

I know no better way of providing jobs in our Hudson Valley, New York region than by approving a responsible Clean Water Act that provides strong environmental protection and the restoration of our natural water resources. Relaxed water quality standards will jeopardize many of our Nation's largest industries, including the \$400 billion a year travel and tourism industry and the \$55 billion a year fishing industry.

Similarly, we must not forget the air we breathe, our most precious resource. No matter what our party affiliation we are not immune from having to breathe clean air to survive. Air pollution has been linked to cancer, birth defects, brain and nerve damage, and long-term injury to our lungs and breathing passages. Moreover, air pollution damages our environmental surroundings. Tree, lakes, and animals have been harmed by air pollution. Accordingly, Congress passed the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 to improve our air quality standards. I was pleased to be an original cosponsor of that landmark legislation.

Today, we are rethinking our approach to environmental policy. As has been reported by my colleague, Representative SHERWOOD BOEHLERT, "the first fruits of that re-evaluation can be seen in the landmark conservation section of the farm bill Congress passed last month."

The farm bill has set aside billions of dollars for conservation programs to assist farmers in preserving wetlands and reducing agricultural runoff. I would argue that this bill is one of the most important environmental pieces of legislation to come out of Congress since the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990.

We in the Congress must never forget the need for clean air and water, as well as the need to preserve our important natural resources. More importantly, we should never forget the great environmental gains we have made during the past decade.

In recognition of Earth Day, let us all commit ourselves in our own communities to do our part. Together we can ensure that our environment will be a clean, safe, and beautiful place for generations to come.

THE CALIFORNIA PACIFIC MEDICAL CENTER

HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1996

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express the profound appreciation felt by many of my constituents for the transplant physician team at the California Pacific Medical Center [CPMC] in San Francisco.

The patients, their families, and their loved ones through their organization, the CPMC heart transplant support group, are gathering today for their 11th Annual Heart to Heart Gala. The gala celebrates their appreciation, and their gratitude, for the work, the extraordinary skill, and the love given by the CPMC heart transplant team. They celebrate as a way to acknowledge the gift of life and the gift in the improved quality of life received as a result of heart transplant surgery, a truly lifesaving procedure for many in the bay area. This form of extension of life is so awesome that there are few words that can adequately ex-

press their feelings of respect and gratitude for the exceptional CPMC physicians and support staff who have dedicated themselves to this cause.

The first heart transplant at CPMC was performed in January 1984. Since that time, 20 to 25 transplants have been performed each year at CPMC, totaling over 250. The majority of candidates who receive a transplant have advanced disabling heart disease remediable by no other known therapy. The CPMC transplant physician staff, consisting of J. Donald Hill, M.D., chairman of the department of cardiac surgery; G. James Avery, M.D., transplant surgeon; Ernest Haensslein, M.D., medical director, heart transplant service, and James Hershon, M.D., director of the medical surgical intensive care unit, are to be commended for the exceptional skills, knowledge, compassion, and tireless efforts they routinely demonstrate while treating and caring for their patients.

Although we are awed by the art of the transplant process and recognize the transplant team's exceptional knowledge and technical abilities, it is apparent that the high esteem in which the patients and their families hold this surgical team is due to the very special attentiveness and the love that they give throughout the arduous preoperation, operation and postoperation period. Such a combination of attributes is indeed rare and must be recognized.

It is therefore a privilege for me to join with my constituents, and I invite you to join us, in recognizing, saluting, and honoring this exceptional group of professionals today.

TRIBUTE TO ROSE AND CHARLES MATT ON THEIR 61ST ANNIVERSARY AND 85TH BIRTHDAYS

HON. WILLIAM O. LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1996

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to two people in my district who made, and have kept, a lifetime commitment to one another, Rose and Charles Matt of Riverside, IL.

The Matts recently celebrated their 61st wedding anniversary and their 85th birthdays with family and friends at a local restaurant. They were married June 16, 1934, at Mary Queen of Heaven Church in Cicero, IL. Over the years, the Matts have been active in the local business community and involved in civic affairs.

The Matts opened a successful appliance store and two bowling alleys in Cicero. In addition, Mr. Matt served as a member of Morton High School District Board and is a past president of the Cicero Rotary Club. Mrs. Matt is a past president of her church's Alter and Rosary Society.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the Matts on 61 years of commitment to each other and their community, and wish them many more years of wedded bliss.

EARTH DAY

HON. PAUL E. GILLMOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1996

Mr. GILLMOR. Mr. Speaker, as the House was not in formal session on April 22, Earth Day, I wanted to take the floor and talk about the importance of protecting the environment. While I recognize this day was used by many to feign interest in appearing "Green," not to mention fund raise, I think it is time to cast aside the "sound-bites" and have an honest and open discussion about the best way to improve our environment.

