

Baltimore County and all over this Nation, it has become increasingly clear that after a lifetime of service to family and community, too many seniors are faced with the cruel and difficult choice between paying for the miracle drugs which sustain life and buying food.

The findings of the Committee on Government Reform minority staff study of my district, the 7th Congressional District of Maryland, demonstrates that in Baltimore a senior citizen paying for his or her own prescription drugs must pay on the average more than twice as much for the drugs as the drug companies' favored customers.

For the five drugs investigated in this study, the average price differential was 133 percent. The drug with the highest price differential was Synthroid, a commonly used hormone treatment manufactured by Knoll Pharmaceuticals. For this drug, the price differential for senior citizens in Maryland was an incredible 1,641 percent. An equivalent dose of this drug would cost the manufacturers' favored customers \$1.75. An uninsured senior citizen in Baltimore must pay over \$30.

Now, because large preferred customers of the drug companies typically buy in bulk, some difference between retail prices and favored customer prices would be expected. But the study found there is an unusually large price differential being enforced for prescription drugs, over six times greater than the average price differential for other consumer goods typically purchased by senior citizens.

Moreover, it appears to be pharmaceutical manufacturers, not our local drug stores, which are responsible for the far higher prices. Local pharmacies appear to have relatively small mark-ups between the prices at which they buy prescription drugs and the prices at which they sell them. Retail prices are just 5 percent above manufacturers suggested price to pharmacies.

It appears that the drug companies are engaged in a form of discriminatory pricing that victimizes those who are least able to afford it. Large corporate governmental and institutional customers with market power are able to buy their drugs at discounted prices. Drug companies then raise prices for sales to seniors and others who pay for drugs themselves to compensate for these discounts to the favored customers.

By engaging in these cost-switching price practices, drug manufacturers are earning enormous profits, while seniors must choose between food and medicine. America's top 10 drug manufacturers are expected to reap approximately \$20 billion in profits in 1999 alone.

Reducing the cost of prescription drugs for seniors and other uninsured individuals is a moral imperative.

Until we can achieve expanded Medicare coverage, the Federal Government should not be doing business with drug manufacturers which discriminate against uninsured senior citizens and others in their pricing.

That is why I commend and join the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. ALLEN) and another 100 of the Members in Congress in cosponsoring the Prescription Drug Fairness for Seniors Act.

This legislation would not enact price controls, but the government would cease buying drugs from companies which engage in cost-switching. It would require drug manufacturers to sell to pharmacies the drugs needed by Medicare patients at the lowest price paid by any government agency or other preferred customer.

This bill would assert the Federal Government's purchasing power to encourage the compassionate and evenhanded pricing of live-saving prescription drugs. The bill would allow pharmacies to benefit from the government's purchasing power, effectively reducing the price that they pay for the drugs they dispense to Medicare beneficiaries. Based upon our analysis of Baltimore's prices and those applicable in other areas, I believe that pharmacies would pass most of these savings on to Medicare patients in the form of lower prices.

Today drug companies are utilizing market forces against the interest of senior citizens in a way which is unfair and contrary to our national interests. We can make the market follow morality. Never again should any senior citizen be forced to choose between food and medicine. I urge my colleagues to support the Prescription Drug Fairness for Seniors Act.

#### LOOKING AT THE RECORD OF THE VICE PRESIDENT

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

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, tonight marks the second in a series of special orders that House conservatives hope to hold on the record of Vice President AL GORE.

The Vice President has been particularly aggressive in attacking the work of congressional Republicans. He likes to call us names and say that we are extreme. That is a frequent theme from the Clinton-Gore administration.

Conservatives believe it is important for the American people to understand why AL GORE finds our record of cutting taxes, balancing the budget, eliminating wasteful government and restoring common sense environmental policies so contemptible. To do this, we must look at AL GORE'S record.

At a future time we plan to call attention to the fact that while in Con-

gress, AL GORE voted to raise taxes more than 50 times. He even voted to raise taxes after he left Congress. As Vice President he broke a tie vote in the Senate in favor of the 1993 Clinton-Gore tax increase, the largest tax hike in our Nation's history.

We also will examine his record on spending, which cannot under any definition be seen as moderate. In fact, he was given the dubious title of "big spender" 14 of his 16 years in Congress.

Tonight we will continue the examination of AL GORE'S views on the environment. This examination is important because, upon being elected, President Bill Clinton ceded control of his administration's environmental policy to Vice President AL GORE. In fact, Mr. GORE was given the authority to select the EPA administrator and other high-ranking environmental policy positions.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have read accounts where people expect us to ridicule Mr. GORE by quoting from some of his writings. The ridicule will have to be done perhaps by the listener. I would just observe that we are not here tonight particularly to focus upon his exaggerated claim to have been, he and his wife, the model on which "Love Story" was based, that movie of many years ago, or indeed his claimed fatherhood of the Internet, which frankly is outrageous and laughable, or indeed most recently his claim to being the originator of the idea of a certain web site designed to protect children, to assist parents in protecting children from the dark side of the Internet, the pornography that is available there.

