

that we now call the Declaration of Independence. Adams wrote his wife that a single day in July 1776 would be honored "as the most memorable day in the history of America."

That is a remarkable prediction to make about a nation that did not even exist then, that first had to free itself from the control of the world's most powerful country. Other predictions that Adams wrote to his wife about a special day in July 1776 were right on target, too. In his letter he said, "It will be celebrated by succeeding generations as a great anniversary festival. It ought to be solemnized with pomp and parades, with shows, games, sports, guns, bells, bonfires and illuminations . . . from one end of the continent to the other . . . from this time forward . . . forever more."

John Adams got only one major detail wrong in his amazing prediction—he had the wrong date.

He wrote his wife that he could foresee those parades and fireworks happening every year on July Second. That is because it was on July 2, 1776 that the Continental Congress, meeting in secret session, actually voted on the Declaration of Independence. Two days later, on July 4, the delegates to the Continental Congress signed the Declaration. Also on that day they came out of their secret session and showed the world what they had done.

Does that mean we are wrong in celebrating July Fourth? Should we be having Second of July picnics and Second of July fireworks? No.

Most legal documents take effect when they are signed and July Fourth is the day when signatures were put on a draft of that incredible document written by Thomas Jefferson.

Many historians will tell you it is not because of the signatures that we use July 4 as the official birthday of our country. It is because that is the day people first heard about the Declaration of Independence. In this country the people count. What is important is the involvement of the people in managing their own affairs, not governmental bodies making decisions in secret. For most of human history—and even in large parts of the world today—that is still a revolutionary idea.

We should remember every July Fourth that the rights we often take for granted do not come easily or automatically. Those rights are re-purchased by each generation, often at a terrible price.

Nearly we have the graves of some of our Revolutionary War dead. They know that freedom is not free since they paid with their very lives. On the tombstone [of the Unknown Soldier in Washington Square] is the inscription "Freedom is a Light for Which Many Men Have Died in Darkness."

Fifty years ago today the beachhead at Normandy was not quite a month old. Nearly a million men and women from the United States, Great Britain and our wartime allies had landed there. They were beginning to spread out from that small foothold in northern France and each mile of liberated Europe demanded a high price in human lives and suffering. Many terrible struggles were still ahead of the U.S. military 50 years ago today during World War II.

Today our enemies are harder to identify, but they are out there. Our commitment to the men and women in uniform should be as strong today as it was 50 years ago. History has taught us the best way to avoid war is to be better prepared than any adversary. Vigilance is also the watchword in our domestic life. Even the best of governments can forget that government is the servant of the people and that the people should never be the servant of government.

Just five years ago the Supreme Court ruled that people who burn American flags are entitled to legal protection under the First Amendment's provisions safeguarding free speech. This decision outraged many Americans who see the flag as a sacred symbol of the country, as a symbol of our values that ought to be respected and, especially, as a symbol of the brave sacrifices of our men and women in wartime. We want to amend the Constitution to allow the states and the federal government to enact laws prohibiting physical desecration of the flag. If it is in the Constitution then the courts cannot rule it unconstitutional.

"Old Glory" is precious to me. So is the idea that government should be answerable to the people. We hear more these days about the search for values in America. Some of us do not have to look very far to find values. We start with devotion to God, love of country and respect for the flag. These are solid foundations upon which this country has been built and they are foundations upon which we can grow. If we need to find values, we can start with the values laid down 218 years ago in that remarkable document we honor today, the Declaration of Independence. It says: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness. That to secure these rights governments are instituted."

That is still the best statement of who we are as a people, what we hold dear and what we will fight to preserve.

God Bless America.

REFORMING THE WELFARE SYSTEM "NO STRINGS ATTACHED"

HON. RICHARD "DOC" HASTINGS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1995

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation aimed at reforming our failed Federal welfare system. Reforming welfare is among my top priorities and is supported by a majority of the American people.

The time for reform has come. Since 1965 we have spent \$5 trillion on the War on Poverty—yet the poverty rate is higher today than it was then. The current welfare system has failed both the people it was created to help and those whose tax dollars support it. It is a bureaucratic nightmare and it offers the wrong incentives for recipients. It fosters illegitimacy and dependency, rather than strong families and economic independence. We must act now to enact fundamental and far reaching change.

I believe the most important change Congress can make would be to allow States and local communities the flexibility to find creative solutions and determine who should be eligible to receive benefits. The legislation I am introducing empowers States and local communities by shifting the responsibility for welfare to the States in a single block grant—with no strings attached.

I repeat: no strings attached. This isn't just a swap for government control of Medicaid or other assistance programs—it strictly empowers the States and local communities to address the problem in the most effective manner possible. No additional mandates would be imposed on the States. Finally, Federal

funding will be reduced by 5 percent per year and will be phased out completely in 20 years.

