

FLORIDA KEYS

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, the Florida Keys are made up of 100 miles of 30 islands that form a chain. Adjacent to the Keys is the most extensive living coral reef in North America and the third largest in the world.

These coral reefs are intertwined to a marine ecosystem that supports one of the most diverse and unique collections of plants and animals in North America.

Millions of people come from all over the United States and the world to visit the Florida Keys. This is both a blessing and a big part of the problem. The Keys are suffering from pollution brought about by humans.

Some of our beaches have already had to be closed over the July 4th weekend because of these contaminants. Even more crucial, the living coral reef is in danger of dying from pollutants if the water quality is not improved immediately.

I urge my colleagues, therefore, to preserve one of our national treasures, the Florida Keys, by acting on the bill of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTSCH), the Florida Keys Water Quality Improvement Act of 1999, H.R. 673.

AMERICAN BORDERS WIDE OPEN WHILE GUARDING BOSNIA AND KOSOVO

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, all heroin and cocaine comes across our borders, and everyone agrees that heroin and cocaine cause most of the crime, murder, and medical bills in America. And Congress does nothing.

While American soldiers are guarding the borders of Bosnia and Kosovo, American borders are wide open. And Congress does nothing. Beam me up, Mr. Speaker.

A Nation without secure borders is a Nation without security. A Congress that turns its back on our borders is a Congress that invites disaster.

I yield back the stupid un-American policies.

SURPLUS IS NOT PRESIDENT'S MONEY TO SPEND

(Mr. GARY MILLER of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GARY MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, last week when the President was in California, he was quoted in the newspaper as saying, "It would be wrong to spend our hard-earned surplus on tax cuts."

What the President meant by "our" was the government's. So he said it

would be wrong to spend the government's hard-earned surplus on tax cuts. When did the government ever earn any money?

How would the President know what the private producing sector of our country can and cannot afford? His whole life he has worked for government. According to his own biography, the closest he ever came to being paid by the private sector is when he won a college scholarship. Even then, the government gave him a grant to supplement his tuition to Georgetown.

When the President says we cannot afford a tax cut, he only speaks from the perspective of government. He does not know any better. I will repeat, he does not know any better.

Well, as someone who has signed both sides of a paycheck, I can speak for the private sector when I say he is wrong. What we cannot afford to do is keep the surplus in Washington, D.C. to grow government. It is not the President's money. Let us send the American people's money back to the producing sector of our Nation, the American people.

CHILD GUN SAFETY LEGISLATION

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

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, in June, the House of Representatives had the opportunity to pass bipartisan moderate gun safety legislation. We had a chance to make this country a safer place, and we let it slip away.

Yesterday, again, we had the opportunity to add child gun safety legislation to the Treasury Postal appropriations bill. Three amendments were offered at the committee markup mirroring the Senate legislation which was passed in May. Unfortunately, all three of these amendments were defeated in committee.

The people of this country want child gun safety legislation. I have received many, many letters from mothers, fathers, teachers, ex-military officers, even Republicans urging me to do something, to make schools safer for all of the children and to keep guns out of the hands of children.

Tackling this problem of guns should not preclude the need to address our cultural problems. But we need to look at all of these issues to address child safety in this country. I urge my colleagues to do this before the August recess.

LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION NOT PROVIDING SERVICES IT CLAIMS TO BE

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

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, many years ago, the Congress of the United States, under the principle that all

Americans, rich or poor, should have equal access to protection under the law through legal representation in the courts, created the Legal Services Corporation. This was designed to give the itinerant, the poor American without means, access to the courts.

We had hoped it would do a good job of service for the American people. Many of us have been surprised to discover the number of times we hear from constituents that they have been turned away from the Corporation. They did not have time for this person's case. So we began to ask what is going on. I have to tell my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, the results we are discovering are heartbreaking.

Reports from the Inspector General's office showed that the Legal Services Corporation grossly overstated their case load by 70 percent. But they have not told Congress.

Since Congress could no longer rely on timely, accurate information from LSC, we asked the General Accounting Office to look at five of LSC's largest grantees, Baltimore, Chicago, Los Angeles, New York City, and Puerto Rico. GAO found the same: LSC bloating the numbers, misrepresenting the number of people they actually assist.

At the very least, Congress needs to be able to trust the information government departments and agencies provide and that it is timely and accurate. Not only does LSC give Congress overstated caseload reports, they hide the truth and refuse to tell Congress. Personally, I find this insulting. The American people have a right to expect more from their government.

Mr. Speaker, it comes down to this: How can the Legal Services Corporation claim to be helping poor people when they do not even know how many people they are helping?

Mr. Speaker, when Congress expresses the compassion of the American people by providing a service to its very most poor and needy, those agencies must deliver those services, and they must be accountable to Congress.

Legal Services Corporation must be made to do their duty for the American people. We simply cannot fund that kind of misrepresentation of the Nation's goodwill.

MODEST GUN SAFETY LEGISLATION KILLED WITH BACKROOM ARM TWISTING

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

Ms. DELAURU. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Republican leadership killed modest gun safety legislation, not once, but three times. Backroom arm twisting by high-powered members of the NRA left the 13 members of the Committee on Appropriations switching their votes on sensible reforms.

We could have closed the loophole on background checks at gun shows,

banned the importation of high-capacity ammunition clips, and ensured that all handguns come with child safety locks. But instead, there is no progress to report, only partisanship.

We have been waiting for months for the Republican leadership to act on this issue. Thirteen children are killed every day by guns. Yet, on this side of the aisle, we are stymied and stonewalled at every turn.

