



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 107<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 147

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MARCH 13, 2001

No. 33

## House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BALLENGER).

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,  
March 13, 2001.

I hereby appoint the Honorable CASS BALLENGER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,  
*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

### MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2001, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 30 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

### BICYCLE RIDING IS EFFICIENT MEANS OF TRANSPORTATION AND PROMOTES WELLNESS

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I came to Congress dedicated to making the Federal Government a better partner in helping our communities to be livable, for our families to be safe, healthy and economically secure. One important way of advancing that mission is through the intelligent use of the bicycle. As a person who cares about cycling and the world environment and energy supply, it was, to say

the very least, unnerving to read the story about cycling in China in Monday's Washington Post.

China is a huge country with an old and venerated tradition that is having trouble modernizing. It has experienced a century-long love affair with the bicycle since it was first introduced to China by American missionaries. They have more bicycles in China than any place in the world, but it is ironic that this country is seeking to ban bicycles in some areas. It is especially ironic to ban them from the central cities where they can have the greatest impact.

The bicycle is the most efficient means of transportation that has ever been devised. Unlike the horse or automobile, there is no pollution generated from cycling. It leaves the cyclist healthier, and the cyclist takes up a fraction of the roadway. As somebody who brought a bicycle to Washington, D.C. instead of a car when I was elected 5 years ago, I can testify that for the vast majority of my meetings around Washington, D.C., I will beat my colleagues who take cabs or their cars.

The movement from bicycles to cars has serious and wide-spread side effects and is a prescription for disaster. It is frightening to consider the 1.3 billion Chinese each with their own car living further from where they work.

The increased demand for concrete in the cities and impact on the environment resulting from more automobiles in China than any place in the world is not going to help our efforts to address global climate change.

The bicycle is not the only answer to problems of livability and it is not for everyone; but the facts remain at a time when our roads are too congested, the fitness of our children, the skyrocketing levels of morbid obesity, an important part of every community's equation for being safer, healthier and more economically secure is probably stored in the garage or parked in the basement. Over 100 million Americans

have access to bicycles, but what should Congress do to help people use them?

First, and foremost, Congress should lead by example and provide more adequate bike parking, more showers and changing facilities in order to encourage bike commuting here in Washington, D.C. Surveys show that if offices are so equipped, 45 percent of the employees who live within 5 miles would choose to bike commute to work.

Federal employees are allowed, in many cases, free parking or free transit. They can be reimbursed for cab fair or auto mileage, but cyclists are on their own; and that is rather foolish. Benefits should be expanded to include bicycle commuters the same way we treat other Federal employees.

We need to provide funding for safe transportation for our children. Over the course of the last 20 years, the number of children who are independently able to get to school on their own has decreased substantially, in some communities by 70 percent or more.

Regular cycling can help deal with that access. It can help with the epidemic of childhood obesity and promote the wellness of our children. Indeed children that ride to school in cars in slow-moving traffic experience worse air pollution than those who are walking or cycling.

I hope that Congress will consider more ways to encourage the implementation of the Safe Routes to School program to help provide the routes and to teach children about bicycle safety and promoting biking as a viable means of transportation.

Last but not least, Members of Congress should join the Congressional Bike Caucus. This is a group of Members of Congress who periodically host rides around Washington, D.C. for Members, their families and staff, but there is also a serious component to what we do.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H833

We have worked to help promote sound Federal bicycle policies and encourage the construction of thousands of miles of bicycle paths. Our rides have served to raise the awareness of the cycling climate here in Washington, D.C. and to work with groups in the community to improve the cycling conditions in the District.

At the end of the month of March, there will be hundreds of cycling advocates from around the United States here on Capitol Hill to deal with the first annual Bicycle Summit. It will be a time to concentrate on those areas where the Federal Government can be a better partner in providing greater transportation choices so that our communities can be safer and our families can be healthier and economically secure.

#### PRESIDENT BUSH'S TAX RELIEF PLAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, this body last week passed President's Bush's tax relief plan, the first step towards a broad tax reduction for our generation. The timing, Mr. Speaker, could not be better for all of us. We have to tighten our belts and prepare for a possible change in our economy.

In fact, the NASDAQ stock exchange closed below 2000 points yesterday, the first time the index closed so low since December, 1998.

President Bush's tax relief plan is a vital means of ensuring the economic engine that we have today continues to move forward, continues running; and of course, we do not want the economy to stall. By returning Americans' hard-earned dollars back to their wallets through tax relief, we will be saving Americans their checking accounts and, of course, and this is my point this afternoon, from Congress spending their money. For, if we fail to return money back to all those hard-working Americans, men and women, the Federal Government will just keep writing checks to spend their money. It is important we give it back to them, with the economy starting to slow.

