

or barged to the North Slope around Deadhorse and Prudhoe Bay. The companies have been able to afford to bring everything in to such a remote location because today they are making money. But guess what? Tomorrow it will still be there, and tomorrow and tomorrow and tomorrow. All this stuff never leaves. The roads, the pipes, the dry holes, the bulldozers, the spent wells, the gravel pits, it all stays. And together, it makes up a footprint that can only be described as a world-class mess, and it is going to stay that way because once the industry starts making money up there, the last thing they are going to do is to go into debt in order to clean it up.

The industrial footprint extends for miles. When it is overlaid on the refuge, we can see that it would end any notion of this treasured corner of God Almighty's earth remaining wild, untrammelled, and untouched.

Let me finish by noting that this is Federal land that has been set aside for all of the people of the United States. It does not belong to the oil companies. It does not belong to just one State. It is a public wilderness treasure. We are all the trustees. As far as I am concerned, we are going to have to work as hard as we can in order to make sure that this incomparable wilderness is not touched. There are plenty of other places that can be explored in Alaska; and as Joe LIEBERMAN said in his debate, if we just increase fuel efficiency of an automobile three miles a gallon, it would produce more oil than all of this Arctic wilderness.

Let me conclude and compliment the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for holding this important special order. I think all of these issues have to be discussed.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) joining us, and I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL), who has been active in these issues since long before he came to this Chamber.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to associate myself with the comments of my colleagues and in particular acknowledge the articulate and eloquent comments from the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) about the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. As I think he pointed out, the geologists tell us we have probably something along the order of 6 months' supply in this area, and to me it would be a big mistake for that short-term supply of oil to trample an area that was described in such fashion. It is a trade-off that is not really acceptable, I think.

What is acceptable? Well, if we look at what Vice President Gore has been talking about, what is acceptable is to throw ourselves into all of these opportunities that we have to develop different types of energy production methods that are really exciting tech-

nologies out there. One hundred years ago, when petroleum was discovered, there were only two or three obvious uses for it. What did we do as a country? What did we do as a society? We said let us invest in research and development.

The Federal Government stepped in, and now we have almost countless uses for petroleum. In fact, some historians, I think, will tell us that we wasted it in our automobiles in the latter half of the 20th century.

We have very promising technologies in solar, as demonstrated by phototechnologies. We have wind technologies where the price of kilowatts is coming down dramatically. Biogas. We ought to be throwing all of those kinds of technologies into the mix at this time. I think we are going to see some enormously exciting things happen.

It is a false choice: it is going to hurt our economy, or it is going to hurt our environment. It is truly a false choice and the Vice President is saying, look, we have incredible opportunities in the developing world to take these technologies to places like China and Indonesia and India, and in the process do right by our economy, do right by the economic development opportunities. So the Vice President looking ahead, oil is going to be a thing of the past; the geologists tell us that those supplies are limited, that in the next 100 years oil as we know it will not be available to us. Let us look ahead, follow the leadership and the vision of the Vice President.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HANSEN). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I am sorry, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time has expired.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I had yielded the gentleman 2 of 3 of my minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Apparently he used more than the 2 minutes. I am sorry if there is a misunderstanding, but the hour is up.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I would ask unanimous consent for 30 seconds.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. I would advise the gentleman that a unanimous consent is not acceptable under a special order for additional time.

#### TAXATION

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

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the courtesy of the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN). I am sorry, but I thought the Chair would notify me when the time had expired. I apologize.

Mr. Speaker, the Vice President has sometimes been accused of being sort

of robotic and wooden. In fact, he has joked about it himself. But there is one thing that that man is passionate about. It is the environment. When I look at the dismal record in the State of Texas with the air quality deteriorating, I look for the passion and the commitment from the governor of that State, but I do not see it. I think there is a huge difference between the two, and I hope that the American public will have the opportunity in the remaining 3½ weeks to focus on this.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to address yesterday's debate and focus on taxation. Why such a dry topic as taxation? After all, one of the candidates seems like a much nicer, more likeable guy. Why do we not just make him President by acclamation? Well, it seems that running the Federal Government is a little bit more complicated than just being a nice and congenial individual.

First, let us talk about the cause for our prosperity. We have the longest expansion in this country's history. It has lasted so long some people take it for granted, but we should not because it arises from the combination of two very important causes; one of which is the ingenuity, the hard work and the inventiveness of the American people working in the private sector. But let us remember, Americans worked hard in the early 1980s, the late 1980s, and the early 1990s; but not until the mid-1990s did our prosperity begin to bear fruit.

Why is that? Because only then was it combined with the other essential element: Federal fiscal responsibility. Responsibility at the Federal level is something this administration achieved when most of us thought it was impossible, and in doing so they have given us lower interest rates, available capital for the private sector, and a lower inflation rate.

The governor of Texas would have us put this all at risk for \$1.5 trillion of tax cuts, nearly half of which goes to the richest 1 percent of Americans; plus another \$1 trillion in unstated costs as the cost of shifting from our present Social Security system to this new Social Security system he promises with individual accounts funded by a trillion dollars that no one mentions.

Let us talk about taxes. There are basically three taxes that support the Federal Government: the estate tax, which falls chiefly on the richest 1.5 percent of Americans; the income tax which is paid by everyone except the poor; and the FICA tax, the payroll tax that is borne by the poor and the middle class and has only a tiny effect on the rich.

