

ago, under Ronald Reagan, we had marginal tax rates that everybody who pays taxes paid that were much lower than they are today, and that if we adopted a cut in all the marginal rates across the board and lowered everybody's income tax rates, then we would be benefiting mostly those who are lower and middle income. They get the biggest benefit, not the wealthy people, under that proposal but the lower-income people who pay the bulk of the taxes. That is the first step.

The second step, then, is to do the things we need to do like repeal the estate and death tax once and for all that is unfair to small businesses or to those who want to carry on and let the children inherit the property that they worked so hard in their life to do. It is almost un-American to have this tax the way it is today. And to end the marriage penalty.

Those are things that are simple, we all ought to be able to agree on it, end the tax on Social Security earnings that makes no sense. And I think ultimately to encourage savings and investment, we should end the tax on capital gains and the tax on earned interest and the double taxation on dividends. And the easiest way to do that when we have this huge surplus, and we have plenty to do what we need to do, is to be reforming the whole code and go to that simpler code, a flat rate or a sales tax or something simple by sunseting the code, getting a commission, coming to some common understanding. That is a challenge for the next Congress.

I would like to close by saying a couple of things about the overall picture. We are a Nation of laws. Big government is not what it is all about. We are a Nation of better government, and we should be.

I have a friend who used to talk about less taxes, less spending, less government, and more freedom. Our Nation was founded on the principle that government's best is closest to the people. The school board is where educational decisions should be made. We have a role to play. But categorical and targeted grants are not a good idea in many of these cases because they are too restrictive whether it is in education or other areas.

We should look forward to days when laws are in place where money that comes from the Federal Government like the 6 or 7 percent of education dollars are given back in accountability grants where improvement of our schools and education academic performance is required, but where those local school boards and the parents and the teachers make the decisions about what they do with the money and not have to apply for a grant for more teachers or a grant for school construction or whatever and have to follow all the rules and the regs.

We need to simplify Government. We need to come down with those rules. And we need to get back to basics and let local government do most of this,

county commissioners make decisions, school board members make the decisions they can, city commissioners they can, State governments where they have to, and go back to the principles that were so important to our Founding Fathers that leave only to Congress and the Federal Government those things that the States and the local governments truly cannot do.

And that plate is big enough. We do not need to add to it. Government is big enough. We do not need bigger government. We need better government. That is the message I would like to leave with this body.

My tenure here has been a wonderful experience. I have had the great pleasure of knowing many of my colleagues and others who preceded us very well. I have enjoyed my companionship, the relationships, the camaraderie, the many events I got to attend, the experiences, the things I have learned, the chance to learn so much about so many things. But most of all, I have enjoyed being able to be part of a body that has given me the opportunity to really and truly contribute to making the life in this country and this great Nation better for our children and our grandchildren.

This is the greatest free nation in the history of the world. If we keep it there, and we certainly can, it will be because people like those who served with me in this body today continue to be vigilant and because the children and the grandchildren who do study will learn history, do learn English, do their homework in all other areas, and continue what they are doing today, and that is being the wonderful kids that we all know that they are and the inheritors of this great Constitution, Bill of Rights, and greatest free nation in the history of the world.

I thank my colleagues so much for letting me serve.

QUALITY OF LIFE IN OUR ENVIRONMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CANNON). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I certainly join my colleagues in wishing our friend the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM) well.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to spend a few moments this evening discussing elements that deal with our quality of life in our environment.

After a seemingly interminable and preliminary process which has been seemingly going on since the last elections 2 years ago, we are now entering into the political home stretch.

As the candidates move past the debate on debate and the skirmishing that occurs here on Capitol Hill about budgets and health care, there is an overarching theme that is yet to be comprehensively addressed, the liv-

ability of our communities and the role the Federal Government can play in making our families safe, healthy, and economically secure.

The long-term implications for the environment have raised many areas of concern for citizens across the country. I find that it is interesting that it is not just a concern for college towns or for traditional urban centers. We find that these are very significant issues in areas like the mountain States of Colorado and Arizona and Utah.

People have been facing development and fear the situation is going to deteriorate overtime. I would like to take this opportunity this evening to discuss some of those items in greater detail.

But I would like to begin, if I may, by yielding to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), the delegate from the District of Columbia. She, I think, has perhaps one of the most difficult challenges that any of us face, representing the District without a vote, without Senate colleagues, and facing some of the very difficult environmental and development issues.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) to elaborate on some of her concerns.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for yielding to me.

That is a most generous gesture and in keeping with the special attention he has devoted to the capital of the United States. He joins us in so many activities that we share in common with his own constituents.

I want to particularly thank him for joining our bike ride just the other day where we are trying to work with his livability caucus to make the Nation's capital more livable for people who walk and ride and run.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I cannot let the occasion pass without congratulating the gentlewoman on leading the pack of some 3,500 cyclists just 2 weekends ago and a marvelous experience for so many people from the Metropolitan area, not just from the District of Columbia.

