

simultaneously, without allies, with no build-up period and with rotation capability for a long engagement—an obvious gold-plated invitation to the “bottom” of the military to plan forces at about the current levels. A bit of top-down guidance might have insisted on a more realistic scenario.

The review did not question some of the sacred cows of current planning: another attack submarine (against which fleet?); a better attack fighter (when our present ones are the best in the world); the Cold War B-2 bomber when modernized B-52's were the main muscle used in the Persian Gulf; a surfeit of aircraft carriers to “show the flag” when Aegis cruisers demonstrated their capability to hit an office complex in Baghdad from the Red Sea and the Persian Gulf; continued land and sea-based nuclear missiles aimed at the open ocean in numbers far above the 100 or so that respected defense experts agree is sufficient for deterrence.

If to these are added 20 more B-2's designed to penetrate Soviet airspace after a nuclear exchange, six huge C-17 airlifters when C-5's can carry what needs to go by air and heavy tanks should go by sea or be prepositioned to be available in real quantity, and new Trident submarine-launched strategic missiles, one can see that the mindset of the planners is clearly to continue to prepare for and deter the now-outdated massive threat from the Soviet Union. At least 24 budget-conscious Republican congressmen deeped sided the SDI, recognizing that the more proximate threat of a nuclear weapon arriving in the U.S. would be in the hold of a non-descript freighter.

The real post-Cold War world calls for the deployment of new kinds of “secret weapons” such as the diplomatic efforts of former President Jimmy Carter, who has already averted violence in Haiti and North Korea and at least has tried in Bosnia. It calls for programs to reduce the population growth bomb which is already exploding in Asia and Africa. And it calls for carefully planned and conducted anti-terrorist operations with formerly hostile nations and services.

It also calls for more “competition” between the expenditures to fight a Cold War better and the need to keep our nation's economy strong and targeted on the real threats—and opportunities—of the future.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE  
DWIGHT EVANS

**HON. THOMAS M. FOGLIETTA**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, February 28, 1995*

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Speaker, on this last day of Black History Month, I wanted to congratulate the Honorable Dwight Evans for his great accomplishments as a public servant in the city of Philadelphia and in the State of Pennsylvania. Dwight Evans is making history every day for his constituents.

Dwight represents the 203d Legislative District in the Pennsylvania House of Representatives. Throughout his life, Dwight has contributed greatly to the city of Philadelphia. He has made these contributions in many different capacities, but has never failed to make significant improvements in his community.

Prior to his membership in the Pennsylvania State Legislature, Dwight was responsible for revitalizing the abandoned Ogontz Plaza in Philadelphia, turning it into an economically viable shopping district. He was also responsible for bringing a police ministration to the Ogontz Avenue area, making it a safer place

for members of the community. We are working together to develop the Southeastern Pennsylvania Regional Employment and Training Center.

More, recently as the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee in Pennsylvania, Dwight has been able to provide day care services for children, adequate funding for youth programs, and the improvement of educational services to children.

In 1994, Dwight Evans ran as the first African-American candidate for the Governor of Pennsylvania. He surprised the pollsters and the experts, but not those of us who know him by coming in second. He was also endorsed by most of the major daily newspapers in the Commonwealth.

As we mark the end of Black History Month, I would like to recognize and congratulate Dwight Evans for his excellent accomplishments. It is important that we look back at history, but it is also important that we applaud the men and women who are making progress today and tomorrow.

H.R. 450

**HON. CARDISS COLLINS**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, February 28, 1995*

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, last week we were given a real clear picture of what the new Republican majority that now controls the Congress really cares about.

During the consideration of H.R. 450, Members had two opportunities to vote on amendments that would have excluded from the moratorium regulations the Fish and Wildlife service needs to issue in order to establish hunting seasons for ducks and waterfowl.

I offered the first amendment which, in addition to the hunting season regulations, also exempted several other important matters, such as:

Rules the FEC has issued to prohibit personal use of campaign funds; rules to make it harder for aliens to stay in the United States on the basis of meritless petitions for political asylum; rules giving preference to the elderly in section 8 housing; rule pertaining to elimination of drug use in Federal housing; rules designating empowerment zones and enterprise communities; rules compensating Persian Gulf veterans with disabilities from undiagnosed illnesses; and rules for the development of a data base for child molesters, as required by the crime bill.

The Republican majority argued against amending their bill to make it clear that these important regulations could be excluded from the moratorium. They claimed there was nothing to worry about.

Yet, later in the day, they chose to support an amendment which only exempted the hunting season regulations, and none of the other regulations—not for veterans, not for the protection of children against child molesters, and not for the elderly.

I have nothing against duck hunting, but I think it is a sad day when this Congress cares more about guaranteeing there is a duck hunting season, than whether our children are safe, and the elderly and disabled veterans are properly cared for.

