

in the world to people who can least afford it, including our seniors.

The bill that I introduced last year, H.R. 664, the Prescription Drug Fairness for Seniors Act, would deal with this problem by eliminating the price discrimination. The bill is very simple. It allows the government to negotiate lower prices for people who are on Medicare, people who are already in a Federal health care plan. It is called Medicare. It works, but it does not have prescription drug coverage, and it needs to.

All my bill would do is allow pharmacies to buy drugs for Medicare beneficiaries at the best price given to the Federal government, either the price given to the Veterans Administration or the price paid by Medicaid.

I thought that this bill would attract Members of the other side of the aisle when they understood it was a bill that created no new bureaucracy, it involved no significant amount of expenditure by the Federal government, and it would provide a discount of up to 40 percent for seniors in this country who really need the help and need it now.

But the truth is that though we have 140 Democratic cosponsors of this legislation, not one Republican, not one has seen fit to step up and cosponsor this legislation.

I grant that this is a battle. The pharmaceutical industry does not like this bill. The pharmaceutical industry is running TV ads all across the country touting what a wonderful, warm, and fuzzy industry it is, and how they do research and development that is important for the American people. About that, they are right. But what they are trying to do is block the President's prescription drug benefit plan. They are trying to block the progress that we are making in getting a discount for Medicare beneficiaries.

This is a huge battle. On this battle, the Democrats are lining up, taking on the pharmaceutical industry. We are going to be introducing a discharge petition to bring this bill to the floor next week. We would like to have some Republican support. I certainly hope at some point we will get it.

WISHING A HAPPY BIRTHDAY TO GLENYS BURQUIST

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

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Speaker, February 3 marked a special day for a person close to my heart, for it was the 90th birthday of a wonderful woman with whom my family had a long association of close to 60 years. Her name is Glenys Burquist, and she was a legal secretary to my late father for 36 years, and a secretary to me for 18 years, until I was elected to Congress in 1994. She worked 2 years for my dear wife, who is also a lawyer, and she

worked for 11 years before starting with my dad back in 1941 at the law firm that he joined that year.

Her job with our firm was the only job she ever had after becoming a legal secretary, and she was a great one, able to smooth the edges of an unhappy client, or make a happy client happier by her warmth and sense of humor.

I have never met anyone more loyal, more selfless, more honest, more diligent, more full of wisdom, more efficient than Glenys. She never let you know if she had a bad day. Despite a few health problems in her later years, she never has considered herself a victim of anything because she was too busy looking on the bright side of things.

Over the course of 60 years this woman, Glenys Burquist, typed the pleadings for thousands of adoptions that we did, thousands of probates, thousands of letters and other pleadings and real estate closings and minutes of corporations, and all the other things that go on in a law firm.

Before copy machines, she simply used carbon paper. In the late 1980s, she gave in and finally switched to a memory typewriter. That was about as far as she would go.

Unfortunately, in today's world, Glenys may represent the end of an era of employee stability and commitment. She never was looking for a better deal elsewhere, or griped about a little extra work that kept her after regular hours. For years she came into the office regularly for half a day on Saturdays, without any complaint.

Quite simply, Glenys Burquist is one in a million, an institution in the Spokane, Washington legal community, and a person so deserving of happiness and peace and respect and congratulations that this recognition hardly does her justice.

On behalf of the Nethercutt family and my wife, Mary Beth, especially, and all the lives she has touched, we wish Glenys Burquist the happiest of birthdays, and send our abundant love and respect.

IT IS TIME FOR MARRIAGE TAX RELIEF FOR THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

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

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss an issue that was just on the floor less than an hour ago today. That was the marriage penalty elimination.

I must say, as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, I was quite shocked. If Members listened to the entire debate, they would have heard the hand-wringing and moaning and groaning from the other side of the aisle that somehow we were doing a terrible injustice to the United States budget, and that we were somehow going to bankrupt our Nation by providing nec-

essary relief to married couples across this great land of ours.

In the committee, when we were marking up the bill, I heard many Members of the leadership on that side of the aisle describing things like giving taxpayers back some of their money as a bonus. Why are they giving people a bonus when they do not pay those taxes that are being claimed on marriage penalties? And if we are giving them more of their money back, that is a bonus?

Mr. Speaker, where I come from, every cent that the American taxpayer earns, a taxpayer who works hard 40-plus hours a week, some with two jobs, every cent that they send to this Capitol here in Washington, D.C. is their money, not ours.

But they on the other side have this nomenclature of bonus, surplus, and you name it. Then, of course, I heard today about the most important necessity established by that side of the aisle, which is pay down the debt, pay down the debt. I must have heard it 48 times today, if I heard it once.

I am glad they finally recognize that they need to pay down the debt that they have run up when they were in charge for well over 40 years, charging things to the American taxpayer, politically popular programs, but no means in sight to pay for them. Much like a reckless person with a credit card, they were ringing up the total, ringing up the purchase, not worrying about who is going to pay the bill.