I did want to point out that tomorrow morning, again with the cooperation of the office of the gentlewoman, the bicycle caucus is going to have a tour of the south waterfront redevelopment and we will be leaving at 7:30 from the Rayburn horseshoe to be able to combine some bicycle work with understanding some of the development challenges that are being faced by the District.

□ 1800

Ms. NORTON. Indeed so. We invite Members to join us. I will be riding in my skirt because I have a hearing right afterwards. I thank the gentleman for helping us show off our waterfront which we are trying to get in better shape.

I thought I would come to the floor, and I appreciate the opportunity that the gentleman from Oregon has given me, to give a status report to Members on important developments in the District of Columbia. I try to give a status report every so often. This is an important time to do so because it is the appropriation period.

There are new Members here who perhaps think they have been having an out-of-body experience because they have had to vote on the floor on a local city's budget, on a budget raised in the District of Columbia. No, that is the way they do it here. They should not do it anywhere. Some of you have been local legislators. You would never abide that in your district. If I could get out of it, I would. I think that there is going to come a time very soon when there will be ways to modify the present system.

I wanted, though, to begin by thanking the chairman of the District subcommittee, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS), and the vice chair, the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA), for going with me to the Committee on Rules last week to ask for the return of the vote to the District of Columbia that was retracted along with the votes of the other delegates when the Republicans took the majority. As a constitutional lawyer, I had written a memorandum that showed that even as I had the full vote in committees, I could have it in the Committee of the Whole, the creation of the rules of the House, the Democrats were in power then, by a vote I had won it. The Republicans sued us and both the District Court and the Court of Appeals indicated that this was constitutional.

When the vote was retracted through the rules, there were a considerable number of Republicans who came up to me and said that at least for the District of Columbia, which is third per capita in Federal income taxes, if we had been severed, they would have voted to retain the vote of the District. The fact that Chairman DAVIS and Vice Chair MORELLA went with me to plead for the return of the vote for the District I think indicates that we are dealing here with a matter above political considerations, not bipartisan but non-partisan; but because we are talking about the vote, my single vote cannot make a difference, particularly since the rules require a revote if the delegate's vote makes the difference. Of course no one vote makes the difference very often. There cannot be half a dozen times in the session when that occurs. Nothing is lost by the Republican majority should they retain the majority. Everything is gained for my residents who still are smarting under the notion that anybody would take the vote while accepting their Federal income taxes.

There are other reasons as well. Uniquely, this body assumes the privilege of voting on my local budget; yet I have to stand there with no vote on

the amendments as I had when I had the vote in the Committee of the Whole, and of course there is the unique requirement that every law passed by the local city council come here to lay over and perhaps to be overturned. So in the name of the half million tax-paying Americans I represent, I ask that my vote be retained, and I appreciate the bipartisan support I have for that proposition.

Let me say just a word about the District itself. Its basic health needs to be reported to this body because this body saw the District go down in 1995. Since then, there have been 4 years of balanced budgets plus surpluses. The District came into balance 2 years ahead of the congressional mandate. The control board is sunseting. Next year's CAFR will report a balanced budget. That signals the end of the control board. At the same time the city council has revived its oversight functions so that it is now a full functioning city council with all of the vigilance that this body, for example, has over Federal agencies, keeping the new reform mayor on the reform path.

Finally, the school board, which is perhaps where the Congress has had its greatest concern, has itself also been reformed by vote of the residents of the District. We have a new superintendent that was superintendent in Montgomery County, one of the leading school districts in the country, who is now our superintendent. The former superintendent, Arlene Ackerman, did so well in the District that she was recruited away by San Francisco. She took our scores up 2 years running, instituted all manner of reforms including a summer program not only for remediation but to help students get ahead. Our police department is doing extraordinarily well in what has been a particularly high crime city. We have had double-digit drops in crime for 2 years now.

Most of my colleagues know and have enormous respect for our management-oriented mayor, the new mayor of the District of Columbia, Anthony Williams. You have perhaps read of the management plans he has in place which holds managers to goals which are publicized to the entire city so that people can see whether or not these managers are meeting their goals.

One agency has been in the paper recently, the foster care agency. I am pleased that the majority whip, TOM DELAY, a national advocate for children, himself a foster parent, was concerned about the fact that the foster care agency is in disarray. Note, though, that that agency is in receivership. Mr. DELAY has joined Chairman TOM DAVIS and me in calling for the return of that agency from the Federal courts to the mayor of the District of Columbia because he has shown that he knows how to reform an agency and the receivership has not done the job.

Finally, I want to thank the Congress for the tax credits and incentives that it voted in 1997, which are already

having an enormous effect in reviving the economy of the District of Columbia. Just today, Senator CONNIE MACK and I have an op-ed piece in the Washington Post where we call upon the Senate and the House to make citywide these D.C.-only tax credits and incentives which are reviving the private economy of the District of Columbia and have contributed invaluable to the revival of the District itself. Because the District has no State to fall back on, it needs special incentives of some kind; and we prefer private sector incentives, because we are trying to develop a stable economy that depends upon no one but ourselves and our own businesses.