The States have proven themselves to be more successful than the Federal Government in dealing with welfare and developing innovative and effective solutions. States better understand the problems within their own communities and can more efficiently determine who should be eligible to receive benefits.

Consider, for example, Wisconsin. Governor Tommy Thompson's welfare reform proposal has reduced State welfare rolls by 25 percent and saved the taxpayers \$16 million per month. In Michigan, Governor John Engler requires that welfare recipients sign a social contract agreeing to work, receive job training, or volunteer at least 20 hours a week. In just 2 years, the plan has helped almost 50,000 welfare recipients gain independence, and welfare caseloads have fallen to their lowest level in 7 years, saving the taxpayers \$100 million.

The urgent need for reform—particularly welfare reform—was exemplified during the November elections. It is time for the Government to return control to the States. My proposal to shift the power to the local level is ambitious—yet it is only at the local level that the most effective solutions and most efficient answers will be found.

TRIBUTE TO BEVERLY TWITTY

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1995

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, in my district I am fortunate to have individuals dedicated to helping the Brooklyn community. Beverly Twitty personifies this kind of dedication. Beverly is a native New Yorker, educated in the New York City public school system. She attended Brooklyn College and New York University where she earned a B.A. degree and two masters degrees respectively.

Beverly is involved in many community activities and has been very active for many years with the Girl Scouts and the American Red Cross. She is a former member of Operation Bread Basket, the economic arm of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference.

Beverly Twitty is a member of the Cornerstone Baptist Church and continues to be an inspiration to the community. I am proud to recognize Beverly Twitty for her unyielding dedication to the Brooklyn community.

NATIONAL CLEAN WATER TRUST FUND ACT OF 1995

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1995

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing legislation to expedite the cleanup of our Nation's waters. This bill, the National Clean Water Trust Fund Act of 1995, would create a trust fund established from fines, penalties, and other moneys collected through enforcement of the Clean Water Act to help alleviate the problems for which the enforcement

actions were taken. This legislation is identical to a measure I introduced with bipartisan support in the last Congress, and it was the model for a provision I secured in last year's Clean Water Act reauthorization bill, H.R. 3948.

Currently, there is no guarantee that fines or other moneys that result from violations of the Clean Water Act will be used to correct water quality problems. Instead, some of the money goes into the general fund of the U.S. Treasury without any provision that it be used to improve the quality of our Nation's waters.

I am concerned that EPA enforcement activities are extracting large sums of money from industry and others through enforcement of the Clean Water Act, while we ignore the fundamental issue of how to pay for the cleanup of the water pollution problems for which the penalties were levied. If we are really serious about ensuring the successful implementation of the Clean Water Act, we should put these enforcement funds to work and actually clean up our Nation's waters. It does not make sense for scarce resources to go into the bottomless pit of the Treasury's general fund, especially if we fail to solve our serious water quality problems due to lack of funds.

Specifically, my bill would establish a national clean water trust fund within the U.S. Treasury for fines, penalties, and other moneys, including consent decrees, obtained through enforcement of the Clean Water Act that would otherwise be placed into Treasury's general fund. Under my proposal, the EPA Administrator would be authorized to prioritize and carry out projects to restore and recover waters of the United States using the funds collected from violations of the Clean Water Act. However, this legislation would not preempt citizen suits or in any way preclude EPA's authority to undertake and complete supplemental environmental projects [SEP's] as part of settlements related to violations of the Clean Water Act and/or other legislation.

For example, in 1993, Inland Steel announced a \$54.5 million multimedia consent decree, which included a \$26 million SEP and a \$3.5 million cash payment to the U.S. Treasury. I strongly support the use of SEP's to facilitate the cleanup of serious environmental problems, which are particularly prevalent in my congressional district. However, my bill would dedicate the cash payment to the Treasury to the clean water trust fund.

The bill further specifies that remedial projects be within the same EPA region where enforcement action was taken. Northwest Indiana is in EPA region 5, and there are 10 EPA regions throughout the United States. Under my proposal, any funds collected from enforcement of the Clean Water Act in region 5 would go into the national clean water trust fund and, ideally, be used to cleanup environmental impacts associated with the problem for which the fine was levied.

To illustrate how a national clean water trust fund would be effective in cleaning up our Nation's waters, I would like to highlight the magnitude of the fines that have been levied through enforcement of the Clean Water Act. Nationwide, in fiscal year 1994, EPA assessed \$35 million in penalties for violations of the Clean Water Act. These penalties represented 27 percent of all penalties assessed by EPA under various environmental statutes.

