percent of working women provide half or more of their family’s income, according to a 1997 study by the AFL-CIO. At that time, the average American family approximately $4,000 each year.

Mr. Speaker, we talked about giving their money back to them, the taxpayers. That is an appropriate subject for us to discuss. But it is also clear that paying equal wages to our women workers would be a better benefit for them. So despite the fact that equal pay has been the law since the passage of the Equal Pay Act of 1963 and the Civil Rights Act of 1964, we still have a long way to go.

That is why I have cosponsored, Mr. Speaker, and urge my colleagues to support, H.R. 781, the bipartisan Pay-Check Fairness Act. This legislation would toughen the Equal Pay Act, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

ENVIRONMENTALISTS ARE HURT-ING POOR AND WORKING PE-OPE OF THIS COUNTRY

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago it was announced that California utility rates were going up 50 percent on top of an earlier 10 percent increase. Is this a sign of things to come for the rest of the Nation? Already people all over the country have seen their utility bills go up significantly in recent months.

Also, a few days ago it was reported that OPEC has voted to cut oil production by a million barrels a day, and that our gas prices are going to greatly increase this summer. The Air Trans- port Association told me a few months ago that each 1 cent increase in jet fuel costs the aviation industry $200 million. Thus, if oil goes up even just a little more, airline tickets will have to go up, forcing huge numbers more onto our highways, which are hundreds of times more dangerous than flying.

Who is responsible for all this? We can thank environmental extremists, who almost always seem to come from wealthy families, and who are not really hurt by this restriction. The Air Trans- port Association told me a few months ago that each 1 cent increase in jet fuel costs the aviation industry $200 million. Thus, if oil goes up even just a little more, airline tickets will have to go up, forcing huge numbers more onto our highways, which are hundreds of times more dangerous than flying.

Who is responsible for all this? We can thank environmental extremists, who almost always seem to come from wealthy families, and who are not really hurt by this restriction. The Air Trans- port Association told me a few months ago that each 1 cent increase in jet fuel costs the aviation industry $200 million. Thus, if oil goes up even just a little more, airline tickets will have to go up, forcing huge numbers more onto our highways, which are hundreds of times more dangerous than flying.

In California they have protested and have kept any new power plants from being built for many years despite greatly increased demand produced by the Internet and population growth. All over this country, though, we have groups of environmentalists protesting any time anyone wants to dig for any coal, drill for any oil, cut any trees, or produce any natural gas. This has driven up prices for everything and has decimated jobs and has hurt the poor and those on fixed incomes the most. It has hurt truckers and farmers, and has driven many of our manufacturing jobs to other countries.

The current issue of Consumers’ Re-search Magazine has an article enti- tled, ‘‘Why Natural Gas Problems Lighten Up in the USA’’ Today. Listen to parts of this article. ‘‘The problem is that the same government pushing natural gas demand is also keeping vast stocks of it essen-tially bottled up underground through tight and sometimes absolute restric-tions on what can be done on the land and sea above. Two hundred thirteen trillion cubic feet of natural gas are off limits to drillers, thanks to a vast web of regulations and moratoria on drill-ing. The reason for all this is simple,’’ the article says. It says, ‘‘Environmental-ists and preservationists have long pressured government to restrict or ban drillers. President Clinton, shortly before leaving office, took still more supplies away through his na-tional monuments.’’

Some of these environmental groups, Sierra Club, Earth First, and others, have gone so far to the left that they make even Socialists look conserva-tive. They want to stop the working people by destroying so many good jobs and driving up prices at the same time. They tell former loggers and coal miners and others not to worry, that they can retrain them for jobs in the ‘‘ecotourism’’ or ‘‘ecotourism.’’ But who in their right mind wants to give up a $15- or $20-an-hour job for one paying barely above minimum wage, which is what most tour-ism jobs pay.

These radicals hurt most the very people they claim to help, and help most the big corporations they claim to be against. In the late 1970s, we had 157 small coal companies in east Ten- nessee. Now we have five. What hap-pened? Well, we had an office of the Federal Government, OSM, open up in Knoxville. First, they drove all the small companies out, then the me-dium-sized companies were next. Fed-eral rules, regulations, and red tape hurt small businesses and small farms the most. Big government really helps only extremely big business and the bureaucrats who work for the govern-ment.

Mr. Speaker, I chaired the Sub-committee on Aviation for 6 years. En-vironmental rules and regulations have caused runway and other airport projects to take sometimes 10 or even 20 years to complete, projects that could have been done in 2 or 3 years. This has caused the cost of air travel to be much higher than it would have been, and has caused many of the de-layed flights we have today.

When I talk about the higher utility bills and all the lost jobs that environ-mental extremists have caused, noth-ing could potentially cause more harm to working people and lower-income families than the Kyoto agreement.

There are not words adequate enough to thank President Bush for his cour-age in stopping this economic disaster from hitting this Nation. Our economy started slowing dramatically last June, according to the Christian Science Monitor, a liberal newspaper. This was 7 months before President Bush took office. To enforce this Kyoto agree-ment at a time of economic slowdown would run the risk of putting us in near depression conditions.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, when people see their utility bills shoot up, when gas prices go higher, when homes and every other product made from trees cost twice what they should, they can thank the environmentalists.
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We have made great progress over the last 25 or 30 years with our air and water, but some of these groups do not want people to hear good things about the environment because their con-trIBUTIONS would dry up.

The really sad thing, Mr. Speaker, is that this is all about big money. Poor and working people are being hurt so environmentalists can scare people and get more contributions. And companies which benefit if we import more oil, OPEC countries, shipping companies and others, contribute to these groups so we will have to import more pro ducts which are made from natural re-sources. It is really sad what environmentalists are doing to the poor and working people in this country.

A NEW DECLARATION OF ECONOMIC INDEPENDENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentle-woman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recog-nized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, America needs a new declaration of economic independence: Freedom, justice, oppor-tunity. These are the values that our parents, grandparents, and forebears lived and died for. These are the values that prompt young men and women to give themselves to military and public service. These are the values that reflect the highest ideals of our country and what America has historically of-fered to the world.

Thus, last week’s debate on taxes, the first major economic debate of the 21st century and of the new Presidency, disappointed me greatly. The debate should have centered on what is the wisest economic course of action for the sustenance of our republic. But the debate basically boiled down to what every American can take for himself or herself. The President went around the country divisively and derisively say-ing, ‘‘It’s not the government’s money; it’s your money.’’ Except for one thing: We, the American people, are the gov-ernment. His rhetoric appealed to the most selfish instincts imaginable; and his proposals are proving he is headed towards government of the rich, by the rich, and for the rich.