The D.C. residential and business credits have had phenomenal success in the many communities in which they are found. But not every community has had the benefit of these tax incentives. The result is that there are businesses that have the incentives on one side of the street and on the other side of the street they do not, or competitors have them and their competitors do not. That is because this is a small, compact city, and you cannot divide it up the way you can Chicago or New York or L.A. into districts with some getting it and some not getting it without having terrifically adverse effects. The effect here has been to unintentionally discriminate against some communities.

What Senator MACK, who has been extraordinarily helpful to this city, wonderfully attentive to our economy, and I ask is that the proven success of these tax credits and benefits make the Congress decide to make them citywide. They are a tax-exempt bonding authority, for example, which means that we have what most cities have had for a long time, and that is tax bonding authority for profit-making businesses. We only had it for tax-exempt institutions before. Now there is \$100 million of private investment in the city because of the tax-exempt bonding. It is paying for itself over and over again.

The best example is the \$5,000 homebuyer credit. It is the only one of the tax incentives Congress passed in 1997 that was citywide, and look what has happened. We have turned around the extraordinary exit of middle-class homeowners from the city. Seventy percent of those who bought in the city said they bought because of the \$5,000 homebuyer credit which allows you to get \$5,000 off of your Federal income taxes if you buy a home in the District. We want that to be the case for the tax-exempt incentives as well.

Finally, let me thank the Congress once again for the 1997 tax credits and incentives that have boosted the city's private economy. In one or another of the tax measures coming out of the House, we expect these tax credits to perhaps become citywide, and I ask for Members' support for that measure.

Let me thank, once again, those who have supported me to get the vote back

for the tax-paying residents of the District. I ask whoever becomes the majority to at that time give the District back the vote it lost when the Republican majority assumed power here in the Congress. I think that it would be a most fitting way for the Congress to say to the District, which has blossomed back from the depths of insolvency into now a thriving city, "Job well done."

I thank the gentleman for yielding to me so that I might give the Members of the House this progress report on the Nation's capital.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I again commend the gentlewoman for her valiant efforts in terms of promoting the environment and livability of our Nation's capital. I think she is doing a job on behalf of all of us, because we all have a stake in the success of Washington, D.C.

I would like to return, Mr. Speaker, to focus for a few moments about the environment and what difference it is going to make in the election this fall. We are now facing the issue of what candidate and which political party will do the best job. It is very clear that the Republican ticket, even though not currently in office on the national level, does in fact have an environmental record. Former Representative Cheney, when he was in the House for almost 13 years, compiled a lifetime voting record on environmental issues of 13 percent, one of the worst in that period of time. Likewise, Governor Bush in his two terms now as governor of Texas has an environmental record. Where is his leadership dealing with the fact that Texas puts more chemicals in the air than any other State and by most rankings is the State with the worst toxin level in the atmosphere? Were Texas a country, it would be the world's seventh largest national emitter of carbon dioxide.

The largest problem is the dangerous amount of nitrogen oxide which mixes with the exhaust vehicles to create ozone and smog. And under the leadership of Governor Bush, in 1999 Houston surpassed Los Angeles as the country's smoggiest city. Texas had the Nation's 25 highest ozone measurements and 90 percent of the Nation's readings deemed very unhealthy by the EPA.

This summer, while Los Angeles has posted eight more days of unhealthy ozone than its Texas rival, Houston's worst smog was dirtier than any in Southern California according to air quality officials. Since Bush took office, the number of days when Texas cities have exceeded Federal ozone standards have doubled. Houston and Dallas currently face Federal deadlines to make sharp cuts in air pollution or risk losing Federal transportation money.

□ 1815

At the same time that Texas environmental conditions are reaching a crisis point, cities such as Charlotte, North Carolina and Salt Lake City have man-

aged to absorb growth while improving their air quality. The Bush administration claims that growth, not governance is the reason for the State's appalling air quality. It is hogwash. Rather the State's environmental record perhaps best underscores what a Bush Presidency would mean for our Nation's air, water, streams and for forested area. Virtually no support for growth management, no commitment to improving the air or water quality, no protection for environmental resources.

Consider the impact of the Republican governor in terms of who he has appointed to run the State's environmental agencies. All of the Texas natural resources conservation commissioners have backgrounds in industry. The same industrialists who are the generous contributor to the Bush Presidential campaign.

He is fond of saying you cannot regulate or sue your way to clean air, clean water. Yet, consider the results of his environmental centerpiece, rather than forcing the worst polluting industrial plants in the State, those grandfathered into the State's clean air policy, that currently contribute 36 percent of the chemicals Texas released in the atmosphere, Bush has worked out a program with the industrialists, a voluntary cleanup.

After 2½ years, the scheme has produced only 30 of 461 plants not already facing Federal restrictions to comply with environmental guidelines. Together these 30 plants reduce grandfathered emissions by only 3 percent. Should Vice President AL GORE and the American public push Bush on these issues, George W. may feel like the disobedient son haunted by his father's words. I recall in 1988 George Bush, Sr. went to Boston Harbor and attacked the environmental record of his opponent Michael Dukakis, saying my opponent has said he will do for America what he has done for Massachusetts, that is what I fear for my country. That has an ominous ring as it relates to George Bush's leadership in Texas.

