

No, if America is going to pass a morality and an IQ test on November 5 in the Presidential race, they had better know something about the full physical records, the actual documents. Not summaries by doctors taking down, as when I get a physical, they say, "How is your health?"

"Pretty darn good, doc. Generally excellent." And they write all that down.

No, no, not testimony from Clinton himself, the medical records.

There are all sorts of ricochets flying around, like the center of the new book by Roger Morris called "Partners In Power." In the middle it has a brother who went to prison for cocaine under a cocaine pusher named Lassiter who got pardoned, saying my brother has a nose like a shovel. Guess of whom he was speaking, Mr. Speaker?

Rule XVIII prohibits me from telling the million or so people in our audience. Use your imagination. Who has a shovel for a nose in Federal Government today?

#### TEEN DRUG PROBLEM IS NATIONAL CRISIS

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

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor again. I have been here just about every day recently, talking about what I consider a national crisis, as a parent, as a father, someone concerned about the future of my children, how I tried to raise my children, and talk about the serious problem of teen drug use and abuse.

What prompted me today to come to the floor is really an ad I have seen which features the President talking about his efforts to curtail drug use, and I just do not think that the President is really dealing with the facts here.

Now, if we listen to the ad, the President says the Republicans cut funding in programs. Now, I just have to remind the Congress and the American people that, in fact, from 1992 to 1994, the House of Representatives was controlled, by an overwhelming majority, 250 Democrats plus, I believe, and the Senate was controlled by the other party, and the White House was controlled by the Democrats. Now, we did not have the power to do anything in that time period except raise concerns.

I came to this floor repeatedly and raised concerns. I had over 100 Members sign a letter to the committee of jurisdiction asking for hearings because we knew then what was starting to happen; that we cannot put all our eggs in one basket in treatment, in the end, treating only the wounded, as it may be in a battle, and not paying attention to education, to interdiction, and also importantly to enforcement.

Here we see the results. Again I bring this to the floor. Twice as many teens using drugs as in 1992. These are the facts. This is not something that the

Republicans have manufactured, the new majority has manufactured. It is the result of firing the Drug Czar's office, of hiring a Surgeon General, the chief health officer of the country, who says, "just say maybe."

□ 1445

Then we had a President who got on TV, and I still cannot believe it. I was personally offended by it because I have children, and he said if he had it to do over again, he would inhale. What kind of message does that send to our people? And what does it do? And the evidence is here again. These are the statistics and the latest.

Overall drug use by our teenagers 12 to 17, up 78 percent; marijuana use up 105 percent; LSD use up 105 percent during this time frame; and, cocaine use up 166 percent. And heroin is epidemic even in my own community. I brought the headlines from my community.

So what the President has sown, now we are reaping with our children. First of all, they controlled the House of Representatives, the other body, and the White House. Then, to top it off, they killed our interdiction program. And I spoke out against it on the floor. We even met with the President in Miami and we said this is a disaster. We stopped our radar sharing and our information sharing to shoot down drug planes in the Andean region.

They transferred, this administration transferred, and I met with the agents in South America who told me that they transferred, \$40 million and left them with a shoestring operation in Haiti for their agenda and nation-building in that country.

So the facts are in that just treatment does not work. You have to have education, you have to have interdiction, and you have to have enforcement. The fact is in. The Republicans expressed concern, I expressed concern on the floor of this House in letters to the chairman and to the administration about what was going to take place.

The fact is that now this new majority is taking steps to restore money in interdiction. We are giving our military and our Coast Guard the tools to stop drugs cost-effectively at our borders and at their sources. So we are taking positive steps. We are providing the leadership that is lacking in the White House.

And, again, the President is wrong when he tells the American people that the Republicans, or the new majority, cut. We did not even have control. We did not have votes to change anything here, but we did express concern and this is the results you see today. Again, a situation out of control, a situation where we have lost our streets, lost our children, and we must turn this around.

#### ENVIRONMENT MUST BE PROTECTED AT ALL COSTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May

12, 1995, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, for more than a quarter of a century successive Congresses sought to strengthen environmental law in order to protect our air, water, and land from pollution and other threats, and from the time that Democratic Senator Gaylord Nelson organized the first Earth Day over 25 years ago and Republican President Richard Nixon created the Environmental Protection Agency in 1970, there was a consensus that we needed laws to protect the health of our families and the quality of our natural resources.

It is a consensus, a bipartisan consensus, that led to passage and strengthening of the Clean Water Act, the Clean Air Act, the Endangered Species Act, the Marine Mammal Protection Act, the Solid Waste Disposal Act, Superfund, Safe Drinking Water Act, and many other pieces of pro-environmental legislation.

However, that consensus, that bipartisan consensus that existed, both with the White House as well as with Congress, broke down during the Dole-Gingrich 104th Congress that we are now in, that is now about to end. Under the leadership of Dole and GINGRICH, Congress for the first time in 25 years devoted more time to rolling back environmental protection than to improving the health, safety, and well-being of our families and our Nation.

Now, many in Congress have tried to further environmental protection in ways that would be for the average American. But Bob Dole, NEWT GINGRICH, and their Republican leadership colleagues have instituted a campaign to reward special interests at the expense of the health and environmental heritage of our citizens. From the very first day of this current Congress, we saw the special interests, the polluters, actually sitting down in committee writing legislation that would gut many of the environmental bills that I already mentioned.