No, tonight I plan to focus on policy. What is the policy of this man who is the Vice President, who has stood largely in the shadow of the President, but who in reality is a key policymaker and whose views are actually set forth by his own hand in his own book, "Earth in the Balance: Ecology and the Human Spirit," a book not actually ghost written but in fact written by the Vice President himself.

So this book is a valuable document because it is in his own hand and reflects his own thinking, thinking which he has repeatedly and very recently backed up and acknowledged that, indeed, this book continues to reflect his views. So I think it is very timely to look into some of these issues.

In the first special order a couple of weeks ago we did this, we looked at one of his writings. I think just by way of review, it would be good to go over this again. Quoting from "Earth in the Balance," he wrote that "Modern industrial civilization as presently organized is colliding violently with our planet's ecological system. The ferocity of its assault on the Earth is breathtaking, and the horrific consequences are occurring so quickly as to defy our capacity to recognize them, comprehend their global implications, and organize an appropriate and timely response."

There is a recurring theme throughout his writings of promoting this idea of a crisis and the need for extraordinary measures in responding to this crisis, just as if we are not in a normal situation where we go through normal processes, but because it is a crisis, it justifies extraordinary approaches.

Another quote on the Holocaust and global warming: "New warnings of a different sort signal an environmental Holocaust without precedent. Today the evidence of an ecological crystalnacht is as clear as the sound of glass shattering in Berlin. It is not merely in the service of analogy that I have referred so often to the struggles against Nazi and Communist totalitarianism, because I believe that the emerging effort to save the environment is a continuation of these struggles."

Many, I think, Mr. Speaker, would certainly feel this is gross exaggeration at a minimum. Actually, when we think of the very idea of bringing in the Holocaust where people lost all their freedoms, including their lives, lost many of their family members, indeed entire families were wiped out by this horrific, historic event, it seems demeaning to me to be talking in these terms and implying that whatever situation we may face today is in any way related in kind or in degree to what went on during the Holocaust.

Well, here again, we have a very dramatic statement on the coming civil war: "We now face the prospect of a kind of global civil war between those who refuse to consider the consequences of civilizations' relentless advance and those who refuse to be silent partners in the destruction. More and more people of conscience are joining the effort to resist, but the time has come to make this struggle the central organizing principle of world civilization. God and history will remember our judgment."

□ 1945

Very, very strong terms that he is using here, implying really that, if we are not on his side, we are not a person of conscience, implying that if we do not refuse to be a silent partner in a destruction, so to speak, that if we are not with them, we are against them, that if we are not part of the solution, we are part of the problem. Very much that kind of dogmatic expression here and really impugning all those who do not join in this particular view of the situation.

And again, whatever we may think of the circumstances we face in the environment, I guess I would just observe we made great strides in the environment by any dispassionate standard.

For example, I grew up in Los Angeles as a young person and I remember my eyes smarting so badly on any number of days and the tremendous air pollution that we had there extending

up into the early 1960s. And then we go back today and we do not experience that kind of thing anymore, and on a number of occasions we will find clear days there.

So I mean, I just point out, and the statistics do bear it out beyond my anecdotal experience, but there has been dramatic improvements in the area of for example air pollution, in the area of water pollution, dramatic improvements in the way that we treat the environment.

So I honestly find it difficult to fathom these illustrations of a civil war, of an environmental Holocaust. I mean, it is shameless exploitation. It is a gross exaggeration. It is not indeed the reality.

Well, here is the quote I guess we read last time, AL GORE on the American century:

The 20th century has not been kind to the constant human striving for a sense of purpose in life. Two world wars, the Holocaust, the invention of nuclear weapons, and now the global environmental crises have led many of us to wonder if survival, much less enlightened, joyous and hopeful living, is possible. We retreat into the seductive tools and technologies of industrial civilization, but that only creates new problems as we become increasingly isolated from one another and disconnected from our roots.

I mean, this is an unbelievable quote. Every time I read it I marvel there is so much to pull out of that. There again we see the Holocaust being pulled into it, two world wars, and then the reference again to what we face as the global environmental crisis, implying that when it is a crisis, it is like a world war, it is like the Holocaust, implying that extraordinary measures are called for and, frankly, implying, when we read the rest of the book, that the compromise of our freedoms is justified in order to meet this crisis, just as in wartime in the United States the Government becomes much more powerful and is able to impose things on the citizenry that it could not do in peacetime because it is involved in a struggle for national survival. And this is the framework that is being set here by the Vice President.

And then this last part I find interesting, paradoxical, frankly, in light of the Vice President's own actions. "We retreat into the seductive tools and technologies of industrial civilization."

Well, this is the man who has claimed authorship of the Internet. That is about as high tech as we can get. That is a futurist, if you will. And yet, by his other writings, some of which we have read off these charts tonight, I mean, he is almost anti-technology, almost pre-Colombian, getting back to the time before the European male disturbed everything in the world and caused this environmental crisis, if you will, that we presently suffer from according to him.

I just think these are interesting views for someone holding the second

highest office in the United States to have.

Look at the future on cars that he has. Quoting again from the book:

Within the context of the Strategic Environment Initiative, it ought to be able to establish a coordinate, a global program, to accomplish the strategic goal of completely eliminating the internal combustion engine over, say, a 25-year period.

