

convenience, do our constitutional republic a grave disservice.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, I would call upon the President of the United States to cancel his questionable fundraising activities tomorrow, to stay in Washington, D.C. and to do something unique, indeed, novel: To call the leadership of the Congress and to join with Members of this House and the other body in constructive solutions to the challenges we face. Otherwise, Mr. Speaker, let us state clearly, so there will be no doubt, we are prepared to stay here as long as it takes.

#### COMMENTS ON CONGRESSIONAL ACTIVITIES

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, the speaker who preceded me in the well waxed eloquent about the President of the United States leaving town for a short while tomorrow to do some fundraising for the Democrats, and he took great opprobrium to that. But I would remember twice in this Congress in the midst of the legislative session when the House went out of session, in the middle of the week, on a Wednesday at 4 o'clock in the afternoon, so the Republicans could get on corporate jets and fly up to New York for the largest fund-raiser held in the history of the United States. Their corporate buddies flew them up there. Wasn't that nice?

What is the result? The work is not done. It is not surprising. Congress has been in session 108 days working here in Washington, D.C. this year. The average American working for wages has put in 200 days so far this year, and they have gotten their job done, every day, day in and day out. Congress, having worked under the Republican leadership one-half as many days and being paid generously quite more, has not gotten its work done.

There is nothing for the President to sit down and talk to the Republican leadership about. The Republican leadership cannot even agree among themselves. On the House side they have tried to cut taxes by taking the money and stealing it from the Social Security trust fund. The Republican leadership in the Senate has wisely chosen not to go down that path.

The Republicans in the House passed a *de minimis*, not very helpful, but better than nothing HMO reform to give patients some little bit of rights, nowhere near what we would have done on the majority side or even some Republicans wanted to do on their side and were blocked by their own leadership. The Senate has denied that.

So there is no agreement between the Republican leaders of the House, the Flat Earth Society, and the Republican leaders of the Senate, those who are sometime in the era of Christopher Columbus and discovered the Earth is round, but not much further ahead of

that in history. They cannot agree. So how can the President sit down with a bunch of turkeys who cannot agreeing among themselves within their own parts I?

Yesterday when we were talking about the failure of the Republicans to do anything for education, smaller class size, more teachers, rebuilding and building schools across America, something that would be a real benefit to the American people, when we talked about the failure to do anything for patients rights, when we talked about the attacks on the Social Security trust fund, the chairman of the Committee on Rules jumped up and said, "That is right, but we have cut taxes."

Now, I would ask those who are listening today, are your taxes really lower than they were four years ago when the Republicans took power? In fact, the answer is no. The first returns on the 1997 Taxpayer Relief Act are in. The results are striking.

Seventeen of the 80 percent, that basically figures out to about 14 percent of the people earning less than \$59,000 a year, got a generous tax cut of \$6. I hope you did not spend it all in one place. Maybe you put it away for retirement or the kids' college. That is great.

Now, we go after the \$59,000 to \$112,000 bracket. They did a little better, \$81. But that is not where the money really went. Guess what? Two-thirds of the taxpayer relief under the Republican bill passed last year went to people whose incomes average \$660,000 a year, and guess what? They got \$7,135. Now, the families struggling on a \$59,000 income got \$6. The families struggling, the Republican constituency, just struggling to make meet on \$666,000 a year, they got \$7,000.

But, don't worry, they will spend that money in a way to put Americans to work. Of course, the Republicans are against any increases in the minimum wage and they are following a trade policy which is driving down wages in America.

But they have done great things for the American people, great things, but they cannot get their work done here in Washington, D.C. They have raised a pile of money, and they want to go home and spend it to change the subject from what they have not done in Washington, D.C. or what they have done in killing HMO reform, in killing tobacco legislation, in attacking the Social Security trust fund, and what they have not done for education and what they have not done for average working families.

Shame on the Republican Party.

