamps because she cannot prove she is a U.S. citizen. She entered the United States in 1919 from Japan. Her husband is now deceased. She has no support documentation that would show she is a citizen or that she worked 10 years in this country. Soon she will lose her \$40 per month allotment.

The stated purpose of the welfare reform bill was to promote self-sufficiency and to eliminate the reliance of government assistance for able bodied individuals. The goal being to return these able bodied individuals back to work.

As a result of the Welfare Reform bill we witnessed a direct attack on our noncitizen elderly population. These individuals clearly should not have been included in the group targeted to return to work. Recognizing this, Congress and the President partially restored some of the benefits unfairly denied this population. However, even with the partial restoration of benefits, many of our elderly noncitizen population are still suffering.

This bill will remedy the unfair result imposed by Congress last year by restoring to a small group of our most vulnerable individuals their food stamps. These individuals are our most needy. We have a duty to assist them in their aging years. This bill eliminates these individuals from a law that clearly should not apply to them.

#### CONGRESS SHOULD DO MORE PROBLEM SOLVING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PAUL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, frequently I am asked, when I am in my district, if Congress is making any progress in solving the problems that this country faces. I wish I could be more optimistic in my answer, yet I am optimistic about the people in the district and the people in the country, because I think they are beginning to see the problems correctly and they are beginning to sense that we should be doing more to solve the problems.

Truthfully, I cannot give them an optimistic answer about the progress we are making here within the House of Representatives and in the Senate. For instance, yesterday we had a piece of legislation come up rather quickly. It was the FDA legislation. There was no announcement the day before. There was no announcement last week. It came up suddenly, under suspension, with only minutes to prepare.

Actually, I came to the floor hoping that I could at least make a statement, asking for 1 minute, but because it was managed by both majority and minority that supported the bill, there just happened not to be any time available to discuss anything in the FDA legislation.

This legislation involved 177 pages. It was not available to me on the Internet. It is a complex piece of legislation, and something that I think is a very important piece of legislation. I had received numerous pieces of correspondence critical of this legislation and urging caution on its passage. The bill was rushed through rather quickly. There was no vote taken on this and, actually, not one single thing said in a negative manner about this particular legislation.

The pretense of the legislation is to speed up the process, to get drugs approved more quickly, to avoid the bureaucracy of the Food and Drug Administration and, quite frankly, there probably is plenty of bureaucracy over there that slows up the process. But if they are not doing a good job, why would speeding up the process necessarily be helpful?

If they speeded up the process to get drugs out, like Dexfenfluramine, which is a drug now known to cause heart valve disease, I cannot see the purpose of trying to speed up a process that guarantees very little to the consumer. Quite frankly, the Good Housekeeping seal of approval that the FDA puts on it I question. I favor the original Good Housekeeping seal of approval, something done more privately.

But the serious parts of this legislation, which I believe will come back to haunt many in this Congress, and I am predicting they will hear from the constituents and from many groups interested in this issue, in the first way the bill itself internationalized regulations

for the first time. The regulations are to conform with all other nations when possible. I do not see this as a positive step in any way.

Unfortunately, it diminishes the State's role in regulation and in food labeling and it allows more Federal regulation rather than less. This, to me, is not going in the right direction. We talk a lot about reducing the Federal control, but here is a piece of legislation that comes up rather quickly, no debate, no chance to really debate the issue at all and, at the same time, it enhances and empowers the Federal Government over the States and, at the same time, it introduces this notion that some of these regulations may well become internationalized.

In another area that I think we have done a poor job has to do with the budget. If the American people would go by what is said from here, so much optimism, that we are on the verge of having surpluses and we are running around arguing about how to spend the surpluses, I have to take a different side to that argument. I do not see the surpluses.

For instance, this past year they say the national debt is down to \$30 billion, approximately. Well, \$30 billion to a lot of people is still a significant amount of money. So a \$30 billion deficit should not be ignored and, quite frankly, I think it is lower than was anticipated more by accident than by what we have done, especially if we look at the budget resolution, which actually introduced more welfare programs, not less. So the fact that we have a smaller deficit is not too reassuring to me.

If we look at the increase in the national debt, it suggests another story. The national debt has actually gone up nearly \$200 billion in this past year. The national debt went from \$5.22 trillion to \$5.41 trillion. So why the discrepancy? Why is the deficit so small and yet the national debt is increasing rapidly? There is a very specific reason for this. More money is being borrowed from the trust funds, such as Social Security. That is not the solution. That is a problem.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take my time out of turn.

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

There was no objection.

#### CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. SNYDER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Senate had a series of votes which temporarily killed campaign finance reform. I know the general public is confused over what happened over there, but the bottom line is the majority of the Members of the U.S. Senate

support campaign finance reform, the American people support campaign finance reform, but the Senate Republican leadership will not let there be a clean vote on campaign finance reform.

And I say to my friends on the Republican side of the aisle, I know there is Republican support. I know there are many Republicans that support campaign finance reform.

Here on the House side we have had no hearings, we have had no votes on campaign finance reform, we have had no bills brought to the floor. In almost a year we have been in session, we have had no debate on the floor on campaign finance reform. And, again, the problem is the Republican leadership of this House.

I say once again, I know there are many Republican Members who will vote for campaign finance reform if it is brought to the floor of the House. The problem is the Republican leadership.