While some people planted trees, posed for pictures with fuzzy birds, or made fiery speeches set against a scenic backdrop, it takes more than symbolism and scorecard votes to make our environment safe. Even though Russell Peterson of the National Audubon Society coined the phrase "Think Globally, Act Locally," our national environmental policy has been void of local control, flexibility, or involvement. We need the efforts and input of every thoughtful and concerned person to move environmental protection from the sloganeering stage to a daily reality.

Several times during this Congress, we have been presented with legislation in which it has been suggested that passing these bills would improve the environment. Now, without commenting on the merits of these bills, I want to suggest that many of them were dismissed out of hand because they did not follow a "traditional" protocol for environmental protection, greater regulation and/or use of expensive technology. This development troubles me in that collegiality of thought is continuing to be sacrificed on this issue.

Many here in Congress, on both sides of the aisle, as well as those in the media, propose and advance the notion that the only way to enhance environmental protection is to use the most expensive technology available or institute more restrictive regulations. I reject that notion. While new technology or tough restrictions are not in themselves evil, it shows lack of foresight and depth of understanding that other means can accomplish the same end. The bottom line is that tighter regulations and "Cadillac" technologies cost money. And, regardless of what people may think, we only have a limited amount of resources, private and public, that we can commit to environmental protection. We should be placing our resources toward the most pressing environmental concerns of our day, and getting them remediated, not chasing allegations of hearsay or negligible, scientifically defensive problems.

Let me propose one of my favorite examples of what I mean to illustrate this point. Federal regulations currently require cities to keep atrazine levels in drinking water below three parts per billion—which on the surface sounds reasonable, nobody wants to be serving up a glass of weed killer to their friends or family. However, under these levels, a human would have to drink 3,000 gallons of water, or 38 bathtubs, per day with three parts per billion atrazine to equal the dose found to be cancerous in rats. Of note, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency issued a "Health Advisory" for atrazine, which states that a child can drink water containing 100 parts per billion for 10 days or 50 parts per billion for 7

years without adverse health effects—this “Health Advisory” is much lower than the EPA guideline. Yet, the city of Columbus, OH found that compliance with this regulation could require a new \$80 million water purification plant. For the same amount of money, the city could hire an extra 2,300 teachers at the average State teacher’s salary. We must remember that protecting our environment has real costs and that we cannot squander those resources on minimal threat, extreme cost environmental boondoggles.

Another thing that we, as Americans, cannot tolerate in our environmental trek, is a cumbersome bureaucracy that makes environmental protection difficult to attain. The Endangered Species Act first passed with strong bipartisan support, all of us can agree that we should not be willfully trying to eradicate the creatures important to our ecosystem. However, the two pronged efforts of the act, protection and recovery, have become stymied in bureaucracy and court cases so that many species have become protected, but very few species have been recovered at all. This undermines the real intention of the law.

But as bad as the bureaucracy has been with the Endangered Species Act, the Superfund Program has been worse. This program, which was put into law 16 years ago to clean our Nation’s worst toxic dumps, has been a miserable failure; it is the archetypal government program. Everyone believes this program needs to be reformed. We have spent billions of dollars on this program only to see hazardous waste sites sit uncleared, with lawyers and bureaucrats drawing ever-increasing paychecks. The American people deserve a much better return on their investment. I have successfully offered an amendment to congressional efforts to reform Superfund that would force greater amounts of the Superfund’s cleanup budget—the money that should be going to “dirt moving” activity, not bureaucrats, desks, and reams of studies—to go to site remediation. The private sector generally spends over 200 percent less on administrative costs in cleanup projects than the Government. The money we save here could be used for tangible environmental improvements and I am hopeful that this important provision can be enacted into public law.

Our country has made significant strides over the last 30 years to make our environment safer, cleaner, and healthier. We should not abdicate the responsibility to protect our air, land, and water that has been established and been successful. However, we should not forget to reform or improve those laws that have actually perpetuated the problems. More of a bad thing does not make it a good thing, it only becomes a bigger bad thing—and delay is worse. This should be our credo in finding environmental problems, as well as in proposing their solutions. Trying something new, or looking at the problem in another way, does not immediately constitute an infringement on environmental protection, we all want a clean environment.