Clearly, it is the obligation of those who care about the purity of the water for their children, that their children drink and the air that they breathe, to actively oppose this extremist Republican agenda that we have seen in this 104th Congress. We have to make sure that the disastrous environmental record of this 104th Congress will not be repeated.

Now, I just wanted to say that this effort, if you will, to turn back the clock on environmental protection manifests itself in a major way in terms of the budget cuts that we have seen and have been proposed by the Republican leadership for those agencies that deal with the environment, such as the EPA, such as the Department of the Interior. And I know that we have to make tough decisions if we are going to balance the budget. We have to figure out where our priorities should be.

But I do not believe that environmental protection in this country has to suffer because of belt tightening, or budget tightening if you will.

What we are seeing is that time and time again, Bob Dole and NEWT GINGRICH, the Speaker, have basically deprioritized environmental protection. They have taken money in budget cuts from the EPA and those agencies that protect the environment in order to primarily finance tax breaks for wealthy Americans.

The reason I am mentioning this today is because I am very concerned that with the economic plan that Bob Dole has put forward, that what we will see if he were elected and if that economic plan were put into place is a further deterioration of our environmental protection laws because less and less money would be available for investigation and for enforcement of violations of our environmental laws.

Basically, what we would see, what we would expect if the Dole economic plan went into effect is about a 40-percent cut, if you will, in environmental programs, 40-percent cut in enforcement and investigation against violations of our environmental protection laws.

And these cuts, if you will, these efforts to cut back on these agencies and what they can do for enforcement indirectly accomplish what the Republican leadership tried to do in this Congress by simply gutting the Clean Water Act or the Superfund Program outright. They were not able to make the changes in the substantive law, and so what they do instead is to go after the funding for those agencies that carry out the law because they know that if there is not adequate enforcement then the laws do not mean anything.

I just wanted to give an idea of what kind of impact these cuts would have if they were enacted into law. A 40-percent cut in enforcement would mean that the EPA, for example, would not be able to reach its normal average of 9,000 inspections per year. It would have a significant impact on the 3,700 enforcement actions normally taken by the EPA annually as a result of their inspection programs. So if you do not have the people to do inspection, then you cannot bring the enforcement actions, where you basically slap a fine on those who are violating the law.

Based upon estimates from last year's budget cuts, it is likely that scores of Superfund sites ready for significant new construction would not get funded and, furthermore, the cleanups at many of the hundreds of Superfund sites currently being remediated would be slowed down essentially to a snail's pace.

A 40-percent budget cut would also have a marked impact on the leaking underground storage tank trust fund that was established by the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986. Leaking tanks have polluted drinking wells in many communities, and the trust fund has proven to be an

effective effort to combat the problem. Current funding for this program represent about a 30-percent cut from fiscal year 1995 levels, and a further 40-percent cut would lead States to lay off hundreds of enforcement personnel and greatly reduce their cleanup activities.

So, even with the current appropriation levels we are seeing cutbacks in the enforcement actions and the inspections that these environmental agencies can do. Whatever cuts would come about as a result of the Dole economic plan would simply reduce the ability to enforce the law that much more.

I just wanted to point out some of these facts because I think it is important when we are debating the issue of what Bob Dole's economic plan would mean that we realize and that we take into consideration what the effect would be on the environment.

Now, I just wanted to point out also that interestingly enough, President Clinton has been very proactive in terms of what he says he would do if reelected on November 5. At the Democratic Convention he basically pointed out a progressive, if you will, environmental agenda. He said, for example, that he would accelerate Superfund toxic waste cleanup, nearly doubling the pace of cleanup. By the year 2000, approximately two-thirds of the Superfund priority sites would be cleaned up.

So here we have a situation where one person, the Republican in this case, is talking about cutting funds for some of these agencies that would mean less cleanups of Superfund sites, and President Clinton is actually talking about increasing the pace of cleanup at Superfund sites.

Also, the need to expand the right to know. One of the major reasons why we are able to bring enforcement actions against polluters for various violations that occur is because we have a community right to know law on the books now that allows individual Americans, individual citizens, to know some of the toxic substances that exist in the community around them. And often-times they will bring actions on their own or citizen groups will bring actions on their own so that it is not always necessary for the Federal Government to get involved. This supplements the enforcement action of the Federal agency.

Again, what the President has proposed is basically expanding Americans' rights to know about toxics in their community so that the EPA would do more investigation, release more information and individual companies that generate toxic waste, for example, would have to provide more information about what kind of toxic wastes are being generated in their communities.

I wanted to just give some examples about how President Clinton has worked to protect the environment, and how former Senator Dole has worked very hard to do just the opposite.

On August 6, 1996, President Clinton signed a bill reforming the Safe Drinking Water Act, which requires drinking water tests to eliminate dangerous contaminants. President Clinton also vetoed the extreme Republican leadership VA-HUD-EPA appropriations bill, which cut safe drinking water funding by 45 percent from the President's request. On the other hand, Senator Dole, Bob Dole when he was a Senator, in December 1995 voted for the extreme Republican VA-HUD-EPA appropriations bill which would have cut safe drinking water funding by 45 percent. The 1995 Dole regulatory reform bill, which was written by lobbyists for polluters, would have prevented the EPA from instituting effective safety regulations for drinking water.