My bill also instructs EPA to coordinate its efforts with the State in prioritizing specific

cleanup projects. Finally, to monitor the implementation of the national clean water trust fund, I have included a reporting requirement in my legislation. One year after enactment, and every 2 years thereafter, the EPA Administrator would make a report to Congress regarding the establishment of the trust fund.

My legislation has garnered the endorsement of several environmental organizations in northwest Indiana, including the Grand Calumet task force, the northwest Indiana chapter of the Izaak Walton League, and the Save the Dunes Council. Further, I am encouraged by the support within the national environmental community and the Northeast-Midwest Institute for the concept of a national clean water trust fund. I would also like to point out that, in a 1992 report to Congress on the Clean Water Act enforcement mechanisms, and Environmental Protection Agency workgroup recommended amending the Clean Water Act to establish a national clean water trust fund.

In reauthorizing the Clean Water Act, we have a unique opportunity to improve the quality of our Nation's waters. The establishment of a national clean water trust fund is an innovative step in that direction. By targeting funds accrued through enforcement of the Clean Water Act—that would otherwise go into the Treasury Department's general fund—we can put scarce resources to work and facilitate the cleanup of problem areas throughout the Great Lakes and across this country. I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

BURTON AND TORRICELLI BLAST IDEA OF EASING CUBAN EMBARGO

HON. DAN BURTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1995

Congressman DAN BURTON, chairman of Western Hemisphere Affairs Subcommittee and ROBERT TORRICELLI, ranking minority member of the subcommittee expressed strong opposition to any easing of United States economic sanctions on Cuba.

According to a report in the Washington Post today, several of President Clinton's advisers are recommending that the economic embargo on Cuba be eased, allowing dollar remittances to be sent to Cuba, and making it easier to travel to Cuba. In response, Congressmen BURTON and TORRICELLI have issued the following statement:

We are absolutely dismayed over reports that the Clinton Administration is considering easing certain aspects of the United States economic embargo on Cuba. We believe that any easing of pressure on the Fidel Castro regime will only prolong the suffering of the Cuban people and will send the wrong signal to the dictatorship.

The communist dictatorship in Cuba is one of the most notorious violators of human rights in existence today. Despite the monumental changes in the world over the past six years, Fidel Castro remains as committed as ever in his nefarious, failed ideology.

The loss of over \$6 billion a year in subsidies from the Soviet Union has caused the Cuban economy to contract by sixty percent. It is for this reason that Castro, desperate for foreign currency, has been forced to adopt superficial measures aimed at increasing foreign investment. There is no mistak-

ing the fact that Castro is only interested in perpetuating his own dictatorial rule.

At a time when the Castro regime is clearly on its last leg, the United States should maintain pressure and resist any calls to lift the embargo. This was the clear message of the Cuban Democracy Act of 1992, which the President supported; and it is the aim of the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity Act (Libertad), which we recently introduced.

Any easing of the U.S. embargo at this time would send the absolutely wrong message to Fidel Castro, and to the Cuban people. We will fiercely resist any such move.

PRIVATE PROPERTY PROTECTION ACT OF 1995

SPEECH OF

HON. RONALD D. COLEMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 3, 1995

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 925) to compensate owners of private property for the effect of certain regulatory restrictions.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the bill H.R. 925. I am disappointed because there were a series of important measures that would have modified the legislation in such a way that I could have supported it. Unfortunately, those measures failed, and the bill that we are left with has extremely alarming implications. Were this legislation enacted, the Federal Government would be saddled with a huge new entitlement program, with unknown costs. Not only will this legislation be tremendously expensive in terms of Federal dollars, but the limitations that it will impose upon the regulatory power of Federal agencies could exact a huge toll upon human health and the environment.

Many of the proponents of this bill have tried to argue that the decision before us is essentially a constitutional question. They have frequently read from the fifth amendment provision which bars the Federal Government from taking private property without just compensation. But H.R. 925 raises a constitutional question only insofar as the bill requires us to expand upon how this body chooses to define "takings." In the past, this interpretation has been left to the jurisdiction of the courts. As the takings question is fundamentally one of constitutional interpretation, the court system is probably the most appropriate forum for determining the proper answer to this question.

Yet, the precedent adhered to by the Supreme Court dictates that Government action must reduce the value of private property by almost 90 percent before the owner can be compensated. Many of my colleagues felt that such a threshold was unreasonably high, and wished to take steps to compensate property owners suffering large financial losses as the result of regulatory action. I strongly supported such initiatives. I feel that it is the proper role of the Congress to craft legislation to meet the changing needs of our society in a manner consistent with the intent of the Framers of the Constitution. I firmly believe that property owners should not be subject to undue financial burdens as a result of Government actions.