Well, the internal combustion engine has been a great blessing to modern mankind, perhaps more than anything else we can think of. I do not know about my colleagues, but the thought of having a battery-powered car spewing off horrendous amounts of ozone fumes being highly toxic, we think we have problems with toxic disposal now, what are we going to do when everybody is driving one of these electric cars that has six, seven, or eight huge batteries in it?

By the way, these cars do not have a very long range. I think they are about a hundred miles or so. They are not nearly as fast or as powerful as today's cars. And that is a problem if we are trying to go over the mountains or up a hill or any number of things that sometimes vehicles are called upon to do. We would have to ask ourselves what is really involved.

It says a global coordinated program. A lot of things I read in AL GORE's writings are linked to this globalism. I mean, is the U.N. going to own a department on this too to supervise and wipe out the use of our internal combustion engine? Are we going to have to fill a report as one of the countries giving some U.N. czar an accounting of how we are making progress on this front?

I mean, it is truly alarming the amount of intervention by the United Nations in what has traditionally been regarded as the sovereign affairs of this Nation. So I find that a very bizarre idea as well, talking about getting rid of the internal combustion engine.

By the way, a lot of jobs in this country depend upon the internal combustion engine. And I do not know what would happen to those people, and Mr. GORE does not really offer that in his book.

Former senior ABC news correspondent Bob Zelnick has written a book actually about the Vice President. It is called "Gore: A Political Life." I am sorry I do not have these quotes up on the chart, but I will just share a couple of them with my colleagues, one by Mr. Zelnick, referring to this book "Earth in the Balance," which I encourage everybody to buy a copy of and to read. He says the following:

The book is pathetically one-dimensional in its view of Western Civilization, shabby in its ignorance of economics, simplistic in its approach to problem solving, and grandly certain of a crisis that has not been proved to exist despite a massive scientific effort funded by the U.S. Government to the tune of more than \$2 billion a year.

Then economist Robert W. Hahn said the following, again in comment upon the book. He said, the book contains "an incredible laundry list which can easily result in central planners selecting environmentally and politically correct products and technologies. It is nothing less than environmental socialism." Again, Mr. Hahn's quote on this book written by the Vice President. "It is nothing less than environmental socialism." Very disturbing.

Well, there are some factual contradictions, many, to the assertions made by the Vice President. Let us look into a few of the claims.

AL GORE has claimed that urban sprawl or suburbanization is rapidly reducing the amount of open space, rural areas, and farmland at an alarming pace that strict growth controls are needed to preserve scenic open spaces and protect the Nation's food supply.

So once again, it is a crisis, it is an alarming pace. I left out a word, "such an alarming pace that strict growth controls are needed to preserve these open spaces." So, once again, extraordinary measures to meet extraordinary events. That is the advantage. If they are a demagogue trying to justify intrusions into one's freedom, they have got to set the stage by advancing this crisis, this idea that we are literally under seize, that we are at war, that we need, therefore, to have extraordinary responses. That is why I think Mr. Hahn refers to these writings as "environmental socialism."

My colleagues heard the claim, loss of our open space so alarming at its pace that we have got to have strict growth controls. Here is the reality: Only 4.8 percent of the land area of the United States is developed; and in more than three-quarters of the States, over 90 percent of the land is used for rural purposes, such as forestry, pasture, wildlife preservation, and parks.

Indeed, according to the U.S. Geological Survey, each year only .006 percent, that is six ten-thousandths of one percent, of land in the continental United States is developed.

Mr. GORE has made another claim. "An increase of 1½ degrees Fahrenheit in global temperatures since 1850 is proof that manmade carbon dioxide emissions are dangerously heating up the planet." Have we not heard a lot about that out of the Clinton-Gore administration? And yet here is the fact on that: This claim ignores the fact that the Earth's temperature naturally rises and falls over the course of several centuries.

If we think about it, they cannot even get the weather forecast right for tomorrow let alone deducing that somehow our temperature has risen. Since the last Ice Age ended nearly 11,000 years ago, there have been seven major warming and cooling trends. Of the six trends preceding the current period of warming, three produced tem-

peratures warmer than today, while three produced temperatures colder than today.

The pattern of the most recent warming, this proves an alleged human contribution. One degree of the warming occurred between 1850 and 1940, when human carbon dioxide emissions were negligible in that 90-year period. Between 1940 and 1979, the temperature increased only one-half a degree Fahrenheit when rapidly rising amounts of carbon dioxide emissions should have been causing warming to accelerate.

NASA's T-ROSE series of satellites indicate that there has indeed even been a slight cooling trend of .02 degrees Fahrenheit since 1979, a cooling trend. And yet we heard his assertion that we are dangerously heating up the planet through carbon dioxide emissions.

These results have been collaborated by weather balloons, the results of the T-ROSE satellite that show that, indeed, far from heating up the planet, there is a cooling trend since 1979. The source for this is "Talking Points in the Economy: Environmental Series" from the National Center for Public Policy Research.

I have just got three more claims, and then I am going to call on my distinguished colleague from Indiana (Mr. MCINTOSH) to offer his thoughts. By the way, I observe that he has been very involved, through his subcommittee, on analyzing the Kyoto Treaty and measures relating to it dealing with global warming.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield for one second before he continues on that?