What is the problem? What is the problem with our campaign finance laws? This morning I held up this phony check I had made out here for a billion dollars, and the reality is it is now currently legal to make unlimited donations to the political party of our choice, Democrat, Republican, Reform Party, or any other party. Whether we are an individual, whether we are a corporation, whether we are a union, we can write out a check for any amount of money we choose to, as long as the account is good, and it is legal under campaign finance reform.

That is wrong. It contributes to the cynicism of this country, and it is a problem that needs to be fixed.

To discuss possible fixes to this very real problem facing America, I would like to yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. FARR], a leader in campaign finance reform.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to engage with the gentleman in this discussion because, obviously, the gentleman saw yesterday that the Republican leadership in the Senate broke things, and the U.S. public is asking for a campaign reform fix. We have legislation here before us. In fact, the legislation before this House does not require that the Senate has to fix their side, we can fix just this side.

I have H.R. 600, which has more cosponsors than any other bill in Congress. It is the bill that historically has passed this House under Democratic leadership. It is the bill that received the most votes when this issue came up before the 104th Congress. It is a bill that totally reforms campaign expenditures, campaign collections, the whole gamut from A to Z, and it is a substantive bill.

The issue here is that we are the legislative branch of government. We are here to fix things that are broken. This is not just about hearing and smearing, it is about acting and doing. We need to have on this floor a vote on campaign finance reform.

The gentleman and I cannot do much about it because we are in the minority

party, but the majority party has indicated that they are some day going to do it. They have the ability to do it now, and we hope they will give us the date and the time soon and that there will be particular bills like this, H.R. 600, that are comprehensive, that allow us to have a vote on it, because I believe that this House, in a bipartisan way, can send a bill to the President that will reform campaign finance methods of collecting, spending and conducting campaigns in the United States of America for people who run for the House of Representatives.

I appreciate the gentleman's leadership. The gentleman has certainly brought about the evidence that there is too much money in politics and that we can fix it together.

Mr. SNYDER. I appreciate the gentleman's comments. There are several good ideas out there, and they are incorporated. I think we now have 85 bills filed. If no bill gets to the floor of this House, none of those bills are going to be discussed, and it is very discouraging, given the uproar in the last election cycle from the American people about the volume of money spent, that we see that we are not doing anything about it this year.

Mr. FARR of California. So the question is when.

Mr. SNYDER. The question is when.

Mr. FARR of California. The question is how.

Mr. SNYDER. The gentleman knows how. We have other Members that know how. The issue is having the debate to make the final decision about the how.

Mr. FARR of California. Well, we have colleagues here, and we hope that they will join us, listening to us, and demand that a vote be brought on campaign finance reform so that together, in a bipartisan fashion, we can fix it in a comprehensive form. Not just plug up one little leak or two little leaks, but do the whole thing so that we limit how much money people spend on campaigns.

That is the issue. We have to take the big mass, obscene expenditures out of campaigns, and we have a way of doing it. It has gotten to the President before. President Bush vetoed it, unfortunately, the Senate Republicans filibustered in the past, but now we have the ability because we do not need to have it go to the Senate and we can get the President to sign it.

So all we need to do is get 218 votes here and the job is done and, hopefully, it will be done soon.

Mr. SNYDER. In closing, I will just say it comes down to the question of the Republican leadership, the leadership in this House saying to the Members, yes, it is okay to bring that bill on the floor of the House.

□ 1800

#### PROPOSAL BY FDA AND EPA TO BAN MEASURED-DOSE INHALANTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Florida [Mr. FOLEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of the Members and Members outside of this Chamber a proposal by the FDA and EPA to ban measured-dose inhalants which contain CFC's, or chlorofluorocarbons, that are used by people suffering from asthma.

Now, clearly, the goal of the FDA and EPA is laudable. They want to remove CFC's from all products in order to protect the ozone. But let us start with the basic premise that, first and foremost, the measured-dose inhalants contribute insignificantly to the problem.

But let us also stress, the need for these is so great, 30 million Americans suffer from asthma. CFC's are able to propel the medication necessary to help a struggling asthmatic sustain life, receive that important breath, and go on living a reasonably healthy life.

In 1999, through the Montreal protocol, the EPA and FDA wanted to start removing from the list products that are currently available to substitute one item that currently is on the market. Clearly, we expect further research to indicate that there will be options and alternatives.

What we are asking in a bill that I have filed is that the EPA and FDA report back to the Congress with a wide range of options available for asthmatics so that they can find products suitable to solve their medical emergency when necessary. Currently there are over 70 types of inhalants available on the marketplace.

My colleague, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. KENNEDY], testified that he uses three different types of inhalants during the day that help provide life-sustaining breath to his lungs. I was an asthmatic as a child and suffered greatly when I tried to strive for breath.

These products are not contributing to the problems in the ozone. I talked to Dr. C. Everett Koop on Friday, and he clearly indicates that this is the wrong approach by the FDA and EPA, that this is not the problem.

Now, I applaud them for banning refrigerators with CFC's, air conditioning compressors with CFC's, hair spray and underarm deodorants that were polluting the air because of the excess of chlorofluorocarbons. But an asthma inhaler pumps the measured dose into the system and does not leach it out into the air. It is not something you waste. It is not something you spray. It is something you ingest, inhale into the lungs, to gain greater capacity.

So I urge my colleagues to support me in this initiative and urge the Speaker to consider this initiative to allow us to have those agencies report back when there are adequate amounts of materials available that can clearly be CFC-free but also provide the needed relief for patients around our country, clearly a policy decision being made that has the right intentions but has