Let us talk about toxic wastes. Since taking office, the Clinton administration has cleaned up more toxic waste dumps than in the first 12 years of the Superfund Program, increasing the pace of Superfund cleanups by 20 percent and reducing costs, reducing costs by 25 percent. In December 1995, President Clinton vetoed the GOP appropriations bill which cut Superfund toxic dump cleanup funding by 25 percent from his request. So not only has the President increased, accelerated the pace of the Superfund cleanup in this country in the 4 years that he has been in office, but he also vetoed these bills, the Republican leadership bills, that would have made it more difficult to clean up Superfund sites.

On the other hand, then Senator Dole in 1965 was one of only four Representatives, actually when he was a Congressman in this House, to vote against the Clean Air and Waste Disposal Act, which authorized \$92.5 million during fiscal year 1966 through 1969 for research and development of methods to dispose of solid waste. The bill passed 294 to 4. Dole supported repealing the Superfund provision which forces polluters to pay for toxic waste cleanup, and he supported repeal of retroactive Superfund liability, which is also supported by his political contributors.

What the Republican leader has proposed and what then Senator Dole has basically supported is this idea that instead of having the corporations that polluted the environment, that caused the toxic waste sites to be created, the Superfund sites, instead of having those corporations clean up the sites, we would have the Federal Government clean up the sites or pay the polluters for the work that they already did to clean up the sites.

□ 1500

Essentially instead of polluter pays, it is government pays the polluters. I see that my colleague from Minnesota is here. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his statement that he has been making, calling attention to the dismal record of this Congress responding to environmental laws and policy.

The last point that Mr. PALLONE was making with regard to Superfund is an especially important one in the end because I think of what I would characterize as extreme positions in Congress, outside the mainstream of the last 20 or 30 years of environmental law, of what we have learned and what we know and have put that knowledge to use in terms of public policy, it has been disregarded and run roughshod over. As I said in the past, I think science to some of the new majority is what the Inquisition was to religion, something to be used basically to undermine and to keep raising questions against and to withdraw from what, I think, had been historically a bipartisan effort to deal with the conservation of our resources, the preservation of what deserves to be and the rehabilitation of our landscapes and air and water, a very important endeavor, one that is strongly supported by the American people, and it reaches back over across Democratic and Republican Presidents and on a bipartisan basis in Congress.

But that has not been what has happened in this Congress. It is a great tragedy, because it meant that we did not do the big things or the little things in this Congress that needed to be addressed with regards to environmental law.

In fact, one example the gentleman was just touching on was Superfund, which means that we are still without a current policy. I think all of us admit that the 1980 Superfund law that was passed has had its imperfections. But as an example, I work on the Committee on Banking and Financial Services. Many financial institutions are saddled with lender liability. And even that fundamental issue cannot be resolved in this Congress because those forces that want to keep all liable, even though a bank may have exercised its right to recover property and the damage that has been done to it has been done by a third party, that was delinquent in terms of their loan transfers the liability to the financial institution. So it is a great tragedy that we cannot focus on that because there has not been an adequate effort to resolve that lender liability issue, the polarized positions that have existed.

Frankly, in the first 2 years of the Clinton administration, a lot of progress was made, in spite of the hand that was dealt to him by his predecessor administration in terms of a host of issues highlighted by the northwest forests. The Clinton Northwest Forest plan, a controversial plan, one that all of a sudden forced everyone to face reality. Before that I think many in congress and certainly in the administration had been in a state of denial with regards to what was happening in the Pacific Northwest with regards to the harvesting of trees and the crashing of the ecosystem in that region.

But the Clinton administration had made a commitment for a positive effort, and all the news was not good

news. As we learned more and more about these areas, we realized the fragility of those areas and what had to be done. The tragedy is that Congress on its own in the 1970's and 1980's had mandated cuts in timber harvests in these areas that were excessive over the carrying capacity of those lands in the Pacific Northwest. The truth is that dollars are gone that come from those historic big timber harvests. In so far as we do make some dollars in profitable sales areas, too often we do not have profitable sales but lose money and the forests. Today we are faced with very expensive land management schemes that are necessary to restore and maintain these landscapes in terms of forest restoration, in terms of watershed restoration, in terms of thinning and a whole range of different responsibilities in which the Forest Service itself and those that are involved in that industry could no longer sustain themselves. So they necessarily needed investment.

But beyond that, this administration had worked on the Endangered Species Act, working out significant problems in Florida with the Florida panther, working incidentally in the Everglades with regards to the water problem, arguably a good solution with regards to the sugar farmers there, the gnatcatcher in terms of the west coast in California. All across the Nation we saw a new spirit that existed, even with regards to our industries. This administration put in place something called the XL, XL means excellence in terms of environmental and compliance with rules, leaving industries and businesses to come up with solutions that really exceed the requirements of law that the Environmental Protection Agency may have with respect to air, to water, to other indices that are required. So we had, I think, for some time and throughout this administration a good positive effort embracing pragmatic solutions to problems which had festered for decades.

Unfortunately, that had not all been picked up. The whole idea of brownfield restoration, in other words, changing the whole dynamic and agenda of what we do in terms of cleanup was something that was put forth by this Clinton administration.

Many are now trying to emulate it, and that is good. In politics there is no law that bars us from taking other people's good ideas and putting them into law. I guess that is the idea. The competition of ideas, the competition of debate ought to bring forth the best that we have to offer with regard to solutions, especially I think in issues of the environment.