#### FOREIGN POLLUTION AT AMERICAN BEACHES

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

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, let me just say to my colleague as somebody

who owns a tax business in a working class neighborhood where not one client makes over \$100,000, I think it is fair to know that tax reductions for the working class people in this country are coming in the next few years, mostly because bipartisan negotiation put off a lot of those reductions. So I do not want to get into that. I am just meaning to address the fact that the partisan bickering has gone so far that people that would normally be outraged and would obviously never vote certain ways are voting ways totally contrary to what their personal belief is. It is either that, or they are just so busy fighting that they are not reading what is being proposed and what they are voting on. It is too easy to vote "no" against a Republican because he is a Republican, or vote "yes" for a Republican because he is a Republican, or vote "no" because he is a Democrat.

The point I am talking about is this summer, as a father, I was taking my children to our beaches in Imperial Beach, Southern California, and this is what we were greeted with, pollution signs that were closing our beaches and saying to children, you are not allowed to go in this water.

I want you to notice that the sign is a bilingual language sign. That is for a good reason. I will explain it later.

The point being, was this a corporation that polluted our beaches? Why was Washington not doing something about it? In fact, this pollution problem has gone on for 20 years. The fact is the reason why it was not taken care of is not because it was a corporation, and I think my colleagues on both sides of the aisle would say they would be outraged if an American business was polluting the beaches so badly that children could not go in the water.

The real outrage about this issue was it was not an American business or citizens polluting these waters, it was a foreign government desecrating U.S. territory with sewage in such large magnitudes that it not only affects the environment so you cannot get in the water, but it is also destroying the largest estuary and sanctuary in the Pacific coast.

You can say wait a minute, Mr. BILBRAY, how could a foreign government actually be polluting and desecrating American soil? Let me just give you a little geography lesson here.

The San Diego-Tijuana Tijuana border happens to be cut by the Tijuana River. But, unlike a lot of rivers, the Tijuana River flows north into the United States.

Now, that normally would not be a problem, except for the problem that Tijuana has been growing so fast, a lot of it by economic development, that the sewage lines are broken and are flowing into the Tijuana River, flowing through the Tijuana estuary and preserve, and going up into the surf zone for the United States.

Now, you understand, these beaches have been impacted for 20 years. Well, the Federal Government has told us,

and I will tell you this as a young mayor of 27 years old, I was told by the Carter administration, that is how far this problem has gone, that, Mr. Mayor, we don't want to do anything that may be embarrassing to Mexico, because we are trying to close a deal on oil.

I would just ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to consider the fact that someone said we do not want to confront a major corporation with polluting our water because it might embarrass them.

I do not think my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would ever stand for their neighborhoods being polluted, and in fact would not support allowing \$200 million of taxpayer funds to be wasted or not put to appropriate use. \$200 million is going to be spent by the taxpayers of the United States to address this problem, and the problem is continuing.

Now, what was the resolution voted against by all but 28 Members of the Democratic Caucus? The resolution said if Mexico does not stop polluting U.S. waters, Congress will take a look at our treaties that relate to Mexico. Can you imagine that being so outrageous, that if the pollution keeps going, we are going to continue to shut it down? That we are just going to ignore it, because we do not want to even look at our treaty obligations?

I do not believe my colleagues who voted against this bill read the bill or understood the bill, and I do not believe that all but 28 Members of the Democratic Caucus believes that they should vote no to clean up the sewage problems and the pollution problems along our border.

□ 1615

I do believe they got wrapped up in this partisan bickering this week that says if a Republican proposes it, let us vote against it. They voted against it, even though it was against the environment.

I would ask every one of them to go back to their constituents and say, citizens, I believe that our treaties with Mexico are more important than the environment; that Washington should continue not to address this issue comprehensively, that Washington should find excuses for Mexico polluting our waters.