Mr. DOOLITTLE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, let me congratulate the gentleman for bringing these issues before the House because they are extremely important in the current business of this Congress. He mentioned how Vice President GORE has advocated and recently said he stood by every word in the book that we should begin a martial plan of sorts to phase out the automobile, or at least the internal combustion engine.

Well, it seems to me a very relevant fact for the oversight hearings that our subcommittee is having on implementing this global warming treaty. It is a policy that it is very clear this administration is implementing even without the Senate approval of that treaty. And tomorrow, in fact, we are having a joint Senate and House hearing where the administration is testifying about what steps they have taken to follow requirements in last year's appropriations bill to justify all of the spending that they are using in the area of climate change and global warming.

So my colleague brings forward to this House information that is critical

to our pursuit of that oversight capacity of this administration on current policies. And some of the goofy ideas that the Vice President put forward and says he still believes in are having a direct effect today on policies in the Clinton-Gore administration and something I think, when most Americans realize, the AFL-CIO even said it could cost us a million jobs if we implemented that treaty as part of this martial plan for the environment.

□ 2000

That is 1 million American jobs that will be sent to Mexico because they are not part of the treaty, or China because they are not part of the treaty, or North Korea or Latin America or India because they are not part of the treaty. And so it has a real impact on the daily lives of at least those 1 million American families that would be affected by the loss of their job when these ideas are implemented by Mr. GORE and the administration. I want to commend the gentleman for bringing this forward. I look forward to hearing his other examples and then have a couple that I would like to add as well.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. I thank the gentleman. I thank him as well for doing his excellent work on this subject with his subcommittee in bringing out these important facts.

Here is another claim by the Vice President. He has said, "Global warming is responsible for 1998 being the hottest year on record." Some of these are just so patently false and absurd that it makes you smile when you read them. The hottest year on record. I mean, that is either true or it is not.

The fact is it is not. This last year's hot weather in North America did not even set records. North America's record high was reached on July 10, 1913 when Death Valley in my State of California hit 134 degrees Fahrenheit. That is pretty hot. None of the other seven continents broke records last year, either. Africa hit its record high in 1922, Asia in 1942, Australia in 1889, Europe in 1881, South America in 1905, Oceania in 1912 and Antarctica in 1974.

Here is another claim. AL GORE has maintained that all old growth forests in America will be wiped out within 20 years. Here is the fact on that. There are a lot of people that have, I think, been misinformed on this, precisely because of comments like this by the Vice President.

The fact is as of 1993, there were 13.2 million acres of old growth forests left in America, old growth defined as forests containing trees over 200 years old. Eight million of these acres were totally protected in national parks and wilderness areas and can never be harvested. So 8 million of the 13.2 million acres of old growth can never be harvested in this country. Furthermore, the harvesting rate for the remaining 5.2 million acres of old growth forest is approximately only 1 percent per year.

Here is another statistic that I will throw out. There is more standing timber in the United States of America today than at any time in the 20th century. That is also a fact. In fact, there is so much standing timber, that is why our forests face catastrophic threat of forest fire. If we quadrupled the cutting of the trees right now, we could not catch up with the amount of growth that is occurring each year. That is how serious this threat really is.

Lastly—lastly for the night—of course there are many other absurd claims that we will focus on, but for the night this is the final one I will address. “The United States is running out of space for landfills.”

Here is an interesting statistic, an interesting fact. All garbage produced in the United States for the next 500 years would fit in a single landfill measuring 20 miles by 20 miles. That is an interesting statistic. So I do not think we are running out of landfills.

With that, I am going to now call upon the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MCINTOSH), who by the way is chairman of the Conservative Action Team, a group of conservatives in the House, organized to try and increase their effectiveness in promoting that philosophy. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MCINTOSH. I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE) for yielding. I should point out to our viewers and our colleagues the gentleman's modesty. He was one of the four founders of the Conservative Action Team and has been a true strength of keeping those principles alive in this Congress and in the previous Congresses. I thank him for that diligent work.

Mr. Speaker, one of the anomalies that some of the research showed was this question of whether or not depleting the ozone layer would in fact cause more cancer. All of us are horrified by the increases in cancer rates, and I think all of us can say we have seen loved ones or friends or family members who have been struck by that terrible disease. And so certainly we would want to do everything possible to try to make sure that that was prevented and every step possible to make sure it was in fact cured and treated.

One of the false claims that I understand has been made is that somehow the depletion of ozone will affect the incidence of melanoma, skin cancer. In fact, the scientific studies show that ultraviolet A rays do affect that. Therefore, we need to be very careful about exposing people to that. But ultraviolet B rays do not. The facts are, the scientific community has confirmed this, ozone has nothing to do with ultraviolet A, which is the cancer-causing rays, but does block ultraviolet B which are not linked to increased incidence of cancer. So the

claims that having to worry about the ozone layer could increase the incidence of cancer do not seem to be substantiated by the science.

But even more profound, as I was reading through the Vice President's book, he talks about one of the promising new treatments for cancer, a drug called Taxol which can be produced from the Pacific yew tree. I want to read to you so you can get an idea where this man is coming from, what he had to say about that.