We are at a day of reckoning. We have balanced the budget. We are putting money towards debt repayment. We paid over \$139 billion over the last 2 years in debt repayment. I think we are making wonderful progress towards debt repayment.

Remember, a few years ago when we, the majority, started this and decided to cut the capital gains tax from ordinary income to 20 percent, we heard again, you cannot do it, the markets will go crazy, you will bankrupt the Nation. Let us talk about what has happened: a record Dow, a record NASDAQ, higher income for all Americans, more money to the Treasury, surplus revenues.

Then the following campaign year when they argued against it, most took credit for it and said, I gave you a tax cut.

We gave a \$500 per child tax cut from this Congress because we believe raising children is expensive, and people need more of their own money back.

Those are just some of the things we did to make a difference in Americans' lives.

We also heard last year before we adjourned that we were dipping into social security, we were dipping into social security. Then new numbers came out in December that reflected the opposite. We did not touch social security. We kept our commitment. We kept our pledge. Our pledge was this: shore up social security, shore up Medicare, work on things for the average

family and give them some tax reduction.

Today we passed the bill. After the contentious debate, hours on this floor, hours of hand-wringing, we actually got 268 votes for our proposal to eliminate the marriage penalty. Forty-eight Democrats and one Independent joined us. That is a bipartisan effort. I applaud those who had the courage to recognize the inequity of the Tax Code. Fifty-one thousand and twenty-one people in my district are paying a marriage penalty, and 1,176,000 throughout the great State of Florida are paying a marriage penalty.

We were on record today as moving forward to eliminate this tax burden on the average families who are working, who are struggling, who are providing for their children and their families in the districts in which they live.

Let us get out of the notion here in this Capital of Washington, D.C. that this is our money, because it is not. This money belongs to the taxpayers of America. Every chance we get, and I am telling the Members, seriously, we are working as a Congress on our side of the aisle to preserve social security, to preserve Medicare, to fix the problems.

Yes, we will meet, I am certain, in some accommodation on prescription drugs. I am certain of this. I know we need to do that. We will reach out in a bipartisan manner. But I have to tell the Members, I have just about had enough, because on some issues that are important to the other side of the aisle, this should be a bipartisan effort.

When we come to the floor on what we think is a bipartisan effort, 22 Democrats signed our bill, we would think there would be mutual admiration for the great work being done today. President Clinton, Vice President GORE, support some marriage penalty elimination. It is all the devil in the details. If it is not their bill, they are not happy and satisfied, and have to bellyache about the consequences.

Mr. Speaker, we will balance the budget. We will pay down the debt. We will shore up social security. We will fix Medicare. We will work on prescription drug coverage. We will also do the things that are necessary to help the American family, who are working oftentimes two jobs in order to make ends meet. We will work to make certain we have reached the threshold so they can at least have some of their own hard-earned money back in their pockets.

At the end of a 40-hour work, it is pretty difficult to go home and realize you have very little left after paying excise taxes, mortgage taxes. In fact, Mrs. Clinton today was shocked, shocked when she said, and I quote from the New York Times, "I can't believe how high taxes are on properties here in New York," since she just bought a house, the first one in well over 20 years.

Welcome to the real world. We are paying taxes all our lives. I have been

paying property taxes for decades. It is difficult. It is tough. Wake up. This is reality, so people do need a break.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. EVERETT (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of illness in the family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MORAN of Virginia) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mrs. THURMAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ALLEN, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FOLEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mrs. CHENOWETH-HAGE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HORN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. METCALF, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. TOOMEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. NETHERCUTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FOLEY, for 5 minutes, today.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following date present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

On February 9, 2000:

H.R. 2130. To amend the Controlled Substances Act to direct the emergency scheduling of gamma hydroxybutyric acid, to provide a national awareness campaign, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 14, 2000, at 12:30 p.m., for morning hour debates.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

6117. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agri-

culture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Asian Longhorned Beetle; Addition to Quarantined Areas [Docket No. 00-004-1] received February 4, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6118. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Suspension of Community Eligibility [Docket No. FEMA-7721] received January 5, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

6119. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Suspension of Community Eligibility [Docket No. FEMA-7725] received January 5, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

6120. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Final Flood Elevation Determinations—received January 5, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

6121. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket No. FEMA-7308] received January 5, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

6122. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Final Flood Elevation Determinations—received January 5, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

6123. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations—received January 5, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

6124. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations—received January 5, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

6125. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket No. FEMA-7301] received January 5, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

6126. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Indirect Food Additives: Polymers [Docket No. 97F-0116] received January 5, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

6127. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Indirect Food Additives: Adjuvants, Production Aids, and Sanitizers [Docket No. 99F-2534] received January 5, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

6128. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of State Plans For Designated Facilities and Pollutants: New Hampshire; Plan for Controlling Emissions From Existing Hospital/Medical/Infectious Waste Incinerators [Docket No. NH040-7167a; FRL-6532-2]