How much money would Congress spend? Well, due to previous threats of a government shutdown by former President Clinton, and now a practically evenly divided Congress, the Federal Government has been on a spending spree of record proportions since the budgets emerged in 1998.

I believe President Bush has proposed holding spending at roughly 4 percent, a 4 percent increase. He has also offered to pay down the debt while reducing the record tax burden shouldered by all Americans, furthermore removing from Congress the temptation to spend the tax overpayment Americans are presently paying to the U.S. Treasury.

Even Chairman Alan Greenspan agrees with this plan. When the Congressional Budget Office, CBO, came out with its most recent budget estimates, one number, Mr. Speaker, stood out: \$5.6 trillion. That is the size of the projected surplus over the next 10 years. It is enough, of course, to pay down the debt, reduce the tax burden through broad tax relief, and target spending at some of the important programs that President Bush just talked about: health care, defense, and education.

But within that budget analysis, there was another number that garnered less attention. That number was \$561 billion. That is the amount of new spending Congress added during last fall's spending spree, discretionary, mandatory, and additional interest expense, \$561 billion. That amount represents fully one-third the size of the proposed Bush tax relief plan.

It also represents the iceberg's proverbial tip. Since the surplus emerged in 1998, Congress has accelerated spending increases three-fold. In the 3 years prior to 1998, discretionary budget authority grew at a reasonable approximately 2 percent a year. Since 1998, discretionary budget authority has grown at a galloping 6 percent a year.

How much has this increase in discretionary spending reduced the projected surplus? It is \$1.4 trillion. Again, that is just the discretionary spending. According to the CBO, the mandatory spending adopted by Congress last fall reduced the available surplus by \$70 billion.

Mr. Speaker, in 3 years we have already reduced the projected surplus by almost the equivalent of President Bush's tax relief plan. Moreover, the Office of Management and Budget estimates that if discretionary spending continues to grow at its current rate, the 10-year surplus would be \$1.4 trillion less over the next 10 years; again, almost equal to the Bush tax relief. So if we do not give it back to the people today, Congress will spend this money beyond inflation's cost of living.

An analysis of spending since the budget surpluses first emerged showed that if Congress had avoided this simple temptation to increase spending above the budget baseline caps, today we could offer American families a tax relief program equivalent to the Bush plan, and still we would be able to have a \$5.6 trillion surplus left over to pay down the debt, increase funding for education, health care, and defense, and still cut taxes even further.

Mr. Speaker, I conclude by urging the other body, the Chamber in the Senate, and other Americans to support the President's broad-based tax relief for American families, and of course, hold spending to 4 percent.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members will be reminded to refrain from

urging the other body to take certain action.

#### ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT FOR PUERTO RICO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. ACEVEDO-VILÁ) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. ACEVEDO-VILÁ. Mr. Speaker, the United States is currently faced with great challenges and at the same time great opportunities. The balanced Federal budget and projected surplus provide economic alternatives that some years ago were not available. However, the indications of an economic slowdown have helped generate calls from the President and Congress to create economic stimulus through a variety of proposals.

Last week the House voted in favor of generous individual income tax reductions. Debate continues on the size and scope of tax cuts and what should be done to spur real economic growth. As the Representative of Puerto Rico before Congress, I will work hard and in a bipartisan fashion to develop and pass the necessary and deserved economic stimulus package that will benefit the 4 million U.S. citizens living in Puerto Rico.

We have before us a unique opportunity to use current budgetary circumstances as a tool for economic development through the creation of jobs and investment in businesses in Puerto Rico.

During the period of 1993 to 1996, Congress took the necessary steps to balance the budget and eliminate the deficit. Many Members may already appreciate how Puerto Rico paid substantially during this process. In 1993, Congress passed the Omnibus Reconciliation Act, which included a provision that substantially curtailed the tax incentives provided by section 936 of the Internal Revenue Code to U.S. companies doing business in Puerto Rico.

In 1996, Congress enacted another set of amendments that eliminated all incentives for new or expanded business operation and investment in Puerto Rico. As of today, Puerto Rico has no Federal incentive to create new jobs, and those that apply to companies already doing business on the island are set to expire in the year 2005.

The negative consequences of the decisions taken in 1993 and 1996 are clear. The phase-out of these incentives is having disastrous effects on Puerto Rico's economy. In the last 4 years, more than 18,000 jobs have been lost in the manufacturing sector as a direct result of the phase-out, and Puerto Rico has not been able to attract significant new economic investment.

The vast majority of these jobs are moving out of the U.S. jurisdiction to countries like Malaysia and Singapore. Employment and wages from American companies are a critical part of Puerto