Mr. Speaker, much of the public debate on the environment has been cast in purely partisan tones, yet, I am here to set the record straight that making our natural inheritance better for present and future generations should not be confined to party identification. If we were to keep score from that perspective, as most people do in this town, I would like to remind people that the Republicans

were the first ones to embrace the cause of conservation. Teddy Roosevelt, the first real standard bearer for the National Park System, was a Republican. And, the Environmental Protection Agency was established by Richard Nixon and would have been elevated to Cabinet-level status under President Bush had certain political considerations not come to the fore.

Our environment is too important to become a political football, filled with hot air every election cycle. Emotional pleas and incendiary direct mail pieces only clutter the burgeoning waste stream of environmental perspectives. We need a science-based policy which gives us solid, substantiated information; governing by fearmongering is no way to responsibly lead. Using informed, expert opinion and legitimate data, we can make our natural inheritance better for present and future generations.

I am hopeful that this Earth Day will be an opportunity for us all to consider the environment and how we can make it better. Billions of tax dollars are spent to ensure our public health and safety, they should not fund unreasonable regulations or stifling bureaucracies. We should take a prudent, realistic course, that realizes we are currently able to accomplish a finite set of objectives, as our resources allow. And, we should see that local involvement in priority setting, on top of proven and substantiated research, lead us to environmental quality in which we can all take pride.

THE 26TH ANNUAL CELEBRATION OF EARTH DAY

HON. KAREN MCCARTHY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1996

Ms. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday marked the 26th Annual celebration of Earth Day. In the time since the first Earth Day, much has been accomplished in to the way of environmental protection. Landmark legislation such as the Clean Water Act, the Clean Air Act, the Endangered Species, Act, and the establishment of the Environmental Protection Agency have resulted from a commitment to protection of our natural resources that is exemplified by Earth Day.

There is no question that today our water is more clean and our air is more breathable than it was 25 years ago. Species that were threatened or endangered 25 years ago, such as the American Bald Eagle, are now thriving. Wetlands are better protected, toxic dump sites are more quickly identified and treated, environmentally sensitive sources of energy are being developed and put into use, and our public lands are more sensitively preserved and maintained.

The job is certainly not complete. Much can be done to strengthen the laws on the books, but much can be done to make compliance with those laws more achievable. Long-term environmental protection can only be accomplished through a partnership between the environmental and business communities. In seeking to expand and improve environmental protection, we must also consider the legitimate concerns raised by those who live with the regulations.

Despite all the positive and popular steps that have been taken to protect the environ-

ment in the past quarter century, and the additional work that needs to be done, the leadership of the 104th Congress has attempted to halt, roll back, and eliminate many of the protections for the environment we hold sacred. Legislation has passed the House during this Congress to dramatically reduce one of the most successful laws on our books, the Clean Water Act. While not perfect, the Clean Water Act has gone a long way towards cleaning up our Nation’s rivers, lakes, and streams; but the bill that passed the House rejects those successes and represents a major step backward in cleanup of polluted waterways.

Another target of this Congress has been the Environmental Protection Agency. In pursuit of a worthy cause—streamlining and making more efficient the environmental regulatory process—legislation has passed the House to establish stringent new requirements for risk assessment and cost benefit analysis of major federal regulations affecting health, safety, or the environment. Should this bill become law, it would hamstring EPA’s ability to promulgate and enforce regulations designed to protect the environment.

In addition, funding for EPA has been slashed by more than 25 percent. The House Leadership’s commitment to reducing environmental protection funding has resulted in fewer hazardous waste cleanups, a reduction in enforcement, and a decrease in needed water infrastructure and treatment programs.

Today, as we celebrate the 26th anniversary of Earth Day, it is important to reflect on the successes that have been achieved in environmental protection over the years, and the work that must continue to be done to ensure our natural resources will be preserved for generations to come. Instead of misguided attempts to roll back protection, we need to develop ways to preserve our environment that are cost-effective, efficient, and responsible.

I participated in the first Earth Day celebration in 1970 by walking to my teaching job rather than driving, and discussing with my students the responsibility each individual has to the environment. I have marked the anniversary of Earth Day each year since, and this year I helped to create a community garden with Americorps volunteers in my district.

All of my life I have worked for sound environment, and I practice conservation and recycling at home and in my offices. As a member of the Transportation Committee’s Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment, and the Science Committee’s Subcommittee on Energy and Environment, I work as an advocate for substantive changes in law and policy that will ensure a quality environment.

Concern about our environment must be reflected in each of our lives daily. From recycling our newspapers, to planting trees, to using public transportation whenever possible, together we can make our environment cleaner and safer. Let us each pledge to make every day, Earth Day.

COMMEMORATION OF THE OKLAHOMA CITY BOMBING

HON. VIC FAZIO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1996

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the Oklahoma City