

that such a disaster never happens again. We have no other choice. We must stand up to Castro. We must protect American lives, and we will do that.

Freedom will come to Cuba, and we will win that fight because we have no other choice. We are Americans.

□ 1700

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN). Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I, the Chair will now put the question on each motion to suspend the rules on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today in the order in which the motion was entertained.

Votes will be taken in the following order: H.R. 2196, de novo; and S. 1494, de novo.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first such vote in this series.

NATIONAL TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER AND ADVANCEMENT ACT OF 1995

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is on the question de novo of suspending the rules and concurring in the Senate amendments to the bill, H.R. 2196.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA] that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendments to the bill, H.R. 2196.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOUSING OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM EXTENSION ACT OF 1996

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question de novo of suspending the rules and passing the Senate bill, S. 1494, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAZIO] that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 1494, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members are recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. WATERS addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION STILL VERY MUCH ON THE MINDS OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

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, I am not sure that I will use the entire time, but I did want to seek recognition today to talk about environmental concerns, and particularly to point out some of the results of a hearing that our Democratic Environmental Task Force held yesterday on February 26. We had a full, I guess, 2 or 3 hours of hearings. We heard from not only the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Babbitt; the EPA Administrator, Ms. Browner; and also Assistant Attorney General Schiffer, but also from a distinguished panel of citizens from around the country who are concerned about environmental protection.

The reason for the task force existence and the reason for the hearing yesterday was because of our concern, Democrats' concern, that the Republican leadership in the House of Representatives has essentially used 1995, our previous year, in order to try to turn back the clock on 25 years of environmental protection in the United States.

For more than a quarter of a century, there has been a consensus, a bipartisan consensus in Congress, as well as with the President, largely with Democratic Congresses and mostly with Republican Presidents, or sometimes Democratic Presidents, but in any case on a bipartisan basis for 25 years this Congress has tried to protect the environment, improve the laws, improve enforcement, improve inspections, so that polluters, whether they be polluters of the air, the water, or our natural resources, would have to stop their efforts to continue the degradation of the environment, and if they did not, they would be penalized severely, hopefully, for their activities that were detrimental to the environment.

In fact, in many ways we can hark back to the days in the 1970's, in the early 1970's, when the Environmental Protection Agency was created under then President Richard Nixon. It was a Democratic Congress, but a Republican President in 1970 who created the Environmental Protection Agency. In fact, when the first Earth Day was organized back in 1970, President Nixon and the Republicans in Congress were very supportive of the efforts to move forward on environmental protection.

But this 25-year consensus, this 25 years, if you will, prior to 1995, when every year stronger environmental protection laws were passed and money was made available for enforcement and inspections for our environmental laws, all of a sudden in 1995 this consensus was broken and we saw the effort on the part of Speaker GINGRICH and the House Republican leadership to roll back environmental protection. And whether it was through authorizing bills or cutbacks in the budgets for these various environmental agencies, all of a sudden there was an effort by the Republican leadership to change this 25-year consensus.

The reason for that I believe very strongly is because of special interests. In other words, corporate interests, the polluters, if you will, were very much behind the Republican leadership in saying look, the time has come to turn back the clock and we expect you to come down to Washington and help us to make it easier, if you will, or less stringent, with regard to pollution, and less stringent regulations and less stringent statutes and less money available for these agencies to do their work was essentially the order of the day.

I feel that it is an obligation, not only of the Democrats but also of moderate Republicans who support the environmental protection agenda, to point out what is happening and how extremist this Republican leadership agenda is that seeks to essentially turn back the clock on environmental protection, because we know that the American people consistently support strong environmental laws and strong enforcement of those environmental laws. In fact, a survey was recently done, which I would like to point to, by American Viewpoint. It pointed out that by greater than a 2.1 margin, voters have more confidence in the Democrats than Republicans as the party they trust most to protect the environment. In fact, it even pointed out that 55 percent of all Republicans surveyed do not trust their party when it comes to protecting the environment, while 72 percent of the Democrats do trust their party to protect the environment.

So the bottom line is that environmental protection is very much still in the forefront of the minds of the American people. They did not elect a Congress in 1994, whether it be under the Republican majority or Democrats in the minority, they did not elect a Congress with the idea that the leadership of the Congress was going to come down here and try to turn back the clock on environmental protection.

What I think has been happening though is that in 1995, while this effort was going on on the part of Speaker GINGRICH and the Republican leadership, more and more they began to become aware of the fact that, particularly toward the end of the year, that this was not a popular agenda, that destroying environmental laws and turning back the clock was not something

the public was responding to in a favorable way. What we see now is an effort in some ways by the Republican leadership to suggest to their Members that perhaps they should go slow on this agenda, or maybe they should vote for the antienvironmental agenda, but not give the impression back at home that is what they are doing.

A memo was put out in fact to the Republican membership by one of my colleagues, the gentleman from Texas. TOM DELAY, who is in the Republican leadership, on September 29, 1995, and what he says essentially is that Members, when they go back to their districts, and we just finished a district work period, about 3 weeks when we were not in session and we were back in our districts and States and congressional districts, what this memo says that Republicans when they go home should try to at least give the impression to the public and the media that they are trying to protect the environment, even while they come back here and vote very differently.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY], suggests certain action items like tree planting. He suggests that Republicans should sponsor tree planting programs in their districts or participate in ongoing tree planting programs that would provide Members with earned media opportunities.

