Florida and for the United States, and that is approve the Everglades legislation.

READY TO WORK

(Mrs. THURMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. THURMAN. Mr. Speaker, they have mentioned that there are so many people gone. I just want my constituents to know that I am still here. This is KAREN THURMAN from Florida, and I am ready right now to pass the Everglades bill. We were told last night before we left here that we would, in fact, have the Everglades bill on the floor tonight. I do not know why we have to wait until tomorrow to get this up. It could have been done; it would have been passed. It sounds to me like everybody stayed here because we think it is an important bill to get done. It is a national thing, and we want it done. But I do not know why we are waiting until tomorrow morning and not getting it done tonight.

So to my constituents, I want them to know, I am here, I am ready to work, and I am ready to save the Everglades.

STOP THE FINGERPOINTING

(Mr. STENHOLM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I hope we can put an end to the fingerpointing. It is time for us to close down this part of the session of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I want all of those that have been doing the fingerpointing, I want to ask, were there any meetings to work out the differences yesterday? Were there any meetings today? Have there been any meetings between the leadership of the House and the White House since 1:20 last Sunday night? Can anyone from the other side of the aisle tell me of a single invitation to meet and truly negotiate over the remaining items that the administration or Democrats from Congress refused to attend? If they can, take another 1 minute and say so. If not, let us quit the fingerpointing and realize we have to come back after the election and finish the work of this Congress. This is not doing any good, what we have heard tonight, not one bit of good. We are not doing anything. It is ridiculous. We could have voted on the Everglades yesterday. We could vote on it tonight. We do not have to come back tomorrow, but we will be here tomorrow.

1915

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

HONORING ROXCY O'NEAL BOLTON, SOUTH FLORIDA'S PIONEER FEMINIST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, tonight I would like to honor Roxcy O'Neal Bolton, a pioneer feminist in my congressional district who has and continues to champion the rights of women by widening the gate to equality.

Born in Mississippi in 1926, Roxcy Bolton has always been a trailblazer. She is a persistent advocate who continues to serve as a powerful voice for women whose needs and pleas had not been heard.

Through her actions, Roxcy has always demonstrated her courage and her deep convictions. She showcased the problems facing women of her time, and continues to encourage women to take action and to extend the fight for equal rights.

In South Florida, Roxcy's fight for equality helped to facilitate change. In the workplace, Roxcy demanded equal respect, equal opportunity, and equal pay for men and women.

For example, in dining clubs, as was the custom of the time, working men had a special dining area. During business day lunch hours men were seated and served quickly, while women, working women with short lunch hours, had to wait in line, looking at empty seats in the men's section.

By writing letters, meeting with restaurant owners, and organizing women, Roxcy Bolton changed this policy, and soon the ''men only'' policy in South Florida became obsolete.

Roxcy was also a fighter on behalf of abused women. In 1972 she founded Women in Distress, the first women's rescue shelter in Florida to provide emergency housing, rescue services, and care to women who found themselves in situations of personal crisis.

During that time, no one talked about rape, much less did anything about alleviating the horrendous trauma that the victim undergoes. Brave crime victims who actually reported their rapes were often treated callously.

Roxcy, however, was not afraid to speak on behalf of these unfortunate women, and did so publicly, with a march against rape down Flagler street in downtown Miami. Approximately 100 women gathered to march with Roxcy to make the community take notice of their concerns, of their anguish, of their need. It was the first time that South Florida women had taken to the streets, and Roxcy knew that if women banded together, we were going to make a difference.

Shortly thereafter, Roxcy approached every local official and persuaded them that something had to be done about treating rape as the violent crime that it is. In 1972, her efforts resulted in the first rape treatment center in the country, located in my regional congressional district at Jackson Memorial Hospital in Miami. In 1993, this rape treatment center was correctly named after Roxcy Bolton.

Roxcy also organized Florida's first crime watch meeting to help curb crime against women. She has served on many boards and commissions, working for women's rights, and has been the recipient of numerous civic awards related to her work with women's rights. In 1992, she helped form the Women's Park, the first park in the United States dedicated to all women who have made contributions to our community.

To this day, Roxcy continues to be a champion for humankind. We cannot keep her down. She continues to persevere and to recognize women's role in history. She continues to fight for women's rights, human rights, social welfare issues, and to put an end to the sexual discrimination in employment and in education.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have Roxcy O'Neal Bolton in my congressional district, and I wish her many more successful years in the ongoing struggle for women's issues. I ask my colleagues to join me in saluting this Florida heroine for her remarkable dedication to women, and for making South Florida a better place in which to live.

We are a richer community for having hard-charging feminists like Roxcy O'Neal Bolton in our midst.

GOVERNOR GEORGE W. BUSH'S FALSE STATEMENTS ABOUT HIS TAX PLAN

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, we should not pretend that we are working here toward a final solution. We all know we are coming back after the election. The people who know this best are the Republican Senate leadership. They have all gone home, so why are we pretending we are going to cut a deal without the Senate leadership?

This country needs an election so that the people can tell us that we need more Federal investment in education, that we need a prescription drug benefit that is part of Medicare, and that we need an increase in the minimum wage.

I trust next Tuesday that message will be heard here in Washington loud and clear.

Mr. Speaker, one thing that could prevent us from hearing that message is a misconstruction of the Governor of Texas' tax plan, because there are two false statements that have been made by the Governor about his own plan. I trust that he has not made these statements deliberately, but simply because

he has not read and studied his own tax plan, and that these are innocent, though major, mistakes.

The first is that the Governor of Texas tells us that under his plan, every American who pays taxes will get tax relief. He has said this over a dozen times, and it is false a dozen times. In fact, under his tax plan, 15 million American families who pay Federal taxes will get not one penny of tax relief.