I would yield to my colleague from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND) a few moments to elaborate on these elements.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for yielding to me for this opportunity to join him in this special order discussion of environmental issues affecting the year 2000 campaign, especially the Presidential race.

First I want to commend the gentleman and compliment him for the leadership role he has assumed here in Congress regarding a whole host of environmental issues, but especially the sustainable development issue that is sweeping across the country and that large and small communities, urban and rural, have to contend with now on an ever-growing basis of how they can grow and manage the growth in a sustainable way so that they all enjoy livable communities.

In fact, the gentleman is the founder of the Sustainable Development Cau-

cus that has formed in the House of Representatives and I am a proud member of, and the gentleman brings in a lot of experts and speakers in order to enlighten Members of Congress on how Federal policy can sometimes adversely affect the sustainable development goals of our communities back home, and what we can do then to change that course of action, and how we can assist our communities back home through the dissemination of information and ideas on their sustainable development goals.

And the gentleman has really elevated that issue on the national plane, and I commend you for all of your hard work in that regard and look forward to working with the gentleman on that in the future.

I just want to take a few moments to talk about why I am supporting and why I think the Gore-Lieberman ticket is a strong ticket and the right ticket to go with for the next 8 years in this country. I had an opportunity now as a member of the new Democratic coalition of working both with Vice President GORE and Senator LIEBERMAN on a whole host of issues, and there are not two people who are more committed to environmental issues and sustainable development issues, the impact that it has on our country, than Vice President GORE and Senator LIEBERMAN.

Mr. Speaker, both of them realize and understand that we can have sustainable economic growth in this country without jeopardizing the environment at the same time, and both of them has shown an incredible amount of leadership and courage at this time on this very issue. In fact, I had the pleasure of traveling back with both the Gores and Liebermans the day after the convention in LA so that they could start their general election campaign in my hometown in La Crosse, Wisconsin, which is a beautiful area in western Wisconsin situated right on the banks of America's river, the Mississippi River.

There was a tremendous crowd and rally waiting for them at La Crosse that launched them on their general election campaign, and we all boarded the Mark Twain Riverboat that we took then down the Mississippi, and given that my congressional district has more miles that border the Mississippi River than any other congressional district in the Nation, I felt a certain moral responsibility to assume leadership on issues that affect the Mississippi River Basin.

So I helped form a bipartisan Mississippi River caucus, and this was a great opportunity for me to talk to both AL GORE and JOE LIEBERMAN in regards to the importance of that river basin, the Mississippi, through the heartland of our country, and some of the programs and projects that we have working on it, and both of them were very impressed and very supportive with the number of projects that affect the river basin, the sustainability, trying to preserve and protect it for future

generations, one of which is the environmental management program for the Mississippi River.

This is a program set up through the U.S. geological survey that has long-term resource monitoring and data collection, also habitat restoration projects in the upper-Mississippi basin that the Corps of Engineers helps us on, in order to deal with the adverse effects that growth and development have had on this important river system.

It has received tremendous amount of support within the Clinton-Gore administration and also from Senator LIEBERMAN. But I have also introduced a bill that we are trying to work through Congress right now; I had a chance to talk to both of them on it. It is the Upper Mississippi River Basin Conservation Act. And it is a very simple bill with the overall goal of trying to reduce the amount of sedimentation and nutrients that flow into the river basin.

I had a chance to speak at length with AL GORE about this legislation especially as we are drifting down the Mississippi River. He said this is something right in line with his own environmental philosophical beliefs and a direction we need to go on when it comes to environmental policy. And to accomplish the reduction of sediments and nutrients flowing into the basin and resulting in back bays being filled up and the destruction of wetlands, we would implement, again, through the U.S. Geological Survey, a comprehensive scientific monitoring and modeling program, so we can identify where the hot spots are, better direct our limited resources to get the most optimal effect on the investment in order to combat some of these challenges that the river basin faces.

We also build upon existing land conservation programs that come out of the USDA so that farmers can participate in good land stewardship programs that are voluntary and incentive based because we understand they are going to be a crucial component partnership in trying to reduce the sediment and nutrient flows into this river basin. And there are some very good programs that we are relying upon in order to accomplish our objective, one of which is the conservation reservation program.

This is a program out of USDA that allows farmers to take land out of tillage and out of use, especially land that could lead to erosion problems and, therefore, water management problems in the area. This is a program that Vice President GORE has been a staunch proponent of, understanding that it is a voluntary incentive-based program for farmers to participate in.

Mr. Speaker, it helps them with the reliable steady income stream for those who are able to enroll in CRP, and I believe that as we shape the next farm bill, this is a direction we need to be going in in regards to foreign policy, rather than passing a multiple billion

dollar farm relief package. If we can have a more reliable sustainable farm support through land conservation programs, this would help our family farmers during a very difficult period when we have historically low commodity prices. Milk prices now are looking at a 20, 30 year low. These are popular programs that our farmers are asking for expansion and more of.