“The Pacific yew tree can be cut down,” and, by the way, this is on page 119 of his book, “Earth in the Balance.” I do recommend people try to read it and get a better understanding of what philosophy is driving this administration and Vice President GORE's actions in particular. On page 119, he says:

The Pacific yew can be cut down and processed to produce a potent chemical, Taxol, which offers some promise of curing certain forms of lung, breast and ovarian cancer in patients who would otherwise quickly die. It seems an easy choice. Sacrifice the tree for a human life, until,

and this is the part I would like people to focus on,

until one learns that three trees must be destroyed for each patient treated. Then it becomes a close question.

Well, quite frankly in my book it is a very easy question. Three trees versus a human life, three trees versus the ability to prolong someone's life who is suffering from cancer. I would pick the individual, the person, the human being who is a cancer patient and suffering from that dreaded disease and say it is clear three trees are worth it. We can sacrifice three trees to save one human life. But the Vice President apparently does not think that is so clear. He goes on to discuss that in his book.

That to me is an indication of the larger differences in philosophy that are approached by this administration and many of us in the Conservative Action Team. We set as our priority having government actions that help people, that maximize freedom of individuals, that allow individuals to pursue their lives, that allow businesses to pursue remedies for cancer, whether it is in yew trees or other research. They feel it is better to regulate that, have the government make that larger question, is it worth three trees to save a human life?

Our philosophy is, let the individual make those choices. For me, the answer is clear. It is worth it. But let individuals make that. If they want to seek that remedy, that aid, that treatment for their cancer, give them the opportunity to do it. Do not interpose AL GORE's government to make that decision for us and say, “We have to consider the larger social ramifications because we think those trees may be important to save and, yes, we regret

that some people may lose their lives to cancer but we have these larger considerations.”

That difference in philosophy is profound. It ends up being part of every decision that we make here in Congress. Do we add more regulations and thereby take away freedom in the name of this cause? Do we increase taxes so that government can decide how we should distribute resources among different individuals? To both of those, the Conservative Action Team says no. And let no more regulations unless you can show there is a definite benefit that outweighs the cost. And no more taxes. In fact, we want to reduce the cost of government so that we can lower taxes to allow people to keep more of their hard-earned income.

It is important that we have those fundamental debates from time to time here on the House floor, because they come up bill after bill after bill. There is something that often we do not focus on. And so one of the things that I think is critical as we continue this effort of bringing forward the record of a very important official in our government, someone whose decisions are making an impact on each of our lives every day, that we know both the record but also those philosophical differences that can be discerned from their writing.

If you had told me that perhaps this was written before Vice President GORE had had a chance to be the number two executive in the government, and that he has learned since then that perhaps some of these ideas were a little far-fetched, a little bit goofy, perhaps a little bit out of context for the modern world and that he had rethought some of them, I would understand that perhaps we should not be bringing them forward today and focusing on them. But I am told that as recently as a couple of months ago when asked about it, Vice President GORE said categorically he stood by every word in this book. And so it is in fact relevant to today's thinking what exactly is written in this book.

I was surprised, as I read through many of the pages there, that it is a completely different description of what our goals and aspirations are and should be. I do not think the modern world is like the Nazi Holocaust. I think the modern world has provided incalculable benefits, that people are better off today than they were 10 years ago or 20 years ago or 50 years ago; that we have miracles of modern science that allow us to treat cancer patients, that allow us to extend life, that allow us to provide a better hope for the future for all people; and that that progress has gone forward in spite of the thinking that we need to restrain it because there might be this almost Nazi-like Holocaust in the world if we do not reverse course and undo much of the modern society,

much of modern technology, much of the learning that has accrued to our benefit in the last 50 years.

So I do appreciate the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE) leading this effort. I hope to be able to join him in the coming months to bring forward other topics. As I understand it, we will be looking at the Gore tax on long distance calls, a tax that Al Gore promoted, that actually was never voted on directly by this House of Representatives, but now every person who places a long distance call in this country pays to the FCC because of this man. I understand that we will also be looking at some of his record when he was in the Senate, what did he vote for, what were his prerogatives, what were his preferences on taxes.

Somebody told me, and we are going to track this down before we say it categorically, but somebody estimated they thought he might even be more liberal than TEDDY KENNEDY. It takes a lot of work to be more liberal than TEDDY KENNEDY in the United States Senate. We will look at the record and bring it out and tell the American people that.

I thank the gentleman from California for giving me an opportunity to participate today.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. I thank the gentleman. I would just observe the motto of the University of California is lifted from the Bible, "Let there be light." We intend to shine as much light as we can so that, as the Bible says, "The truth shall make us free."

With that, I would like to now acknowledge our distinguished colleague from Florida (Mr. WELDON) who will share insights with us and perhaps will explain why AL GORE was not allowed to make the taxpayers fund his pet project of raiding money from NASA to show constant images of the earth from outer space.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I commend him for arranging this special order to talk about some of the issues that our Vice President has promoted and some of his policy positions.