Of course, in the past 2 years much of that has changed, things are at a standstill here, fingers pointed back and forth. But I think as we look at what happened in the Clean Water Act, where it was an open secret that special interests reported that Washington, DC, K Street lobbyists on the front page of the newspaper had been respon-

sible for writing the Clean Water Act. It turned out to be a very bad bill and that should have been no surprise. Fortunately, that did not pass the Senate. It left the House on almost a straight party line vote, and it has not been heard from in the Senate since.

The fact there were various actions taken on the Endangered Species Act which, incredibly, the policy came out of a committee that is supposed to be the specialists in this issue, which stated that species could exist without habitat, that you could have a living animal or plant without a habitat. So you could protect it in a zoo, I guess, and make a greenhouse for plants. The proponents actually wanted to count zoo populations as protected. But it was really pretty elemental in terms of the differences that existed there. I am sure that the point is well understood.

Mr. Speaker, as we looked, sadly, some measures were not considered by the committee and were enacted such as suspending the Endangered Species Act for a long period of time, and this action did irreparable harm to some of the fostering of biodiversity in our society. Other measures like the timber salvage bill today are still, because it was signed into law and in a must pass appropriation bill; of course many of us feel the President should have vetoed that bill a second time to make the point but the President relented.

Apparently some thought that there was more authority, executive flexibility and that the President could prevent the damage from the timber rider. The courts have ruled to the contrary. Now we see the harvest of not just salvage trees but the harvest of green trees, old growth trees in the Pacific Northwest because of provisions put on the affected section 318 lands.

We areas of Montana that were wilderness study areas at one time. They were administrative wilderness study area, roadless areas that have now been opened to harvest areas like the Yak that Bass has written about, Dick Bass, many other areas that really in a sense should have been set aside and left as the way they left the hand of the creator are now being spoiled because of specific provisions that related to Montana.

Of course, the whole issue of forest health and the science of that forestry, I think, was made a mockery of by the execution of this timber rider, which suspended all the environmental laws and fundamentally provided for expedited harvest of many areas. I think that the administration, frankly, the Clinton administration under Jack Ward Thomas had in fact moved ahead, administratively, with salvage sales.

In fact, that made up a greater part of the harvest in the Pacific Northwest where there was controversy about the limits of what could be cut. It concerned many of us, but they at least had put in place certain safeguards. This measure went far beyond that and has of course as its purpose to invade these green tree areas. It has done

great damage with little money available really to offset that.

As we look at these forest sentinels that have stood for hundreds of years over the past centuries in terms of their evolution, we know that once they are harvested, they will not be back in our lifetime and the lifetime of my grandchild, my one grandchild or many, or any of, maybe perhaps his grandchildren.

Of course, this Congress attempted to put on the bidding block many, many different resources, selling our water resources, the grazing language, all very polarized, obviously we have to come to resolution with that. No one expects we are going to get wealthy as a nation and solve our fiscal problems on the back of ranchers and farmers. But clearly I think we need to expect a higher degree of conservation and stewardship on the part of those that use those lands. That is only reasonable, but not to many in this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I think we are moving in that direction under the guidance of Secretary Babbitt. He tried very, very hard, I must say. It was partly my fault and others that we did not pick up on some of his work in the last session in 1993-94. We also committed the same trespasses that I suggested in opposite direction that others are doing in this session in despoiling our landscapes. ANWR, the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, at 1.4 million acres in area on the Buford Sea north of the Brooks Range, was proposed by this Congress to be opened up.

This 1.4 million acres which is the calving area for 160,000 porcupine caribou herd really, I would say, represents a window on the Ice Age. It is the way life existed in North America 20,000 years ago when the glaciers pulled back and retreated from the ocean, the northern arctic oceans the current Buford Sea. It is an area that needs to be preserved.

It is something, I think, that while there may be a 1-in-10 chance of finding oil, there is a 100-percent chance of destroying this arctic tundra, this arctic desert, as it were, in the north of the Brooks Range.

So I think these examples indicate the actions that have taken place in the 10th Republican Congress. Of course it is no wonder that the record of this Congress is reported to be so dismal with regard to the environment. The Members have received such very low grades by objective groups looking at this, that the Republican majority have formed committees and groups on the side to try to restore their credibility.

It sort of reminds me of the story of the two Marx brothers that I adopt from my friend BARNEY FRANK. They said, when Groucho said to Harpo, he said, Harpo, who are you going to believe, me or your own eyes? So we have to look at what this 20-month record is that has occurred, not just the slogans that seems to characterize the election cycles, as we know, where everybody

seems as a prerequisite of being elected they must be an environmentalist. But being an environmentalist or being someone that is working on these issues is enormously important not just for the political stump at home or for the political stump on this floor in election years but what happens over the course of our service in Congress.

There are many more things that should be talked about, the rules and regulations game that was played here, suggesting that a Member could be against bureaucrats and rules, the various ways we put laws into effect, ending up with more and more litigation and less and less effectiveness, the result effectively tying the hands of the EPA or departments or agencies that have these responsibilities, which I might say from the land management agencies, from the other agencies that regulate our air and water, we are very fortunate in this country that they are led by professionals, and staffed by professionals from the ground on up.

They are decisions that are not necessarily political, but they certainly are authorities with regard to science and the facts and what has to be done. So we have a great task here. I think Congress has a role, an unchallenged Federal role in terms of working with the States, the significant collaboration that has gone on between the Federal and State government, the great success in terms of turning the corner on solving environmental problems.