RISK ASSESSMENT AND COST-  
BENEFIT ACT OF 1995

SPEECH OF

**HON. BLANCHE LAMBERT LINCOLN**

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, February 27, 1995*

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1022) to provide regulatory reform and to focus national economic resources on the greatest risks to human health, safety, and the environment through scientifically objective and unbiased risk assessments and through the consideration of cost and benefits in major rules, and for other purposes.

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. Chairman, I rise as a strong proponent of risk assessment and effective government and cost-benefit analysis.

Having grown up on a farm in eastern Arkansas and having seen in person both the tremendous waste, that government regulations can assist us in preserving our environment and our surroundings but also in being overburdensome as well as top heavy in regulatory needs. Risk assessment is a vital tool in forming cost-effective and well-reasoned Federal regulations. It should be used to create a better and responsive Federal Government, not stymie things down with court actions or excessive delay.

But I do have some concerns that the bill we are looking at today, this will happen under the current bill. Before we consider H.R. 1022 further, we may have to take a time-out to do a cost-benefit analysis on this bill. CBO has made some conservative estimates that the bill will cost the Federal Government an additional 250 million a year to conduct risk assessment. This breaks down to approximately 5,000 new Federal employees, including many new lawyers hired to defend agency actions.

As we look at this bill today, I hope that we will work in bipartisan fashion to make it better so that it will be of great assistance to all of us across the Nation in making government more effective.

Mr. Chairman, the costs of doing an effective and needed risk assessment doesn't bother me very much if in the long run those expenses are more than covered in the costs saved down the road. However, I am skeptical that the \$25 million threshold is a figure where we can get the biggest bang for our buck. The threshold set out under this bill to conduct risk assessments is \$25 million. However, Executive orders in the past issued by President Ford, Reagan and Clinton set the threshold at \$100 million. OMB in 1993 concluded that 97 percent of the total rulemaking costs on the economy came from rules with a dollar threshold over \$100 million. Like the companies who rightly complain that we shouldn't spend millions of dollars to get Superfund sites, water and air one additional percentage cleaner, I question whether we should be spending so much money in conducting additional risk assessments to reach an additional 3 percent of the regulations that have a financial impact on the economy. Additionally, H.R. 1022 requires a risk assessment for permits under Federal program. Does this mean that every State that issues a Clean Water Act section 402 permit must conduct a risk assessment before finalizing any permit? Let's make sure that we are adopting the most cost effective law as we

can by looking at the potential scope of the bill.

I am also concerned about this bill's potential financial impact on our States. Just last month we passed a bill to curb unfunded Federal mandates on unwitting States. However, upon closer analysis of this bill, I feel that there might be possibility that States will bear the impacts and financial burdens of conducting risk assessments. Many States act as the agents of the Federal Government in enforcing certain laws. This bill would require the Federal Government, or any entity acting "on behalf of a covered agency in the implementation of a regulatory program" to conduct risk assessments.

I will be offering an amendment later during the debate to solve the potential unintended consequence. It has the support of the National Conference of State Legislatures and the Governor from Arkansas.

I hope that my colleagues will support some of the bipartisan amendments that will be offered during the course of debate to eliminate some of the bureaucratic nightmares in this bill.

## BLACK HISTORY

### HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, February 28, 1995*

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, for the last 14 years, I have been the proud sponsor of an Annual Congressional Black History Month Breakfast. Each year, it has been a privilege to hear the remarks of many distinguished guest speakers and this morning was no exception. The honored speaker for this year's breakfast was the Honorable Eric Holder, U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia. I found Mr. Holder's remarks insightful, thought provoking, and timely. Therefore, I am proud to submit his statement for the RECORD.

#### BLACK HISTORY SPEECH

(By Eric Holder)

In discussing black history we must always be cognizant of its continuing nature and we are obligated to assess where black America stands at the time of that discussion. Though I would like to talk today about the concept of, and importance of, black history I would also like to discuss the black present. The past and the present are inextricably bound and to understand either, one must comprehend both. History should be used as a tool in trying to understand a present that seems at times to be frightening and illogical. It is my belief that the seeds of our inner cities present distress are found in the manner in which this nation has dealt with its black population over the years. But we must also acknowledge that this same population has done much in recent years to contribute to its present negative condition. The study of black history is a means by which we can understand and plan for a better black future. To look forward one must also look back.

Let me start with the present. Black America today stands at a crossroads. A valiant past filled with courage and struggle is being replaced with a present replete with irresponsible behavior and an almost passive acceptance of negative actions in general and of violence in particular. Black Americans, like too many others in our society, have become all too willing to blame others for their situation. It is definitely true that

government has not done all that it could, or should, have done in the recent past. But a study of black history indicates that we have frequently had to deal with governmental indifference or outright hostility. This did not stop our striving in the past, cannot be used as an excuse in the present, and must not inhibit our growth as a people in the future. We black Americans must commit ourselves to responsible behavior and do all that we can to retard the growth of the culture of violence that so grips many of our communities.