The Republican leadership is woefully out of step with American parents. Youth violence is a complex problem. It requires several answers. Parental involvement, safe schools, better discipline, and violence in the media are all involved, but gun safety is part of this puzzle. Now is the wrong time to do the bidding of the National Rifle Association.

I urge the Speaker, take up sensible measures passed by the Senate. Appoint conferees immediately. Acting now is the right thing to do. We have already waited too long, and too many youngsters have died.

□ 1015

DEMOCRATS HAVE NO INTENTION OF WORKING WITH REPUBLICANS THIS YEAR ON ANYTHING

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, this week The Washington Post reported a startling admission. One of the leaders of the liberal wing of the Democratic party stated point blank that Democrats have no intention of working with Republicans this year on anything. In fact, they would rather play politics with seniors, with children, with working families than pass legislation to help America stay strong and prosperous.

Listen to this quote given by the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, a hero to liberals everywhere. "It is not our responsibility to legislate anymore. It doesn't make sense for us to compromise."

I certainly do appreciate the gentleman's candor, but let us think about this idea that it does not make sense for us to compromise. What he means is that it does not make political sense for Democrats to compromise. They want to block Republican bills, then turn around and blame extremist Republicans for failing to pass important legislation.

Is this what Democrats stand for? What happened to their call for civility and bipartisan cooperation? Why do they now want to be obstructionists?

REPUBLICANS BLOCK DEMOCRATIC EFFORTS IN SENATE TO IMPROVE AMERICA'S HEALTH CARE INSURANCE

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California asked and was given permission to ad-

dress the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the morning papers are recounting what took place in the Senate yesterday when the Republicans blocked the efforts to try to provide better health care to people who have health insurance.

When the Democrats offered amendments to make it easier for women to choose their primary care physician, to choose an obstetrician/gynecologist, the Republicans blocked that effort. When the Democrats tried to offer an effort to make it easier for people who are denied services to have grievances against the HMO and the managed care corporations, the Republicans blocked that effort. When the Democrats tried to make it easier for people to go to the nearest emergency room in an emergency and know that they would be reimbursed for going to that emergency room, the Republicans killed that effort.

However, the Republicans did decide that they would let women who had had a mastectomy stay in the hospital a couple days longer. Apparently, the Republicans will not let us go to the doctor to detect a cancer, but if we have the cancer they will let us stay in the hospital 2 days extra.

REPUBLICAN TAX CUT PLAN IS BALANCED AND SENSIBLE

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

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, even though there is a budget surplus here in Washington, the liberals are attacking the Republican tax cut proposal, calling it "risky." They think it is risky because they do not trust the taxpayers to spend it right.

Well, I have a different view. I do not trust the liberals to leave the taxpayers' money here in Washington. In fact, I think that it is truly risky to leave Americans' hard-earned taxes lying around here in Washington for people who have made their careers expanding government. It should come as no surprise that the money somehow gets spent. It always does, it always has, and it always will.

Politicians will spend the taxpayers' money, then they will tickle their ears with wonderful reasons why they just had to spend it. Face it, the only way to stop politicians from expanding government and reducing hard-working Americans' freedoms is to give the money back to the people who earned it.

I like the Republican plan: Lock up two-thirds of the money that is taken from the FICA payroll deductions for retirement security and give the other third back to the hard-working Americans who earned it. It is a balanced and sensible plan. I ask all my colleagues to support it.

HATE-CRAZED GUNMAN

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

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I represent the district in which six Jews were shot and Rick Byrdson was killed. I received this E-mail yesterday:

Please allow me to express my horror at the tragedy that has befallen my family. On my way home from synagogue, I was shot by a hate-crazed gunman. I spent 4 days in the hospital. My wife, who was due to give birth any day, witnessed me prostrate on the steps of a house bleeding from wounds to my abdomen, arm and shoulder.

I am grateful I am alive. I did not think I would get to see my wife and 22-month-old daughter again. I do not know how to convey to you the horror of being shot from close range because I belong to the 'wrong' religion. This used to happen all too frequently to my European ancestors. There, too, people shrugged and moved on to their daily routines until it was too late.

This event has harmed my family in so many ways it will take years to heal the wounds.

That is from Hillel Goldstein. His mother, Batya Abraham-Goldstein, said, "This was not just hate. This is what happens when hate is given a gun."

LIBERALS FIND IT DIFFICULT TO ACCURATELY DESCRIBE REPUBLICAN TAX CUT PROPOSAL

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

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, why is it so difficult for liberals to accurately describe our tax cut proposals? In fact, to date I have yet to hear a single Democrat describe our budget surplus proposal by what is actually in our proposal.

As this chart illustrates, Republicans have indicated their priorities by putting \$2 for retirement security to every \$1 for tax relief from projected surpluses over the next 10 years. Let me repeat that. From the budget surpluses, we allocate \$2 for retirement security for every \$1 for tax relief.

That means that Social Security and Medicare will be preserved. It also means that our preference is for tax relief over new Washington spending.

Make no mistake about it, whenever the Democrats talk about their opposition to tax cuts and their preference for debt reduction, we can be sure that this will mean new Washington spending. If the 40 years of Democrat control in the House are any indication, that money will be spent.

A balanced approach is \$2 for \$1: \$2 for retirement security, \$1 for tax relief.

HONORING MEMBERS OF SAFE COLORADO

(Mr. UDALL of Colorado asked and was given permission to address the