We see streams and rivers and landscapes that are being restored because of the 30 years and many decades before that of work that went on with the great Democratic Presidents and Republican Presidents. But this Congress itself obviously had not learned those lessons, it is very clear. Whether they are being educated today in the election cycle remains to be seen.

Mr. Speaker, I just came from committee sessions, at which the Republican majority were trying to strip away the U.S. authority to designate world heritage areas. We are one of 125 countries that participate, 146 signatories worldwide trying to preserve cultural and natural landscapes. All we would have is the power of persuasion, but this new majority on September 17, 1996, want to somehow take away that power, take away whatever authority exists. The United States, which led and created this list of man in the biosphere sites, seek to limit U.S. leadership that voluntarily seeks to build, educate nations around the globe. That did not happen last year. That is happening right now.

That bill has passed out of the Resources Committee today, the committee that holds itself up as your expertise and specialist, that is suppose to be a knowledgeable group of men and women that are to guide this Congress in terms of such issues. That is what they did this day. That is the type of Congress that we have. That is the type of House of Representatives that we have had for 2 long years. I submit that

to the American people and to my colleagues in this body. I hold that up as an example of what not to do.

I thank the gentleman for yielding to me and for taking out this special order.

□ 1515

Mr. PALLONE. I appreciate the gentleman's comments, particularly since he brought out what this Republican leadership has been trying to do for the last 2 years on the natural resource issues, because that is the truth. They have basically been selling the store and trying to basically give away all of our natural resources, and I think it has to be brought out.

In addition, I know the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] talked about the record, if you will, by non-partisan groups in basically analyzing this Republican Congress, and because of the poor record on the environment that was established by the Republican leadership, they put together this Republican Environmental Task Force early in this session in order to try to highlight how they were going to improve things, and the League of Conservation Voters actually gave the members of that task force, of that environmental task force on the Republican side, a 27-percent rating.

In fact, we heard just this past Monday that a group of the most antienvironmental Republicans in Congress had urged the Speaker, NEWT GINGRICH, to remove moderate Congressman SHERWOOD BOEHLERT from his position as cochair of this Republican Environmental Task Force. They were so outraged by his behavior in trying to moderate this terrible Republican antienvironmental agenda that they actually wanted him removed as the cochair of the task force, and if they, of course, had dropped Congressman BOEHLERT from the task force, the rating by the League of Conservation Voters would have even been less than 27 percent.

So this is not something that is going away. The Republican leadership continues to this day, with only a few weeks left in this Congress, to continue to try to turn back the clock on environmental protection.

I would like to yield now to my friend, Mr. MARKEY, the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. I thank the gentleman very much, and I thank you for calling this special order because it is so important to remind the American people here at the end of this congressional session that the GOP—you know, GOP used to stand for grand old party, but today it stands for gang of polluters. They took the whole first year and a half of this Congress trying their best to undermine the environmental law which were put on the books in this country over the last 25 years. They took the EPA and they wanted to change it from EPA to every polluter's ally.

You know, the American people, they have to ask the question: Is the water

really too clean? Is the air too clean? Is there too little cryptosporidium in our water? Is there too little *E. coli* in our hamburger? Is the ozone hole too small? Can we really afford to cut the EPA, the Environmental Protection Agency, enforcement budget by 30 percent, which was the Republican proposal?

I do not think so. I do not think the American people want less environmental protection. I do not think they want their water to be dirtier, their air to be dirtier, their food to be less safe. They want it to be more safe. They appreciate the fact that in the 20th century, largely because of Democratic initiatives, we have extended the life expectancy of the average American from age 48 in 1900 to age 70 today. We have added 31 years to the life expectancy of the average American in this country in the 20th century, largely because the Democratic Party health and environmental and job safety initiatives.

What a radical change. We went from the Garden of Eden to 1900, and the life expectancy of the average American male or female was 48 years of age, added 31 years in the last 95 years, and the Republicans look at it, and they say, "Let's roll back Medicare, let's roll back Medicaid, let's roll back the Environmental Protection Agency, let's roll back all the safeguards we offered to ordinary people so their lives could be protected in ways that no one from the dawn of time until the introduction of these programs had ever been protected if they are working people, if they are ordinary people, white, black, hispanic, Asian, whatever, in our country they all get the protections."

Then they look at the Superfund Program. As you know, we have hundreds of sites across this country where polluters in the twenties, in the thirties, in the forties, fifties, sixties, they just dumped their chemicals into the water, into the ground near neighborhoods, turning the whole neighborhood into a neighborhood nightmare, but, more importantly, putting the children in those neighborhoods at risk because the water that they drank, the dirt which they might have been playing in, it came back to haunt communities, and so the Superfund Program was put into place. It is not perfect. It needed to be reformed, and the Democrats were more than willing to work to ensure that the imperfections were corrected.

But that was not the objective of the Republican Party. Their objective was to destroy the Superfund Program. In fact, they constructed something which I call the Ed McMahon polluters' clearinghouse sweepstakes, which meant that if you were a polluter, if you had already in a court of law or in an administrative proceeding accepted legal responsibility for having polluted a neighborhood and you had already cleaned it up, you will get a rebate from the Federal taxpayer, and it will

be half of all the money which we, as taxpayers, put into the Superfund Program. We give the money to the polluters, but accepted legal responsibility.