Recently I had the opportunity in the Committee on Science, as we were marking up the NASA authorization bill, to offer an amendment cutting the funding to a satellite that had been promoted by the Vice President. The satellite was called Triana.

The Vice President originally announced his concept for this on March 13, 1998 in a speech that he gave at MIT. He is quoted as saying, "It will help us reach new heights of understanding and insight." All this satellite really is is a picture of the sunlit side of the earth that would be available on the Internet; interestingly, a service that is already available right now on several Internet sites. Simply what they do now is, they take several weather satellite images and combine

them together to produce what AL GORE wants to spend \$70 million producing and then maybe another \$100 million launching into orbit.

□ 2015

Now the Washington Post ran an article about the Vice President's speech where they stated, quote, that GORE almost literally dreamed up the idea in his sleep about a month ago, so that would have been in the middle of February of 1998, waking up at 3 a.m. one night, according to a White House official, and I would like to point out to my colleagues that there were a lot of people waking up at 3 a.m. around that same time in my congressional district, not because they were getting great wonderful ideas for new satellites that they could order NASA to go ahead and produce, but because they had gotten pink slips from NASA because they were supposedly short of money. Indeed, there were actually 600 people laid off because of a supposed \$100 million shortfall in the shuttle budget. But then miraculously, after Mr. GORE proposed this idea, NASA, the agency that he to a certain degree has been ceded control over by the President, found tens of millions of dollars has been put towards this project.

Now in my opinion not only was this satellite as proposed by AL GORE not necessary, as it is already available on the Internet, and not only was it a waste of taxpayers' money, but as well it is really bad science. As I understand it, there was really no peer review to indicate that this science project was really needed. Indeed the only peer review that actually occurred, according to my understanding of it, was the peer review of how to build the satellite.

It is planned to be launched on a shuttle mission. This will take up space on the shuttle, space that could be used to deploy other more important research projects.

As I stated, a lot of people were waking up around the same time that AL GORE was waking up worried in my congressional district whether or not they were going to have a job. But I would like to point out to my colleagues that I believe if AL GORE is allowed to fulfill his true environmental vision for America, there are going to be a lot of people waking up in the middle of the night because they do not have a job.

We just heard tonight from the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE) about his position on the internal combustion engine and his desire to totally eliminate the internal combustion engine. How many hundreds of thousands of jobs currently are involved in producing automobiles, selling automobiles in the United States, and he would like to eliminate the automobile? And I, for one, could tell my colleagues that there are a lot of

good purposes that come out of the use of the internal combustion engine.

Might I just mention that most ambulances run on the internal combustion engine, most fire trucks run on the internal combustion engine, and yet Mr. GORE would like to eliminate the internal combustion engine and probably put millions of Americans out of work currently in the auto industry, and they, too, will be waking up in the middle of the night, but not with brilliant ideas for new satellites, but instead waking up in the middle of the night because they do not have a job.

Might I also point out that AL GORE is the biggest champion of the so-called global warming treaty that would call for the United States to eliminate 25 percent of its industrial production in order to come within these supposed caps on carbon dioxide elimination, something that the Chinese do not have to adhere to, most South American countries, African countries, Asian countries. It is believed by many economists that if we actually implemented this treaty that AL GORE wants us to implement, it could result in the loss of thousands of American jobs.

And then I am so pleased that my colleague from Indiana mentioned the section in AL GORE's book on Taxol. I have taken care of cancer patients who have gotten Taxol, and what a great drug that has been, what a great tool it is in the hands of oncologists as they treat patients suffering from cancer, and to cite in his book that maybe we should not be harvesting this drug from these trees because we have to cut down three trees for every person we save, in my opinion it is shameful.

When I got elected to the United States Congress and left my medical practice and realized that I would be coming to this town and having to work in a government under the authority of Bill Clinton and AL GORE, I got Earth in the Balance, and I read Earth in the Balance, and let me tell my colleagues it caused me to wake up in the middle of the night knowing that the second in command in this country had such values and opinions where he places the value of a tree over that of a person, and I highly commend my colleague the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE) for calling this special order. Reading Earth in the Balance to me was a real eye opener. It clearly lays out the reality of AL GORE's true values, and might I point out that he stated those very clearly in his acceptance speech at the Democrat National Convention back in 1992 where he stated that he thought the thing that united all Americans together was the environment.

Point of fact: All Americans support a clean environment, as I do, and there is plenty of evidence to indicate that the Clean Air Act and Clean Water Act are having their desired effect. Water quality standards are improving, air

quality standards are improving, and there is not an environmental crisis. We are making good headway in this problem area. If there is an environmental crisis anywhere, it is in these Third World and Communist countries where they do not enforce any kind of environmental standards, it is not here in the United States, and for AL GORE to cite that the environment was the thing that unites all Americans in my opinion is a tremendous insight into what his true values are.

Now I am not going to stand here tonight and speculate on what unites all Americans. We can have great debates about that, whether it is freedom that we all cherish, the right to free speech, worship as we wish, the right to start our own business. We could go on and on about what is it that unites us all. We are truly a diverse Nation. But to cite the environment as the thing that unites us all in my opinion is a tremendous insight into the distorted value system that this Vice President has, and I strongly would encourage all my colleagues and all Americans to read *Earth in the Balance*, particularly those that work in the automotive industry, to get a better understanding of the values of Vice President AL GORE.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MCINTOSH).