Unfortunately, Governor Bush has come out in strict opposition to the conservation reserve program. I do not know why, since it is widely popular within the agriculture community and with family farmers because of the win-win situation that it creates, good land stewardship, good land conservation programs, which help drinking water supplies and watershed areas.

I think that is a distinct difference for people to judge the various tickets in this year's fall campaign, a tremendous difference that I think is going to have an impact throughout rural America of what party, what administration is going to be supportive of this direction in agriculture policies.

I mean those are just a couple of reasons why I think again, Gore-Lieberman is the strongest ticket when it comes to environmental issues and environmental policy. One that I know that we would be able to work successfully with in the next 8 years during the administration, because again they recognize that good environmental stewardship should not be a partisan issue.

Unfortunately, all too often the debates and the programs that we support come down along party lines, and it should not have to be that way. I mean, we see what the polling numbers show. The national and local polls of how popular good environmental programs are to the people back home. And so for a Bush-Cheney ticket to kind of offhand discount some very important land conservation programs that our farmers can benefit from, I think is an issue that should be out there and will become more and more a part of this Presidential campaign.

But again, I thank my friend from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for allowing me to share a few minutes with him tonight during this special order. I commend the gentleman for the leadership role that he has taken here in the United States Congress on the sustainable development issues, the bike caucus that he helped form as well to encourage alternative modes of transportation, given the congestion problem that we face here in the District itself. And I do look forward to working with him in the future on these important programs.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for joining us and the gentleman is too modest. As the gentleman is leaving us, I want to express my deep appreciation for the leadership that the gentleman has shown on a whole range of issues with the Mississippi River Valley.

When we had the week-long expose in The Washington Post dealing with con-

cerns, serious concerns about management of the environmental issues in terms of Congress' behavior, I was proud that there were numerous references to the gentleman's insightful reform legislation that he has introduced well in advance of the current controversy to try and depoliticize, to make more transparent and to allow the public to be involved with these critical issues.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be a cosponsor with the gentleman of his legislation and look forward to working with him hopefully maybe even in this session to achieve that reform, but certainly in the next Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), who has served as a mentor to me in my brief tenure in Congress to understand how Congress can be a better partner with the environment, including a report that he issued today on the steps of the Capitol.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for yielding the time to me and, Mr. Speaker, for you allowing us to have this time and this discussion. As the gentleman stated, I am a Congressman from California. California is very proud of being a State that is dealing with a lot of issues on the environment.

I mean, the fact of the matter is that California has such a diverse geography, a geography that is noted by its forests in the north and its deserts in the south, by its magnificent Sierra Nevadas on the east and its incredible coast line on the west. And in that diversity of geography, lives 33 million people, the most multicultural democracy on the face of the Earth.

And California is a testing area for the globe, not only for our Nation. It is a State that has learned that you cannot take care of the people unless you take care of the land. And we have developed in California a very extensive way of addressing the impacts of people in the land through zoning process and master planning that cities and counties must do. General plans that are in great detail.

And what has this evolved into. It has evolved into the most successful economic State in the United States. An economy that ranks 7th in the world in gross national product. What it tells my colleagues is that there is indeed a correlation between the economy and the environment. We cannot grow the specialty crops that we grow in the Salinas Valley in the central part of California anywhere else in the world, because we have a climate that is dependent on clean air, clean water, a coastal fog belt climate that has a temperature that allows us to grow 85 different crops in just Monterey County alone, that is more than any other crops that any other States in the United States gross.

□ 1830

We have an economy in California that flourishes with tourists who come

to the State, attracted by its scenic wonders, by the Yosemite, by the San Francisco Bay, by the Marine Worlds, by the ocean, Big Sur, and the list goes on and on.

What I am bringing all this up to is that I am very, very worried that the national direction of local control and State control of environmental effects could change with the new administration. We look at what is happening in this Congress, take air, for example. Vice President GORE went to Tokyo to participate in the debate on global warming. There was no debate that there was global warming. There was debate on what to do about it. There were protocols laid out which request the industrialized nations to take the lead because, one, they have more information; two, they have more technology; and, three, they have the ability to think outside the box and lead countries that are less developed.

We developed those protocols and each country is supposed to go back and check about it. Well, the Republican-controlled Congress here has put riders in saying, and this is really something and I think it is shocking, it is essentially a gag order that says nobody, nobody in the Federal Government, can go out and discuss anything about the Kyoto Accords until the treaty is ratified in the United States Senate. They cannot even have discussions. They cannot even share ideas. They cannot go anywhere else in the globe.

If one sees the documentaries that are coming out, this is a concern that countries all over the world are raising, and they are asking for the United States to help in trying to understand what they can do about it; and we are gagged, we are bound, we are ordered that we cannot do that. We cannot even talk about it.