It is time for black America to come to grips with the crime and violence problem that destroys so many promising, young black lives. Put quite simply, it is time for black people to begin to identify with, and work with, the forces that are fighting to make our streets safe. The preoccupation with criminal defendants and the abject neglect of criminal victims is in some ways a moral indictment of our community. This concern was understandable in a past where people of color were systemically, routinely and legally denied the rights to which they were obviously entitled. But in a present where at least the legal impediments to equality have been largely erased, such concerns are largely misplaced. I am not naive, however. Black people must be ever vigilant to insure that all of our people, criminal defendants included, are always treated in the same constitutional manner as all other Americans. But for too long we have sought to excuse that which we know to be wrong and in the process have ignored the real pain suffered by members of our own community. The overwhelming majority of crime committed by black defendants is directed at other black people. Over 90% of the nation's black homicide victims, for example, were killed by other black people. This is truly a sad part of black history but is an aspect of our existence in this country that must be explored and honestly discussed if the next chapters in our story are to be filled with hope and progress.

We must also strive to curb other voluntary conduct that threatens the very existence of our people. The plagues of AIDS and unwed births that so affect the black community, for example, are the products of irresponsible sexual conduct. Because this conduct is voluntary it can, and should, be rather easily controlled. I understand that in things sexual and personal we must tread lightly but is it not painfully clear that by being just a little more responsible these problems could be cured? We must insure that we do all we can to reduce the rate of black unwed births in our nation that now stands at 67%—two out of every three black babies are born into this condition. In some parts of Washington that figure rises to over 80%—four out of every five babies. This plague tears at the fabric that has traditionally bound us together. It inhibits the development of the black community by stunting the growth of both the mother and the child itself. A recent study showed that women who became mothers when they were married, over 21 and high school graduates gave birth to children who lived in poverty about 10% of the time. By contrast, women who were under 21, high school dropouts and not married gave birth to children 79% of whom lived in poverty. There is little dispute that there is a direct line between poverty and the social problems that so bedevil us. As you can see, at least a part of the poverty problem is self inflicted and could be controlled by self restraint.

In the current discussion about unwed births, welfare reform and values we too frequently focus on women as if they created children without the assistance of men. We must never stigmatize the women in our

community who valiantly struggle against great odds to raise good kids and we must always love all of our children whatever the marital status of their parents. But we must recognize that this is a problem. And we must acknowledge the irresponsibility of men in this situation. When I was a judge at the District of Columbia Superior Court it was striking to me to find that virtually every young man who came before me in a criminal case did not have a man who was meaningfully involved in his life. As the United States Attorney for this city I have been struck by the way in which children have responded to the men in our office, both black and white, in our outreach efforts. We have programs with elementary schools in the city and it is in some ways sad to see our youngsters, black youngsters, cling to the men in my office for the support and guidance they should be receiving from their fathers at home. In any discussion of our situation we must focus more on absentee fathers. We cannot hope to have our young boys grow up to be good men without role models to emulate. And the best role model is not an athlete, not an entertainer and not a United States Attorney. The best role model is a father at home who devotes himself to the child he has brought into the world. An army of these kind of fathers would probably do more to cure our social problems than all the government programs we might ever devise. We must somehow force the concept of family back into the consciousness of the men who are now too willing to create children but not willing to help raise them.

Moving from a partial examination of the black present to a look into the black past one finds that the history of black America and the history of this nation are inextricably tied to each other. It is for this reason that the study of black history is important to everyone—black or white. For example, the history of the United States in the nineteenth century revolves around a resolution of the question of how America was going to deal with its black inhabitants. The great debates of that era and the war that was ultimately fought are all centered around the issue of, initially, slavery and then the reconstruction of the vanquished region. A dominant domestic issue throughout the twentieth century has been, again, America's treatment of its black citizens. The civil rights movement of the 1950's and 1960's changed America in truly fundamental ways. Americans of all colors were forced to examine basic beliefs and long held views. Even so, most people, who are not conversant with history, still do not really comprehend the way in which that movement transformed America. In racial terms the country that existed before the civil rights struggle is almost unrecognizable to us today. Separate public facilities, separate entrances, poll taxes, legal discrimination, in essence an American apartheid, all were part of an America that the movement destroyed.

In addition, the other major social movements of the latter half of this century—feminism, the nation's treatment of other minority groups, even the anti-war effort are all tied in some way to the spirit that was set free by the civil rights movement. Those other movements may have occurred in the absence of the civil rights struggle but the fight for black equality came first and helped to shape the way in which other groups of people came to think of themselves and to raise their desire for equal treatment. Further, many of the tactics that were used by these other groups were developed in the civil rights movement.

And today the link between the black experience and this country is still evident. While the problems that presently afflict the