Of course, over $700 billion of tax relief over 10 years will go to the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans, but not one penny will go to 15 million American families who work every day, who pay taxes to the Federal government in the form of FICA taxes taken from their wages, and who work at the lowest-paying jobs in our society.

The second false statement made by the Governor in both the second and third debates was that his plan provided only $223 billion over 10 years of tax relief to the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans. He was off. It is really closer to $700 billion of tax relief, because in stating the degree of tax relief that he provides to the wealthiest 1 percent, he simply forgot that his plan involves the repeal of the estate tax, which will eventually cost this country $50 billion a year, or $500 billion over the 10 years that is our traditional measure of the effect of tax proposals.

That is why it is true that the Governor's tax plan will provide more to the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans than he proposes to provide to strengthen our military, improve our education, improve Medicare, and provide for our health care system, or improve our health care system, combined.

Mr. Speaker, I now want to address the need for school construction, which is also a tax issue, because the tradition in this country is that the Federal government provides help for those school districts that have old schools that have need for new schools because of growth, or that need schools with smaller classrooms to provide for smaller class sizes, and therefore need more classrooms.

The tradition is that we do that through the Tax Code by allowing school districts to issue tax-exempt bonds. We on the Democratic side have urged that $25 billion of urgently-needed capital be provided to these school districts, not in the form of tax-exempt bonds but in the form of tax credit bonds, which will be even better for the school districts because they will not have to pay even reduced interest, they will pay no interest at all. The Federal Government will pick up the tab.

In fact, though, the tax bill that left this House provided only half of the $25 billion of tax credit bonds that these school districts need. But that tax bill did address another problem. That problem appears to be that the subspecialist tax lawyers who specialize in tax-exempt bonds feel their job is too boring. I could not agree with them more.

I myself am a tax nerd of long standing, but even I, after many years of reading the tax regulations, had but one solace, and that is, at least my job was not as boring as those of my brethren who subspecialized in tax-exempt school bonds.

Now these bond counsel want something exciting, and they have persuaded this House to supposedly help school districts by changing the arbitrage rules so that school districts will be encouraged not to use school bond money to build schools, but to delay that for up to 4 years, and to take that money on an exciting trip to Wall Street. Mr. Speaker, school bonds should be used to build a school on Elm Street, not a skyscraper on Wall Street.

But the main component of the tax bill that this House passed designed to help school districts is one that does not provide them with tax credits, does not cut their interest costs, does not provide capital to build schools, but instead, encourages those school districts to gamble with the school bond money.

Mr. Speaker, that is how Orange County, California, went bankrupt. That is no help to school districts at all. We need to take back that bill and provide a full $25 billion of tax credit bonds so schools can be built around the country.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY STANDARDS ON CLOTHES WASHERS ERODES FREE MARKETPLACE AND ELIMINATES CONSUMER CHOICE

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

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, over the last few years, the extreme green have colluded with appliance manufacturers, with the rubber stamp of the Department of Energy. This collusion, if left unchecked, will erode the free marketplace, and it would eliminate consumer choice.

I am talking about the DOE's recent decision to propose mandates for clothes washers. On October 5, the Department of Energy rolled out its latest tome of regulations on American household appliances. Their proposed mandate would require that consumers buy clothes washers that are available now but which consumers refuse as a rule to buy.

Those requirements mean only one thing, that the type of washing machine in tens of millions of American homes will soon become a thing of the past. It means that the reliable, affordable, effective washers to which we are all accustomed will have to be replaced.

The Department of Energy, the appliance manufacturers, and a handful of extreme special interest groups together wrote this new mandate. They left out a few people: the consumers and the taxpayers. In my opinion, the consumers and the taxpayers are the biggest stakeholders when it comes to home appliances. They are the ones who have to shell out their hard-earned money when their washer breaks down.

Unfortunately, it is the 81 million owners of washing machines in homes across the U.S. who were the only ones left out of this decision. The average American family is not yet even aware of the proposed mandate.

Mr. Speaker, how many working families do we know who come home after a long day at the office to sit down and read the tedious technical Federal Register every day? I can assure the Speaker, not very many. It is for exactly this reason I am raising this issue, to make the public aware of the flawed regulations coming out of the DOE.

Not only is the Federal government going to take away their choice in the marketplace, but to add insult to injury, it is going to force them to shoulder the inordinate additional cost of meeting the new mandate.

I do not know how many Members of Congress have been out shopping for a front-loading washing machine lately, but if they had, they would come in with a clear case of sticker shock. Many models meeting the proposed efficiency levels are well over $1,000; yes, I said over $1,000. Compare that to the typical top-loading machine that sells for around $400.

Even by the scantest DOE calculation, the consumer will have to part with at least $240 extra for washers that meet this new requirement. All told, that adds up to over $1,000 more per household. Again, those are the low estimates.

The administration's own analysis shows that millions of customers and consumers will never be able to recoup the higher prices. Low-income households, households with fewer occupants, such as senior citizens living alone who use washers less frequently, and those households in areas where energy costs will be disproportionately higher are the ones most affected. Those who can least afford it are unlikely to recover the additional cost that is required.

Then, after having to pay hundreds more at the appliance showroom, the proposal provides for the manufacturers to recoup millions of taxpayer dollars. Let us get this straight. That is right, the back-room deal includes $60 million per manufacturer in tax breaks, tax breaks for the manufacturers, not for the consumers.

Mr. Speaker, several points need to be made concerning these proposed regulations. First, the regulation would hurt working families by severely limiting what type of clothes washers, and it also includes air conditioning and heat pumps, can be purchased.

1930

It forces homeowners to buy products they have shown they do not like. Front loading machines make up less