You wonder, as you see the governor of Texas running for President of the United States, and leadership is about results, and the question is, what are the results that you have accomplished while you have been in elective roles. Here is the governor of the State of Texas that comes out with the worst air in the cities of Texas, in Houston in particular, and the problem with Houston is because they have no zoning, they have no general plan, they have no requirement. It has become the biggest urban sprawl city in America, more sprawled out than Los Angeles. When you get into urban sprawl, you get into an area that the gentleman knows so much about, one cannot build effective transportation systems.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Reclaiming my time for a moment, one of the things that has struck me about the leadership of Governor Bush is how negative it has been towards cities in Texas that are actually trying to solve the problems. This actually occurred, this was reported in the Austin American Statesman reporting that when growth-deluged City of Austin moved to regulate development and water

quality, Bush approved State legislation to negate all its effects. So while talking about local control and turning things back, when communities in Texas, and Austin is a terrific town, they are struggling with significant growth, has actually tried to move ahead, Governor Bush was not there supporting them, urging them on.

In fact, he approved legislation that stripped away the powers that they wanted to try and solve it dealing specifically with what the gentleman said.

Mr. FARR of California. Well, I think that is my point, and the point is that leadership is about getting results. We are into an election-year mode. We all know what is going on in this country, and if we watch the people, it is so easy at this time of the year, this time of elections, to listen to people complain. It is easy to criticize. It is easy to find fault. It is easy to be negative. It is very difficult in the political arena, in a bipartisan fashion, to forge something that can be signed into law and that can be instrumental in helping solve the problem. That is the measure of leadership, is what kind of results are you getting. To do nothing is not a result, particularly when it is dealing with how do you clean up the air, how do you clean up the water, how do you clean up the oceans, how do you make transportation more accessible, affordable and certainly less congestive.

If it is just complaining about it, it is not getting results.

So I am really worried because I see a potential for an administration to come in here to usurp the kind of local and State controls that we have had in law and instead of working with them essentially being in opposition to them. In order to solve water problems in America, we are going to have to actually be more conservative. We are going to have to conserve more water. That means we have to waste less water.

Now, do we have to build water facilities? Yes, but we do not have to build them as big as dam builders would say they have to be built or as many as they say have to be built. There are compromises here, but the compromise, first of all, is using less, wasting less, recycling more.

In land use, we cannot solve our problems in land use by just allowing cities to go out, particularly in areas where there are prime agricultural lands. In California, this is our biggest struggle, urban sprawl. Everybody needs housing. It is so easy to just go out and pave over the orchard, pave over the lettuce field, pave over the cattle grazing area. Then you have houses spread all out. And guess where all the jobs are? Downtown. Tough commute into town and all of a sudden you are now creating air pollution, and you have created an unsolvable problem.

How do you do that? You look around to cities that have grown up around this world; you look to Europe which has had cities a lot longer than the

United States and guess what? Some of those cities are still absolutely gorgeous cities because they put urban limit lines on them and said you are going to grow up rather than grow out; you are going to use space better downtown than you have used it; you are going to bring people back into the urban area; you are going to live in densities that are attractive, that are architectural in planning; you are going to use land, you are going to use resources appropriately.

Agricultural preservation means you have to make sure that the agricultural land cannot be converted to real estate. You do that by not selling to development. The owner owns this, this is a free market system, a willing seller says, look, I would like my land taxes reduced. I would like to have my inheritance taxes reduced. I am willing to sell you the development rights on this land and then the land, no matter who inherits it or buys it, will only be able to do agriculture on it. That is wise. That is wise use. We have done that in most of our communities. We have zoned areas saying you can only have a building of a certain height; or you live in a residential area, you do not buy a house saying I am buying this house today so that I can tear it down tomorrow to build a factory on it or to build a gas station on it. Neighborhoods would never allow that to occur.

So we need to treat our precious agricultural land just as respectfully as we treat our residential land, and we need to know where one begins and the other ends; transportation, quality of life issues.

Lastly, I would just like to say that I represent an area that has learned that the ocean is our new frontier. We have all said here on the floor of the Congress that we know more about the Moon and Mars than we know about our own oceans. That is a huge exploration responsibility. One of the things we have tried to say in California is, look, our coastline is our largest economic engine. It is where our commercial tourism, it is where our dependence on boats getting in and out of harbors, it is an area where disasters, such as oil spills, could ruin the coastal economy, the number one zone of economy in California.

What we are really worried about is that we could have the next President of the United States, the governor of Texas, if he were the President, he could sign an executive order lifting the moratorium on offshore oil drilling that we hailed and applauded President Clinton and Vice President AL GORE in deciding when they came to the first Oceans Conference in Monterey Bay. This administration made a statement that they thought the oceans were important enough that we really ought to commit a long-term agenda to understanding the conflicts of the sea, to understanding the resources of the sea, and to understanding how we can appropriately manage those.

In doing that, the President said we do not need to drill this oil right now. It has been here for millions of years, and it can be here for a long time before we have to drill it because we can allow technology to catch up, we can allow less reliance on oil to catch up. Guess what? He did that by executive order and that same pen could unchange that if it were in the hands of a President who was pro-oil, who is very involved in allowing gulf oil to be developed. That would ruin the coast of California.