Mr. Speaker, no one in this House has worked longer and harder at working with Mexico, at taking care of this problem. But we do not solve problems by ignoring them or walking around them. I have dear colleagues on this side that come from my State that I will continue to work on pollution problems with, but because we got so wrapped up in the partisan bickering, we had votes that were totally contrary to the historical facts, and desecrated our environment.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, put the partisanship away. Let us vote for our children, our environment, and

quit finding excuses to vote no on everything that comes before this floor.

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

(Mr. ABERCROMBIE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### THE FEDERAL ROLE IN FUNDING FOR EDUCATION

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

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I think everybody has heard that great and wonderful quotation about "We are from the Federal Government and we are here to help you."

I don't know how many are old enough to remember the good old days before the Federal Government got into funding the education program that we all have throughout our country. I think, unless I am mistaken, since they got in there and we were taking test scores and things like that, the grades have gone down.

The Federal Government's assistance has been fabulous. They come up and say, we are going to give you 6 percent of all your funding. That is what they have done so far. Six percent is all the Federal Government gives us in funding education at the local level, but they give us 100 percent of the rules and regulations by which we have to operate.

I know at this particular time, back in the 1960s, I kept trying to tell people, do not accept Federal money because it will come with strings, and you will not have the slightest idea what they are going to tell you to do the next day. But they did.

It was not too long ago, I think about 6 or 8 months ago, or maybe when we first came in and got control of Congress, we decided that somebody, somewhere, ought to come up with the idea of preventing unfunded mandates.

Let me give Members an idea of unfunded mandates. Unfunded mandates are what the Federal Government says you have to do if you accept their money. So here we are, accepting 6 percent of the money from the Federal Government, and they come up with new ideas. One of the ones they came up with, and I am not saying that this particular idea was terribly wrong, it is called IDEA. It is the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

Basically, what it was is children with disabilities were not getting a proper education, so the Federal Government, being thoughtful and thinking of what was right and what was wrong, decided we are going to mandate to you folks back home in your school system, we are going to man-

date that you take this special education pot and take care of these children.

So they did. They mandated that we do it, and guaranteed, let me just tell the Members, they guaranteed that they would fund up to 40 percent of this total amount of money that was going to be given to run this special education program.

So far, and I have been here in Congress 12 years now, under the Democrats they never raised anything. They got up to 7 percent and that is where they stopped. They never got any higher. They were supposed to come up with 40, and promised us in blood, we will give you 40 percent of the costs, but they never did. They never got up over 7 percent. Really, we took control 4 years ago, and we have increased it to 11 percent. But stop and talk about a mandate, this program is underfunded by \$10 billion.

The President has come along with a great and wonderful idea, 100,000 new teachers. Can Members imagine how they are going to fund these teachers? Why in the world, if they are coming up with all these brilliant ideas, do we not fund programs that we have already brought up?

The fact of unfunded mandates is one of the major things. I was a county commissioner for 8 years. We spent time after time trying to figure out, if we took the Federal money, what were the strings they were going to put on it and make us do? If we wanted money for a sewer but we had to apply for water, we could not use it for whatever is necessary. At one time under President Nixon, they decided to open it up and let them take Federal money and do with it what they thought they really needed, but that is not the way it operates still.

We passed that program several years ago, just a couple years ago, about unfunded mandates. Let me say, they are coming along now and telling us how much they are going to help us with construction of schools. The Federal Government is going to step into this and help get school construction started.

I do not know if Members have ever heard of a thing called the Davis-Bacon Act. The Davis-Bacon Act says if there is a dollar's worth of Federal money in any construction, they must pay what is a little higher than union wages. In an area like mine in the South, and we are a right-to-work State, if we accepted a dollar's worth of Federal money to construct schools in our State, it would cost us 30 percent more.

In other words, if we wanted to build a \$1 million school and we accepted the Federal money, because of the additional labor costs, it would cost us \$1,300,000, a complete loss of \$300,000 worth of local money because we accepted something from the Federal Government.

All of these great and wonderful things about the 100,000 teachers, and helping us with schools, all of this is