And then they had a backup solution. It is the Evian solution: Well, we really cannot afford to clean up your site, but if there is an acceptable alternative for you to get water in your neighborhood, then the site will not be cleaned up. And this is called the Evian solution. That is, if you can go down to the corner store and buy bottles of Evian every day for the rest of your life, that is a good substitute for actually having water that is drinkable coming through the tap.

Now, there is a great innovation. Everyone in America, buy stock in Evian, buy stock in any water, and, by the way, you will get no Federal subsidies for that either.

And then you have the superfence. If there is a way in which you can build a superfence around the site, not cleaning it up, well, that is a good substitute, too, for ensuring that the hazardous waste material has been taken out of the community. It is the superfence superfiction, to be more accurate, because we all know that kids on their bikes are going to go right through these fences within about 15 minutes after they are put up, and they will be riding up and down these hills, these embankments of hazardous materials, not really aware of what the long-term consequences for them and their families will be.

That is the concept that the Republicans brought to environmental reform in our country.

And then I sit on the Committee on Natural Resources. What a great idea they came up with. We have subsidies on the public lands which we give to the mining industry. We have subsidies on the public lands of the United States that we give to the timber industry. We have subsidies; we are talking billions of dollars every year that come out of the Federal taxpayers' pockets. That is money we do not ask mining companies, timber companies, grazing companies to pay the American people for use of the public lands of our country. We just give it away to these Fortune 500 companies.

So the Republicans, they said, "Well, we have a deficit crisis in America. We're going to have to do something in order to ensure we raise more money to reduce this deficit."

So they touched grazing subsidies of the Fortune 500 companies? No. Gas, timber, mining, no. We would not want to touch those people, those people who exploit our resources every day and then go and make a private sector profit on it.

What do they offer as a reform in our committee? Well, we allow grandmothers and grandfathers to get into national parks across our country for half price. What they did was strip out this spring the protection given to grandma to get in with her Golden Age passport into the national parks of America.

That is how we are going to balance the budget, on grandma's back, not the mining, not the oil, not the gas, not the timber, not the grazing industries that are on the public lands. They do not have to pay market price. But grandma, she loses her senior citizen pass.

And, by the way, and the gentleman from New Jersey knows this better than anybody, what a tough year and a half for grandma, huh? Boy, has she had a tough year and a half.

You know we have about 13 million elderly women in America who live on \$13,000 or less a year. The Republican proposal was to take their Medicare payment and increase it by \$400 a year.

And grandma, of course, has sacrificed throughout her life. A lot of people think she has really been getting too much for free here in America; you know, all these grandmothers living on \$13,000 a year and Medicaid. Well, grandpa might be in the nursing home, but the Republicans' proposal was to make grandma sell her home before she would qualify for any Federal help at all to keep grandpa in the nursing home, and we know the average cost of nursing home care in the United States is \$55,000 a year in most of the larger States, \$40,000 at a minimum even in the smaller States, \$40,000 a year.

No matter how hard you try, no matter how many years you save, you cannot save enough money, if one of the spouses has Alzheimer's or Parkinson's, to pay \$40,000, \$50,000, \$60,000 each year to keep them in a nursing home. And, by the way, 50 percent of all people in nursing homes in this country have Alzheimer's, and 70 percent of all people in nursing homes are on Medicaid. But let us make grandma sell the house before she qualifies for anything.

And, by the way, they also propose to strip off the books the regulation which said that grandpa cannot be drugged while he is in the nursing home or tied down just to keep him under control.

Mr. PALLONE. The gentleman forgot when he came to the well and challenged the Speaker on the qualified Medicaid beneficiaries we are going to take away from the poorest widows in the country where Medicaid was paying for their Medicare part B premium. You brought that up. The Speaker said he was going to correct it and he never did. You might want to mention that.

Mr. MARKEY. Again, when they were called on it out here on the floor, they said, "Don't worry, our intention is not to hurt grandma," and they never corrected it. We were forced to vote out here on the floor on the bill with grandma paying 400 extra bucks each year, and, by the way, the same bill giving \$25,000 a year tax breaks for people who make \$400,000 or \$500,000 a year. It would take 70 or 80 grandmas, each kicking in 400 bucks to then turn around and hand away 25,000 tax breaks to people making over \$400,000 or \$500,000 a year.

Now let me say this about grandma. There was one weekend where she could get grandpa out of the nursing home, and they were so happy. They decided to take the grandkids to a national park, and so they got into the 1974 Ford Fairlane with the grandkids and headed off for the national park, and then the ultimate indignity: The Republicans propose to strip away the Golden Age passport so they can get into national parks.

Now is that right? I mean, yeah, OK, maybe we should look at some of these programs, but do you really think grandma and grandpa are getting too much? You know they took us through the thirties, the Depression, World War II, and then they built us into the greatest country in the world in the fifties, sixties, and seventies that has ever been known in the history of the planet. They have sacrificed to make this the great country it is.

Now is it really fair to tell yuppies who are making \$500,000 that you deserve a \$25,000 tax break and we are going to turn again to grandma and get \$400 out of her in order to make that tax break possible? That is wrong. We should not be giving out those tax breaks to the wealthy.

And within the same bill we should not be telling the mining and the timber and the grazing industries that they should be paying market price. If you are taking coal, if you are taking oil, if you are taking timber, if you are taking grazing materials off of public lands, you should pay the same that you would pay if it was on a private piece of property. We should not be subsidizing you.

