

Rights Practices," including the report for 1994, and the United Nations Human Rights Commission in Geneva, Switzerland, has annually condemned Cuba for its gross violations of human rights. We salute such condemnation.

We also are aware of the deliberate sinking of the tugboat *13th of March* which this House of Representatives unanimously condemned which resulted in the deaths of 40 people, that incident, including over 20 children. In congressional testimony the Secretary of State has stated that the sinking demonstrated the brutal nature of the Castro regime. How does the U.S. Government intend to ensure the rights of individual dissidents, of human rights activists, of former political prisoners, and other objectors to the Castro dictatorship with legitimate claims to political asylum if they are picked up at sea and returned automatically to Cuban officials? Will there be any form of INS personnel on board, or where will they be taken to process their political asylum cases? Those questions remain unanswered.

Under Secretary Tarnoff suggests the Cuban dictatorship can be trusted. Yet it is my understanding that a group of 20 Cuban nationals who recently were deported by the Government of Belize to Cuba have been detained in Cuba by Castro's security forces. How can you ensure that Cubans whom the United States repatriates will be treated differently and that they will not suffer retribution? Can you be certain they will be able to keep their jobs, ration cards, apartments, and any personal effects that they put at risk upon leaving? What further ability will U.S. staff have to monitor the increasing flow to the U.S. Interest Section? I do not believe we have that capacity. And what is the State Department's position and this administration's position regarding Cuban law which was reinstated after the September 9, 1994 accords which forbids illegal exit from the country? It is my understanding that under that Cuban law, people who flee the country are considered as having created a crime punishable as treason. If the law is in effect, how is it possible to believe that repatriated Cubans will not suffer under said law?

Finally, we stated, this administration has stated and the Secretary of State has stated, that we want to foster change in Cuba. But if change is ever to come to Cuba, the human rights activists, the dissidents, and political prisoners who are willing to risk their lives under a brutal dictatorship must know that political asylum is available to them in the United States, and I do not believe the State Department has the necessary safeguards to ensure that those who fight for democratic change can acquire political asylum if their lives are in danger.

That is the reality of this policy that is forthcoming. The fact of the matter is that we could have sought the family reunification we seek to do with the people in Guantanamo, saved the tax-

payers a million dollars a year, and not have negotiated with the Castro dictatorship in violating basic tenets of human rights, one, that we are a signatory to, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which is to ensure that people have the right to freely leave their country.

□ 1845

And in our case, in our own immigration law, to ensure that those who truly have a case for political asylum can purport it. The fact of the matter is this policy simply does not create that possibility, and in fact it dooms those who are political dissidents, human rights activists, the people who could make change in Cuba to knowing that the United States has closed their door on them.

It is a sad day in our history.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RAHALL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. RAHALL addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

THE CLEAN WATER ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to discuss the Clean Water Act and the reauthorization that the House will begin to consider tomorrow and for the remainder of this week.

The Clean Water Act, as we know it, in my opinion, and the resources it protects are in jeopardy pursuant to this reauthorization that we are about to consider tomorrow.

In the committee process, waivers and exemptions have been expanded while bill-strengthening amendments repeatedly met with defeat, and the result of this legislation which we begin with tomorrow, H.R. 961, in my opinion, will be deterioration of over 20 years of clean water efforts, efforts that have successfully moved us in the direction of fishable, swimmable waters.

With H.R. 961, esoteric costs and benefits will rule the day at the expense of human health and safety and protection of invaluable natural resources. If H.R. 961, Mr. Speaker, as it now exists, is passed it will be more difficult, in my opinion, to explain to my constituents and others why they cannot fish in local streams, why they are losing business due to beach closings and other reductions in recreation and tourism, and why their property values have decreased or why their drinking water is not usable.

I would hope over the next few days, as the number of amendments are proposed on the House floor that would seek to strengthen the Clean Water Act and reauthorization and bring back, if

not improve, the existing law, that we would see many of our colleagues join in targeting a number of detrimental provisions of H.R. 961, of which I would like to list a few.