So I am very, very worried that the record of the candidate, of the governor of Texas, on the environmental issues, could literally destroy the green economy that California has so successfully built up. I bring that record to the floor tonight with a real element of concern. I appreciate the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for yielding his time to me to make that statement.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) for his comments, and I must commend his leadership. I had the pleasure of attending that first National Oceans Conference in the beautiful district of the gentleman 2 years ago. It was a very inspirational event. It brought people together. Great things have come from it. Of course, the gentleman was the inspiration for the President with another stroke of the pen, with the California Coastal National Monument. I commend the leadership of the gentleman and his vision, and I appreciate him joining me this evening.

Mr. Speaker, I think the item that frustrates me the most is not the governor of Texas' poor environmental record, lack of leadership; but it is the lack of perception and passion about protecting the environment that I personally find most disturbing. It seems to a casual observer at least that he seems unaware of Texas' serious environmental problems. Where is his outrage and his concern being expressed that under his leadership Houston has become the city with the Nation's worst air quality?

This environmental indifference, if combined with the typical Republican leadership that we have seen in Congress in the last 6 years, could be disastrous. I want to talk about that in a moment, but first I guess it is important to also reference that there is another branch of government that is going to be in flux as a result of the outcome of this election, because every 2 or 3 years on average a Supreme Court Justice is appointed. There have been no justices appointed the last 6 years. It is very likely that the next President will be appointing more than one justice, probably 2, 3, 4, in the next 4-year term alone.

Governor Bush has indicated that from his perspective, Justice Scalia and Justice Thomas would be the models for his Supreme Court appointments. I think a cursory review, even a

cursory review of their judicial decisions indicates why that could potentially be a disaster for the environment. But the Supreme Court is only the tip of the iceberg, because the next President will be appointing hundreds of Federal district and circuit court judges.

Now, these are the men and women who make decisions every day in the various circuits that impact the day-to-day activities of Americans. In many cases, these are the decisions that stand, that are never reviewed, that determine the outcomes. Of course, the judiciary on the district and circuit court level has been sort of the farm club, the bench for future higher appointments. It would be, I think, unfortunate if we were to have an approach such as has been indicated by Governor Bush as his model.

I also mentioned the other branch of government, the legislative branch, because here too there are significant differences that are offered to the American public. It has been the Democratic administration that time and time again has beaten back destructive environmental riders, vetoed legislation that was overreaching, and has been a part of constructive negotiations to be able to protect and enhance the environment and hold the line here in Congress.

If you look at the ratings by the people whose job it is to advocate for us on the environment, one of the best is the League of Conservation Voters. They have for years been compiling a non-partisan assessment of legislative voting records. They break these records out looking at the House and the Senate and the Republicans and the Democrats.

The difference between the two parties is stark. If we look at just the leadership of the environmental committees alone, in the Senate the party average for the Republicans is 13; for the Democrats it is 76 percent, but for the average leadership the chairman of the Senate Republicans are actually even worse, scoring a bare 9 percent.

If we look at the House of Representatives, it is even more stark. The average for Republicans is 16 percent; for the Democrats the average is 78. But if you look at the leadership of the committees that deal with the environment, the average for the chairs of the Republican members is 1 percent.

□ 1845

Of the 5, there was one, according to the League of Conservation Voters, 1 was 6 percent, the others had 0. Yet, for the democratic Ranking Members, the people who stand to ascend to the chairmanships, the average is 69 percent.

If we look at the House and Senate leadership, overall, the average leadership in the Senate was 0 for the Senate leaders, and in the House, it was 4 percent. The democratic leadership was 86 percent in the House, even more environmentally sensitive than the party

average of 78 percent, but basically, more than 6 times more environmentally sensitive and friendly, according to the evaluation of the League of Conservation Voters.

Mr. Speaker, this has manifestations as it deals with actual policy impact. I listened with some frustration earlier this evening as one of my colleagues, the gentleman from Florida, attempted to take to task the Democrats in the administration dealing with energy policy. I thought for a moment, my goodness. What is the energy policy that has been given to us by the Republicans?

For example, the Bush-Cheney ticket would be drilling in the ANWAR, in the Arctic Reserve, destroying forever this pristine, what has been described as the Serengeti of the Arctic, and there are a few month's supply of energy. This is something that the American public opposes by a 3-to-1 margin which the Republicans in Congress have been advocating, but a democratic administration has been resisting.

I look at the difference that has been proposed by my friends in Congress from the Republican side of the aisle, because it has not been very long ago that they had no energy alternatives; that, in fact, the Republican administrations in the 1980s cut back energy research and development by billions of dollars for alternative energy sources.

In 1995, when the Republicans took control of both the House and the Senate, they once again started the attack that was begun by the Reagan administration. Their first efforts were to cut energy efficiency programs 26 percent; \$1.117 billion in fiscal year 1995 was cut to \$840 million. The Committee on the Budget report for fiscal year 1997 actually recommended abolishing the Department of Energy. Think of that: abolishing the Federal agency to work in this area, and further proposed cutting energy conservation programs 62 percent over 5 years. In these total 5 years, the Republicans have slashed funding for solar, renewables, and conservation funding by a total of over one and a third billion dollars below the Clinton administration requests.