Adam Smith is spinning in his grave looking at this policy. We tip grandma upside-down on Medicare and Medicaid, and then we turn a blind eye to the people making \$500,000 a year and say, "No, we're going to give you a tax break this year." Well, where is the sacrifice, the shared sacrifice? Grandma will always do what she always has, but is it fair, before you have gone to the people, that you should ask her to sacrifice for tax breaks? That is wrong. So that we do not have to touch the mining or the grazing or the coal or the other companies on—that is wrong.

So the environmental policies of the Republican Party over the last couple of years have been just upside-down, just completely misunderstanding what the American people want.

□ 1530

They want clean water, they want clean air, they want hazardous waste sites cleaned up. They want our national parks to be protected. Again, Americans are willing to sacrifice, but they want it to be fair. They want the priorities to be correct. They do not want it to be all skewed toward the wealthiest in our society. They want it to be balanced. If it is balanced, they will sacrifice. But there is no reason why the environment has to be sacrificed in this entire endeavor.

So my point is that we have a reckoning that has arrived where the American people have to decide whether or not in fact they are going to allow for a continued erosion, and by the way, a lot of the Republicans right now, they are engaging in the moderate macarena, where for about 6 weeks here they are going to pretend that they are as concerned with all these issues as we are. The point is, though, that once they get back in January, we are going right back to where we were over the last 1½ years. We have a 6-week macarena where they are walking around, I see nothing, I hear nothing. I am with you, and they do the little twist, and let us hope we make it through this election. But we are coming right back with the same agenda, cutting, slashing the environment of this country.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for bringing this subject up. I think it is very important for us to have the American people know the critical nature of this election and the referendum that has been created on whether or not we should gut the EPA and Superfund and clean air and clean water, right down the whole line, all of these issues. I do not think that they do.

I hope that, working with the gentleman and those who have led this charge across the country, because it has been a grassroots movement, ordinary people in cities and towns all across this country, who have risen up against this environmental radicalism, I think that the day of reckoning is approaching where the voice of the people will be heard on clean air, clean water, and all the rest of the environmental issues.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I just want to thank the gentleman, because I think he is bringing back the fact that we are talking about real people here when we are talking about these policies, whether they are natural resources, clean air, clean water. We are talking about real lives and individuals that are impacted by it.

We had a hearing today as part of our Democrats' Family First agenda on environmental issues. We had three just regular citizens, essentially, from the DC metropolitan area who talked about their own experiences with health problems or environmental problems that really have not been addressed.

In other words, here we are talking about the Republican leadership trying to turn the clock back, when there are real needs that have not even been addressed, when there is a need for legislation in certain health, safety, and environmental areas that has not even been addressed, that the Republicans have not even yet thought about.

We have one gentleman who actually lives in the District of Columbia who died from Salmonella poisoning, or I should not say died, nearly died from Salmonella poisoning. He went into the whole situation of how he was im-

pacted. He was in the hospital for such a long period of time.

Last night on Dateline there was a whole expose, basically, about Salmonella poisoning, and how eggs, so many of the eggs that are now produced in the country and that people buy in the store have the potential for Salmonella poisoning. There have been hundreds of deaths and thousands of people who may have been made sick because the Federal Government has not addressed the issue of how to deal with eggs, not only producing them, but making sure they are properly processed before they get to the market and before people buy them.

Mr. MARKEY. If the gentleman will continue to yield, Mr. Speaker, it has come to my mind, listening to you, that there was another initiative which was absolutely preposterous. It was a national parks closings bill. We had a military base closings bill, because as the cold war ended, there was clearly going to be a need to consolidate military activities across this country to save a little bit of money.

The Republicans in this Congress, they decided they were going to have a national parks closings bill. They were going to close down national parks across the country. Mr. Speaker, I have been in Congress for a while and I have talked to thousands and thousands of people over my years in public service. I can tell the gentleman this, I have never had a person come up to me yet and say, "Ed, do you know what the problem with this country is? We have too many parks in this country. Really, we have to shut down the parks in this country." That is the preposterousness of their interpretation of what the American people were saying in 1994.

The American people want a balanced budget. We accept that. We are going to go along with it. We heard the message.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, that parks bill, I think they called it the parks decommissioning bill, they were trying to make out that they were going to do a study and see which parks should be decommissioned, and obviously it was a nice way of saying closed. When the bill was originally proposed, the sponsor sent a Dear Colleague to other Members of Congress and he used a national park, the Sandy Hook unit of Gateway National Park, in my district as an example of a park or recreation area that should be closed.

This summer we had somewhere between 2 million and 4 million people that visited Sandy Hook, mostly, pretty much from the New York metropolitan area; New York, New Jersey. Imagine that many people using this facility, and he is proposing to close it, and using it as an example of a national recreation area that should be closed. It is just incredible.

Mr. MARKEY. Again, Mr. Speaker, this bill is not going anywhere this year, but it just sits there right behind

the moderate macarena for the next 6 weeks. They are sending out memos about adopting a tree, or go visit a zoo and show that you are politically sensitive to the environmental concerns of your constituents, but it is the agenda of the Contract With America.

I do not think the American people understood that in 1994, but as it has been outlined in detail, as each week and month has gone by in the last 1½ years, the American people have become quite aware that it is an environmentally radical program that has been put on the books that calls into question every environmental advance we have made over the last quarter of a century. I do not think the American people want to go backwards. I think they want even cleaner water, even cleaner air, even safer areas around hazardous waste sites.

Mr. PALLONE. I think the gentleman is correct.