One is the existing waivers for combined sewer overflows and industrial pretreatment. Another is ocean discharge in place of full secondary treatment. Another is the loss of wetlands protection, the abolition of the coastal zone nonpoint source program, the erosion of the Great Lakes initiative, the elimination of the EPA from dredged material disposal decisions, insufficient enforcement and lack of citizen rights provisions.

Mr. Speaker, if I could just read some sections of an article that appeared in the New York Times on April 2 which outlines some of the problems with H.R. 961. It says, and I am reading from sections, that the Clean Water Act of 1972, the existing bill, has done much to make America's water fishable and swimmable. Experts in both parties regard it as the most successful of the environmental mandates passed in Congress since Earth Day 1970. However, the new provision we are about to consider tomorrow in H.R. 961 blasts so many holes in this law it is hard to know where to begin. Basically, they would demolish the underlying strategy of the original act. The 1972 law conceded it was impossible to measure the dollar benefits of clean water against the costs of cleaning it up. So, in fact, if industry was instructed to use the best available technology to control pollution, even though that may not be the perfect answer, it has worked.

The new law, by contrast, would postpone any further improvement in water quality unless it could be provided the benefits in health, swimmable, fish stocks are worth the cost. That means monetizing the value of a cleaner environment, a nearly impossible process.

The bill that we are going to consider this week would relax national water quality standards, provide certain industries with further exemptions from whatever laws remain on the books, and make voluntary a program that now requires States and cities to control storm water pollution. Not least, it would reverse a 25-year effort to preserve diminishing wetlands. Scientists now estimate there are 100 million acres of wetlands remaining in the United States, doing what the wetlands do so well, filtering pollutants and nourishing organisms essential to the food chain.

By drastically narrowing the definition of what a wetland is, the bill would make millions of acres available to developers and the oil and gas industry.

In brief, the bill we are about to consider would make it much easier for polluters to pollute.

Mr. Speaker, I have to decry this legislation because I know for the last 7 or

8 years or so, since I have been in Congress, at the Jersey shore we have seen a steady increase in water quality. Beaches that in 1988, when I was first elected, were closed and were not available for tourism and were basically making almost impossible for the Jersey shore to come back economically, those beaches are now open, the water quality is improved, my constituents are looking forward to a great summer beginning the end of this month. But they can not believe that this House or this Congress would seek to gut, if you will, the very legislation that has made that possible.

I hope that many of my colleagues over the next few days will join with me in passing some strengthening amendments so that the Clean Water Act will continue to be viable into the next century.

FIGHTING THE WAR ON TERRORISM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on April 19 a tragedy occurred which rocked the Nation. For the second time in recent years, terrorists struck a target in the United States and, at the same time, dealt a blow to our national sense of security. As everyone now knows, a terrorist, or group of terrorists, exploded a car bomb in front of the Federal office building in Oklahoma City, killing hundreds of adults and children and leaving scores injured.

We, as a Nation, now realize that it could happen to any of us, anywhere, and none of us are immune—not even our children.

In the painful days which have followed, citizens began to take stock of the situation and Congress will consider its legislative options to address this. How can we prevent this kind of disaster from ever happening again? The most truthful answer is that we can't completely prevent these kinds of tragedies, but we can take appropriate steps to reduce the number and severity of them.

As the magnitude of the horror in Oklahoma City was fully felt, all Americans began to realize that the terrorist bombing had profoundly changed all our lives, not just those of us who have lost loved ones in the nightmare attack.

We experienced a tragic lesson that day. Terrorism is not just something to be feared from foreign nationalists; it can be a horror from within our country as well. There are obvious and dramatic lessons to be learned by the American people in the wake of this disaster. We need to examine the balance of power between the authority of the state versus the rights of the individual.