Furthermore, the Republicans have cut programs like the Weather Assistance Program beginning in 1995 when they cut it by 50 percent. Even now, in the middle of the energy emergency that we have been looking at over the course of the last 6 months, the Republicans are, in fact, asleep at the switch. Last spring, in the middle of the gas price crisis, number one, the Republicans were ready to, or they were flirting with having the President's authority to protect our economy by using the Strategic Petroleum Reserve expire. In 1999, the Republicans rejected an Energy Department proposal to buy \$100 million of crude oil, or nearly 10 million barrels of crude at that time of record-low prices to build up the Strategic Petroleum Reserve that could have been used during a situation such as we are facing here.

It took the House Republicans nearly a year to recognize that rising fuel prices were a national problem. They last looked at oil prices in March of 1999 and then held only the second hearing in March of 2000. There was nothing for a year from the people who control Congress.

Now, despite overwhelming evidence throughout 1999 and early 2000 that prices of gas, diesel and home heating oil were on the rise, House Republicans failed to hold even a single hearing or make a single proposal on stabilizing fuel prices, and throughout this period, they took no steps to invest in America's energy independence and economic security. But, in 1999, and I recall this well, the Republican leaders called again for the elimination of the Department of Energy and selling off the petroleum reserve.

Specifically, in April and May of last year, after OPEC's production cuts started a rise in prices, Republican leaders, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) joined the Republican budget chair and 34 other Republicans to introduce H.R. 1649, the Department of Energy Abolition Act. I think the collected memory of my friends on the Republican side when they attempt to criticize the Democrats in Congress, who are not in control, or the efforts of the democratic administration to do something about it is shortsighted, to say the very least.

The ArmeY-DeLay energy bill would have eliminated the Energy Department and with it, oil conservation programs, renewable energy conservation research; it took energy policy out of the cabinet and sold off the Strategic Petroleum Reserve and the Navy's petroleum reserve. Such foresight. How much better off would we be today if we had adopted their reckless proposal?

Another ironic example for me of the Republicans dropping the ball is when the chairman of the Subcommittee on Energy and the Environment of the House Committee on Science held hearings in 1996 that attacked the Department of Energy's information administration for "Consistently overestimating the price of oil and using these 'inflated predictions' to justify increases in conservation research and development programs." The subcommittee chairman criticized the Department of Energy officials for predicting an oil crisis that could be caused by increased demand, increased imports, or instability in the Persian Gulf. The projections that drew that Republican chairman's criticism predicted that in the year 2000, the price per barrel of imported oil could be as high as \$34, and to that Republican subcommittee chair, that was outrageous. I note for the record that as of March 7 in the year 2000, the price was \$34.13.

Mr. Speaker, every day in America communities large and small are struggling with issues that define their environment, their liveability, their qual-

ity of life. Some people suggest that there is no difference between the Republicans and the Democrats, but I will tell my colleagues when it comes to the environment, the reality is stark. The Democrats in this administration and in Congress have a positive record of support and accomplishment, of sympathy and passion. The Republican ticket offers indifferent voting records, cursory performance in office, and advocacy of dangerous, even reckless, environmental policies. Our air, our water, the landscape, our precious natural resources do not have the time to survive benign neglect or malicious indifference, let alone active assault. There is a huge difference between the parties, perhaps on the environment more than any other issue. The stakes of the election for the environment could not be higher. I hope that the American public will look closely at the records and promote policies and candidates that will make our communities more livable and our families safer, healthier, and more economically secure.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING ALL POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST MOTION TO CONCUR IN SENATE AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 940, LACKAWANNA VALLEY NATIONAL HERITAGE ACT OF 1999

Mr. DIAZ-BALART (during special order of Mr. BLUMENAUER) from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-873) on the resolution (H. Res. 583) providing for consideration of the Senate amendments to the bill (H.R. 940) to designate the Lackawanna Valley National Heritage Area, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 4919, SECURITY ASSISTANCE ACT OF 2000

Mr. DIAZ-BALART (during special order of Mr. BLUMENAUER) from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-874) on the resolution (H. Res. 584) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 4919) to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and the Arms Export Control Act to make improvements to certain defense and security assistance provisions under those Acts, to authorize the transfer of naval vessels to certain foreign countries, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5109, DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS HEALTH CARE PERSONNEL ACT OF 2000

Mr. DIAZ-BALART (during special order of Mr. BLUMENAUER) from the

Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-875) on the resolution (H. Res. 585) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5109) to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the personnel system of the Veterans Health Administration, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

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. McNULTY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STRICKLAND, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. UNDERWOOD, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. STABENOW, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCGOVERN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ENGEL, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. FOLEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ROHRBACHER, for 5 minutes, September 21.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1638. An act to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to extend the retroactive eligibility dates for financial assistance for higher education for spouses and dependent children of Federal, State, and local law enforcement officers who are killed in the line of duty.

S. 2460. An act to authorize the payment of rewards to individuals furnishing information relating to persons subject to indictment for serious violations of international humanitarian law in Rwanda, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, September 21, 2000, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

10134. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Myclobutanol; Extension of Tolerance for Emergency Exemptions [OPP-301045; FRL-6742-6] (RIN: 2070-AB78) received September 12, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.