The governor said last night, I believe everyone who pays taxes ought to get relief; but what he did not mention was that there are over 15 million Americans who pay that FICA tax, that payroll tax, and do not pay an income tax and do not get a penny of relief under his program. There are, in fact, 30 million Americans who pay a

FICA tax with no net income tax liability, and over half of them, 15 million Americans, pay a net FICA tax even adjusted for the earned income tax credit which they receive; 15 million Americans that the governor from Texas cannot see apparently because they are poor. They are the janitors; they are the men and women who pick up at restaurants; they are people working hard every day to support families on incomes of \$10,000 or \$15,000 and they do not get a penny. But 43 percent of George Bush's tax benefits go to the top 1 percent of Americans; and that is more than he spends on health, Medicare, education and the military.

Last night, Governor Bush told us that only \$223 billion goes to the richest 1 percent. He is right, if we only look at the income tax. But if we look at the estate tax, we see another \$500 billion going to the wealthiest 1 to 1½ percent of Americans. So we look at the estate tax and the income tax combined and we see roughly \$700 billion going to the wealthiest Americans.

But Mr. Bush cannot see half a trillion dollars in tax reduction, cannot notice it and denies that it exists because, after all, it is estate tax relief for the very wealthiest Americans. He cannot see 15 million poor Americans. He cannot see half a trillion dollars going to the wealthy. I think we could only describe this as fuzzy fiscal facts; and we need instead, as our President, someone who will provide tax relief to working Americans and preserve our fiscal responsibility.

#### TRIBUTE TO CONGRESSMAN TOM BLILEY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, before I get on with the business at hand, I would like to make some comments about the hour or so that we have just heard of facts that just simply do not bear up under the reality of what has happened in Texas in the last few years.

Since 1995, Texas has led the country in reducing the release of disposal of toxic pollution and has led it by 43 million pounds of reduction.

Since 1994, industrial air emissions in Texas have fallen by 11 percent. The EPA says that that is the fact. Under legislation signed by Governor Bush, Texas became the third State in the Nation to require pollution reductions and permits from grandfathered utilities, utilities that would not have had to meet these new standards. Governor Bush said they would have to meet these new standards. Under that plan, they will reduce nitrogen oxide pollution by 50 percent and sulfur dioxide emissions by 25 percent by 2003. Governor Bush has been praised for his

leadership in requiring air pollution reductions from these utilities, and the record is clear on that.

The Wall Street Journal in September of this year said that no one in the Clinton administration has been willing to face this issue separately.

I think what we see happening on the floor is a willingness to distort the facts. We see a willingness to talk about an America that Americans would not want to see happen in our country in terms of the kinds of solutions that have been proposed, but even those solutions, the gentleman from California talking to the gentleman from Oregon a minute ago, talking about electric cars, said that all this could be done today. Well, if it could have been done today, why has it not been done for the last 8 years? That was maybe the greatest condemnation of the point they were trying to make that was made on the floor today, but that is not the purpose of our order here tonight.

The purpose of the order tonight is to talk about the 5 decades of service of the chairman of the Committee on Commerce, the oldest committee in the House, a committee that has such jurisdiction that approximately half of all the legislation that comes to the House comes through the Committee on Commerce, a committee for the last 6 years that has been chaired by the gentleman from Virginia (TOM BLILEY).

□ 1845

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY) began his political career, as others will talk about in a few minutes, when he was elected to the city council in Richmond, Virginia. He served as vice mayor, he served as mayor, and then in 1980, 20 years ago, he was elected to the Congress. He was elected in 1980.

He had steered Richmond through some of its greatest challenges as the schools were desegregated, despite the unpopularity of the measures that were taken at the time. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY) as the mayor said that "This job will be done," and stepped forward and carried the load of seeing that that happened in his city.

As chairman of the Committee on Commerce, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY) led the drive to enact mammography quality standards, assuring the safety, accuracy, and overall quality of mammogram services for women.

As chairman, he led the passage of the 1996 Telecommunications Act, which has unleashed many of the innovative forces and gains in efficiency that are driving our economy forward today. He spearheaded enactment of securities litigation reform, and a host of other reforms that my colleagues will talk about.

They will also talk about their pride in being able to serve with him, a person who served 3 years in the Navy and left the Navy as a lieutenant; a person who the National Journal in a front

page feature called "Mr. Smooth" because of the way he gets his job done.

We will talk about his family: his wonderful wife, Mary Virginia, his two children, his grandchildren; about his commitment in his whole political career to always be sure that Sunday was reserved for family, a commitment that my wife has pointed out to me is something that I should emulate, and the absolute dedication of the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY) to preserving that time for church and family.

He has done a great job. He has made many friends. His leadership will be missed on our committee. I do not know how his teammate on the tennis court will deal with that, or whether they have made plans about their continued competition. But I am glad to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE).

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Missouri for yielding to me.

Before I talk about the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY), I want to commend the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) for his comments regarding the previous hour. Much of that rhetoric was reckless, and it was obviously designed to trash George Bush of Texas, and I thank the gentleman for responding to that.

Mr. Speaker, I met the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY) primarily through tennis. Mr. Speaker, as we know, many Members of Congress or most Members of Congress who are involved in recreation do so in golf. Hunting and fishing would come next. My friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), is a good basketball player in his own right.

I see my friends, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON), and we enjoy tennis. I met the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY) on the tennis court. What struck me initially was his James River-Virginia dialect. My staffers will say to me when I leave work in the evening, "Take Cah," meaning to take care. That is the way the gentleman from Virginia says it. They emulate him almost precisely accurately.

As Members may know, before he came to the Congress, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY) was an embalmer, a funeral home operator. When I first came to the Congress, my mayor back home is an embalmer, a funeral home operator, and the gentleman from Virginia knew him as mayor.

He came to me one day and in his James River dialect, he says, "How do you get along with your mayuh?" I said, "I get along fine with my mayor." He said, "Well, if you have any trouble with him, I will talk to him mayor to mayor, gravedigger to gravedigger."

I did not have to call him in because my mayor and I did get along very well.