In the House, we are considering several measures. The State-Sponsored

Terrorism Responsibility Act would hold state sponsors of terrorism responsible for their actions and allow American victims to have a means of redress. This bill will amend the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act to provide specific jurisdiction for lawsuits against countries that support or condone terrorism, torture or genocide.

International terrorism poses a grave threat to the interests and security of the United States both at home and abroad. Outlaw states continue to serve as sponsors and promoters of this reprehensible activity by providing a safe haven, terrorist training and weapons. This legislation will make those states responsible for their actions and the actions of those they support in their terroristic efforts.

Other bills in the House would place new restrictions on the granting of visas to aliens linked to terrorism activities and would remove restrictions on a database that helps identify aliens with ties to terrorists seeking admission to the United States.

The House measure would also repeal the 1990 law that forbids consular officials from denying visas based solely on an alien's membership in a known terrorist organization and would establish deportation proceedings against aliens living in the United States and engaged in terrorist activities.

It would further restrict the use, purchase, sale and transfer of nuclear materials, plastic explosives and toxic gases and would encourage broader disclosure by consumer reporting agencies to the FBI for counterintelligence and counterterrorism investigations.

Finally, the House is considering legislation which would give the FBI greater access to hotel/motel records for the purpose of identifying subjects of terrorism investigations.

Each bill before Congress deserves careful consideration and I hope we will be able to incorporate the best ideas of each into a bipartisan antiterrorism package with sufficient teeth to help us put an end to the senseless criminal violence we have seen in Oklahoma City, at the World Trade Center, on the Achille Lauro and in the skies over Lockerbie, Scotland.

And for the families of those who were killed in Oklahoma City we offer our prayers and condolences. We will do everything within our power to ensure that those who committed the cowardly acts of violence will be brought to justice and punished. It won't bring back those who lost their lives, but it will send a strong signal that our Government will no longer tolerate such acts against the freedom-loving people of this great Nation.

A DARK DAY IN AMERICAN HISTORY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, at about 12 o'clock this afternoon, a United States Coast Guard vessel brought 13 Cubans who had left Cuba in a raft back to a military base inside of Cuba. That Coast Guard vessel was escorted by two Cuban naval warships in this act.

It is a first time. Today is truly, unfortunately, a dark day in American history, a dark day for the Coast Guard, a day which hopefully will be a very short day and short time period in American history.

But if we do not act, it will be a day that in years to come people will look back, I am sure, with remorse and regret, the first time in American history that the U.S. Government has repatriated people to a Communist dictatorship.

It is a symptomatic problem of a Cuban policy by this administration that has been schizophrenic, at best. We were told during the Guantanamo exodus that it was impossible to blockade the island. Yet the administration, in fact, has blockaded the island with the help of the Cuban Government and Cuban Navy in a one-way blockade, preventing people from leaving.

The island could have been blockaded several months ago, in fact, even up to a year ago, to prevent a migration which did occur of tens of thousands of people.

Our country has become a partner with Castro in repression of his people at this point in time. The 13 people that have been returned to Cuba were not sent back to Canada, were not sent back to Mexico, were sent back to a country which this Government has continuously called, and by accurate, independent accounts from Amnesty International, press accounts, the most repressive government in this hemisphere, a terrorist government, a government in terms of world history that stands out as one of the worst abusers of human rights in the history of this planet.

The Attorney General, in announcing this change in policy, said that those who returned to Cuba were to be guaranteed no reprisals. I asked the Attorney General this evening why then the secrecy in the return, why then the delay in the actions? These people were picked up in a boat on Friday. Today is Tuesday.

It defies logic, based on the history of the country of terrorist incidents that occur in Cuba almost on a daily basis that we know about, obviously scores that we do not know about, that there will not be reprisals. It defies logic.

You do not have to be the Secretary of State of the United States, you do not have to have gotten a Ph.D. in international relations to understand the nature of the Cuban Government.

And again, I asked the Attorney General why into a military base, why not into Havana Harbor where there would have been at least some foreign press to record the incident, some stringers