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, let me take up on a comment that my colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON), pointed out. Part of my concern about current policy and the Vice President's leadership is that in fact it is not good for the environment even because he is so interested in making a political statement about this that the actual effects end up being negative, and I will give my colleagues an example from my subcommittee, the oversight hearing that we had on EPA's regulation of particulate matter and ozone which came out about two years ago. We heard testimony from governors who told us do not go forward with this, we are making tremendous strides in cleaning up the air in our State based on the old standards. If you go forward in what many think is an illegal rulemaking, and turns out the courts just last week validated that rule. They said they threw it out and said it is unconstitutional, but the governor warned: If you go forward, there will be all this controversy, there will be lawsuits, and the programs in his state, and this was Ohio, will be put on hold effectively because all of the businesses will wait to see which standard do they have to meet.

So the result of very radical posturing on the environment, and by the way, one of the reasons they threw this out was that EPA could not justify the rule itself made any difference on pro-

tecting health and safety and the environment, but they wanted to ratchet down the requirements and say we have done something; the result was that for 2 years people all over the country who are trying to comply with the Clean Air Act did not know whether the old standard would apply or the new standard would apply, and so any innovative future-looking plan to reduce emissions, to come up with more efficient engines, to cut back on the use of energy, those were effectively put on hold until they knew which standard they had to meet.

So my problem in part with Vice President GORE's approach towards the environment, of making it such a political statement that you come up with the goofy analogies that he has got Nazis in the book is that it does not really do a service to legitimate conservation efforts which people are every day taking part of in this country.

So I thank the gentleman for bringing up that point.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I am going to yield here in just a second to our good colleague from Florida, but just to observe, to corroborate what you said, the very thing Mr. GORE claims to support, the environment, his policies are actually hurting. It is the same thing in the area of national forests. I said earlier we have more standing timber than at any time in the 20th century. We also have the worst forest health than any time in the 20th century. Great over growth in the forests, huge amounts of dead and dying trees, all brought about by the horrific forest management policies of the Clinton/Gore administration catering to these sorts of extreme, bizarre, goofy views, and I yield now to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON) for his comments.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding again, and I just want to amplify on what my colleague from Indiana was talking about. If you look at all these new areas where the Federal Government has gotten itself involved in in the latter half of the 20th century or the second half of the 20th century, a lot of what the Federal Government has done has really not had a positive effect, and the best example there is education.

The Federal Government in the 1970s, really dating back to the 1960's, began to involve itself in the educational system, and concomitant with that actually educational performance standards in the United States have deteriorated. But the one area where the Federal Government has passed some laws that seem to have had a beneficial effect is in the area of the environment where we have had a good marked improvement in air quality standards and water quality with the implementation

of the Clean Air Act and the Clean Water Act.

What is very important about what my colleague from Indiana just said is we are not done with implementing the features of the Clean Air Act and I believe also features of the Clean Water Act, and there are governors and States and municipalities that are still working to adhere to that standard, and it is believed by many who are truly knowledgeable people in this arena that if we just simply allow them to continue, and my colleague is correct in that they have suspended action for the past 2 years because of this concern of a new standard, if we just leave them go, that water quality standards and air quality standards would continue to improve and actually get better.

And I just cite all this to point out that to claim that we have this crisis when actually the air is better and the water is better, I know I did my medical school training at Lake Erie, and Lake Erie was a mess, and now Lake Erie is a clear lake, it is dramatically improved.

I grew up on Long Island not far from New York City in the mouth of the Hudson River. The Hudson River was a disaster. It is now much better. There is still more clean up that needs to be done, but we are heading in the right direction.

And for the Vice President to claim that literally the world is falling apart, that we have this absolute environmental crisis, I believe is absurd, and it certainly is absurd to entertain a serious discussion of a person with such extreme, extreme values be placed in the position of Commander in Chief of the United States, and I really thank the gentleman for yielding again. He has been very gracious in yielding his time.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Let me just say again, citing another example, of how GORE, Mr. GORE's views actually are hurting the objective he claims to advance, namely protecting the environment. The Clinton-Gore administration has absolutely resisted any change to the disastrous Endangered Species Act which has probably more than any other single act been of detrimental effect to so many taxpayers who own private property throughout the country, and oddly enough there is a very perverse incentive that the federal law now creates, specifically the Endangered Species Act. If an endangered species should be found on or about your property, you become subject to extensive Federal regulation that can cause the massive loss of value of your property, like up to 90 percent.

□ 2030

So the perverse incentive is that far from wishing to conserve and help the endangered species, the incentive for the property owner is to get rid of the endangered species. There is a phrase,

shoot and shovel and bury, something like that, whereby property owners, if they find one, try and get rid of it.

Now, of course, one should not do that. That is a felony under the Endangered Species Act and it is wrong and undesirable, but nevertheless the law should be worded in such a way to encourage people to make the right choices.