Mr. MARKEY. In each and every one of these areas I think they have a big decision to make in 1996, and thanks to the gentleman, I think millions are having it explained to them here today.

Mr. PALLONE. I want to thank the gentleman for coming on the floor, Mr. Speaker, and talking about this issue. I think there is no question that if you ask the average person, and certainly all the polling data that both Republicans and Democrats have done shows that people feel that there needs to be more environmental protection and more health and safety protection.

When we had our Families First hearing today and we talked, and we had witnesses that talked about some of the problems they face, we had another gentleman who was infected with *Cryptosporidium* from tap water, and almost died. We had another woman who helped organize a community effort to reduce toxic waste in her neighborhood. She talked about how we need more right-to-know measures.

So the types of things that the President has proposed, accelerating the cleanup of Superfund sites, providing more right to know for citizens and citizen groups, trying to basically provide better enforcement and more money for enforcement, this is what my constituents are telling me, and I believe when I talk to other members of Congress and other colleagues, what their constituents are telling them, that there should be more protection and more funding where necessary for investigation and enforcement.

I just want to conclude the special order today just giving an idea of what, again, the Dole economic plan would mean in terms of environmental protection. The concern many of us have is that not only many of the environmental programs, whether it be the Clean Water Act, the Clean Air Act, Superfund, that the Republican leadership in this Congress tried to gut that legislation, but even more so, that by deprioritizing funding for environmental protection, by slashing the amount of money that was available to

the EPA, to the Department of the Interior, to protect our national resources and protect our health, and to protect our environment, that by allowing those levels of cuts to be proposed and in some cases actually implemented, what we are seeing is the inability, if you will, of the Federal Government and also State governments that depend on Federal dollars to actually do the investigation and the enforcement that is necessary to carry out our environmental laws and to make sure that there is adequate protection of individual's health and safety and environmental concerns.

If the Dole economic plan were to be put into effect, we know that there would be essentially a 40-percent cut in environmental programs. So the types of cuts that were proposed in this last Congress for the last 2 years would even be deeper, and the effect would be that the environmental protection and the 25 years, if you will, of efforts on a bipartisan basis to protect the environment and improve the level of protection by the Federal Government would simply be reversed, because of the inability of Federal agencies to carry out the law.

That is what we do not want to see. That is what we do not think that the average American wants to see.

#### TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE SAM GIBBONS AND THE HONORABLE GLEN BROWDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCINNIS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

#### WATCH FOR ELECTION-YEAR SPIN IN HOUSE FLOOR SPEECHES

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, it must be confusing to the people who are watching this, both in the gallery and on C-SPAN, about what we are talking about today. During this time of our political careers in history, it is an election year. It is like selling Coca-Cola and Pepsi-Cola. You have one side that says Pepsi-Cola is better, and one side that says Coca-Cola is better. What we do is create spin efforts. We try to convince the American people that one side is going to do all of these evil things, and the sky is going to fall if indeed a certain individual is elected President.

You hear things about cutting Medicare. There is not a provision anywhere in Washington where anybody has introduced or even suggested that we cut Medicare. All of this is partisan politics, trying to convince you, trying to manipulate you, the audience, into believing their side or our side of any particular issue.

They just talked about the environment. We are not going to destroy the environment. Not one individual in this entire body wants to do anything to do harm to the environment.

So as you go through these little periods of speeches on the floor of the

House, keep in mind that it is that time of year. You are intelligent people. You can make your own mind up. Base it on character, base it on history, base it upon the future, base it on whatever you want. But keep in mind that these are like television ads. They are just a few minutes dedicated to the Members of the House to come here and express their views, and to try to convince you that the future lies in someone else's hands, or the future lies in the hands of those that have it today.

Spin is interesting here in Washington, because, you know, I heard the Secretary of Defense went over to Kuwait. I think all of us in the House knew, and certainly everybody in television land knew, and certainly, Mr. Speaker, you knew, that the Kuwaitis decided they did not want us there, even though we sent 500,000 men over there to save their country. When we tried to send 3,500 men there, they balked. But in any event, the Secretary went over there and he explained it. Finally, they let us come in.

But the spin that came out of it, and I quote the Washington Post, Mr. Speaker, it said that the Kuwaitis are inviting us over there to protect their interests. That is spin.

But for the next hour, we are not going to be partisan. We are not going to be Republicans, we are not going to be Democrats. We are going to be telling you some of the things that have taken place during the last several sessions of the Congress, and about two or three individuals that have been an integral part of that. They are two Democrats, and I am a Republican, but there are two Democratic Members of the House who are retiring from Congress this year.

I have requested 1 hour of this time to come in a nonpartisan sense to talk about these two individuals, these two Members of Congress that have made a tremendous contribution to this country during the time that they have served.

We have not always agreed. We agreed generally only on those things that were very beneficial to Alabama, because in the Alabama delegation, unlike some of the other delegations in this Congress, we work together, whether we are Democrats or Republicans. If we have a problem, if we have a need in the State of Alabama, the delegation meets on a monthly basis and we discuss with each other the needs, and why we need it.

I had a home port in Mobile that I was trying to get and got it, because I brought it to our delegation. I said, I need the help of all seven of you. We have things in Huntsville, we had an Army base in Anniston that one of our Members had some problems with. We always work together.

Some States do not work together on anything. Some Democrats never work with Republicans, and some Republicans never work with Democrats. But in Alabama we have been blessed,