This law is just the opposite. It encourages people to make the wrong choices. It is very heavy handed. It is top down. It is punitive. Well, it is socialism. But, of course, as the economist observed, I think Mr. Hahn, whom I believe I cited earlier, he indicated that this is environmental socialism.

What is the basis of socialism? Force. We can go back to George Washington, who understood that. In speaking of government, he said government is not reason, it is not eloquence, it is force, and like fire, it is a dangerous servant and a fearful master.

It appears that Mr. GORE likes the use of force, likes the use of government, and wishes to increase its use and increase the power of the government. In fact, on almost any issue he always has the same answer: more government.

It does not matter what the question is. If the question is how do we stop the killings that occurred in that awful situation in Colorado, well, it is more gun control even though gun control had nothing to do with it. Even though there is no showing that that could possibly work, they always have an answer: more government.

The Endangered Species Act, have to make it tighter; have to raise the fines; have to increase its applicability; we have to go from species to ecosystems and extend our control over the whole ecosystem.

Campaign finance reform, we have to have more of that. That is from the mouth of Mr. GORE, if one can believe it, and yet the fact of the matter is the very reforms that Mr. GORE gave us that are in present law have created disastrous conditions that he now decries.

What is the answer? We just do not have enough government. More fines, more punitive actions, more restrictions on our constitutional freedoms. This is the approach taken by our Vice President.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to Mr. MCINTOSH.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate what the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE) is saying and would just contribute one more example of how the policies that Mr. Gore has put forward are counterproductive to the environment.

The global warming treaty, the U.N. treaty that he signed on behalf of the United States of America, his maiden voyage into the area of foreign policy and representing this country, he ne-

glected to insist in the negotiation that countries like China or Mexico or Latin American countries or India or South or North Korea be bound by the articles of that treaty. Instead, most of the restraint was on the United States.

So it was a treaty that brought us more government here in America, government that would increase the price of gasoline by 50 percent; government that would force coal miners to lose their jobs throughout this country; government that would threaten our auto industry and cost us a million jobs as those jobs are sent to China, Mexico, Latin America and all of the countries that would be exempt.

So he seems to be not concerned about government overseas but concerned about creating government here. The net result for the environment is that the worst polluters are left scot free. China will produce more global warming gasses in the next 20 years than the United States, and yet they will not be subject to this treaty. He cannot solve the global problem.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. If the gentleman will yield, our policy seems to be to bend over backwards and do everything we can for China, despite the fact they point their missiles at us and take advantage of us in every way.

Mr. MCINTOSH. In the end, the environment is the loser, and so are the American workers who lose their jobs.

The only winners are those people who sought to make a political point and stand up and say, we are for the environment. To my way of thinking, that is not good government, and it reflects a disproportionate emphasis on short-term political gain and no consideration for what is in the best interest of the United States.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. I thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MCINTOSH) for his participation tonight.

I encourage everybody to read "Earth in the Balance: Ecology and the Human Spirit." We will be back for the next chapter as we examine further the dangerous and extreme and outrageous and, as my colleague said, goofy views of the Vice President of the United States, Mr. AL GORE.

#### RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE 21ST CENTURY

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I do not know that I will take up that entire 60 minutes.

I want to briefly respond actually to some of the comments that we heard in the previous hour, and then talk about the new economy and how we can adopt our government to address the issues that it brings to the fore.

I was interested to hear for an hour, the 2000 campaign is still a ways away, and for any of those who are wondering whether or not it is going to be positive, I guess the gentlemen who preceded me have answered that question in the negative. It is going to be relentlessly negative.

Amongst the charges that we heard tonight, I understand now that Vice President GORE wants to get rid of ambulances and fire trucks. If the other people are to be believed, that is a core of his policy. Those who were not listening to the comments, what they were saying is Mr. GORE has concerns about the internal combustion engine and would like to replace it. They implied that since these engines are now in ambulances and fire trucks, for him to oppose the internal combustion engine must mean he wants to get rid of ambulances and fire trucks.

I think this sort of extreme negative campaigning is bad for our entire system of government. I think my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, many of their issues I actually agree with. I think we can get up and talk about what we stand for and move the country forward, instead of relentlessly trying to pummel whoever emerges as the leader of the party we are opposed to.

I do not think that serves democracy and I am somewhat saddened to see that, as I said, 20-some months before the campaign even starts we are full bore on the ripping apart of the person who we think is going to lead the opposite party. Let us talk about a few positive issues, what we stand for and the direction we want to take the country in.

Towards that end, that is what I want to talk about today. I talk as a member of the New Democratic Caucus. We try to each week as new Democrats to present a message, an issue that we want to talk about, that we think the country needs to address and that our government needs to address.

New Democrats are essentially moderate, pro-business, pro-growth Democrats within our caucus, and the issue that I want to talk about today has to do with the new economy and how our government can institute policies that address the changes that that new economy brings to our country.

First of all I want to talk about what I mean by the new economy. Everyone has heard about the Information Age, about the global economy. It has almost become a cliché to say that we live in a global economy that is based far more on technology, but just because it is a cliché does not make it any less true. It is the dominant feature of the last few years of the 20th century and will be the dominant feature as we move into the 21st century, as our economy changes.

We must adjust to it. We must understand what moves and motivates this