He also suggests that perhaps they get involved in local schools and meet with students to talk about recycling, or that perhaps they give out conservation awards. He talks about the Teddy Roosevelt Conservation Award, because as you know, President Teddy Roosevelt was known very much as an environmentalist and was a Republican. It says in the memo, using his name, consider establishing a yearly Teddy Roosevelt Conservation Award for someone in your district whose achievements exemplify President Roosevelt's conservation commitment. You can even recognize several award winners by establishing a youth award, a senior award, or a local business conservation award.

He goes on to suggest that perhaps the Republican Members could go door-to-door and hand out tree saplings or get involved in park cleanups or become active in their local zoo.

I am not saying any of these things are bad. I think it is great. I think it is great to participate in Arbor Day and clean up the local park and certainly good to recognize students or seniors in the community that are involved in conservation efforts and give out the Teddy Roosevelt Award. I greatly admire President Roosevelt.

Again it points out that historically conservationism, environmentalism, has been bipartisan. But I would venture to suggest that the suggestions of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY], here are really primarily cosmetic in an effort to try to give the impression that Republican Members when they are in their districts are environmentalists or conservationists,

but then they come back here and vote very much the other way. They vote for measures that break down environmental protection, that turn the clock back on the environmental protection that we have had for 25 years on a bipartisan basis.

All of us want more efficient Government. I would venture to say that every Member of this House of Representatives would like to see the deficit reduced and like to see a balanced budget, or almost every Member, certainly both Democrats and Republicans. Certainly I share that point of view. But I do not believe that in an effort to tighten the budget belt, if you will, or an effort to reduce the deficit and eliminate the deficit and balance the budget, that you have to sacrifice environmental protection. I would venture to say that environmental protection more than any other issue, and EPA and the agencies and programs involved in environmental protection, more than any other agencies have suffered severely by the Republican budget cuts or Republican budget suggestions. And if you look at the continuing resolution, the stopgap spending bill that we are now operating under, at least until March 15, you will notice that environmental protection, those agencies, those programs involved in environmental protection, are cut much more severely than almost any other agency or any other Federal program, again part of the effort to turn back the clock on environmental protection, if not through outright repeal of our laws, then certainly by cutting back on the amount of personnel or the money that is available to the agencies to do investigations, to do enforcement, to bring the polluters to justice, so-to-speak, and penalize them.

As you all know, if you have laws on the books that are very stringent in terms of protecting the environment, it does not do much good if you do not have personnel to go out and check on the polluters, bring them to justice, if you do not have the enforcement and investigation. There is almost no point in having the laws on the books at all.

□ 1715

What I wanted to do in some of the time that I have allotted to me, I wanted to at least initially give some idea in my home State of New Jersey of the impact of the Republican budget cuts. Then, if I could, I will go through some of the data that was provided by some of the speakers at our task force hearing on Monday that indicates exactly how these Republican budget cuts are impacting various environmental agencies.

As far as my home State of New Jersey is concerned, one of the major concerns is the Superfund program. The Superfund program is the national hazardous waste cleanup program. My home State of New Jersey has 107 active Superfund sites, which is more than any other State. Twelve sites have been slated for significant new

construction, in other words, remedial and major removal actions will be shut down by the budget cuts that have been proposed.

I am not going to get into all the list of the sites. I would like to submit them for the RECORD. But the bottom line is that we have at least 12 sites that would see no remedial action, no restoration at all, even though they are on the national priority list.

There are 30 other sites in New Jersey with ongoing work that will experience shutdowns or slowdowns as a result of the budget cuts, with various impacts. So for these other 30, all the work will not stop completely but it will be significantly slowed down. For example, at the Montclair, Glen Ridge, West Orange radium site, the EPA will have to stop cleaning up radium contaminated soil in a residential neighborhood. In disposal sites, buried waste containers would continue to leach contaminants into groundwater. In addition, 34 sites where responsible parties are performing cleanups could be stopped if the region is not provided with funds to oversee those cleanups.

What I am talking about here is the fact that under the Superfund program, it is only if you cannot find a responsible party, in other words, a polluter that we know caused the pollution to take place, that the Superfund or the Federal dollars have to be used. In most cases, the sites are being cleaned up by the polluter, the responsible parties. And in 34 cases in New Jersey alone, where responsible parties are performing the cleanups, there will not be any kind of Federal oversight of the cleanups, which means that essentially they could be stopped. If the Federal Government cannot go in and see what they are doing, they may not, the polluters may not actually be able to perform the cleanup.

Separate from the Superfund program, there is an impact of these cuts on leaking underground storage tanks. This is another Federal program with Federal dollars involved. There is a reduction from fiscal year 1995 of about \$500,000, a half a million dollars, in that program which means 278 cleanups will not be initiated and 303 cleanups will not be completed. So here again an important program, underground storage tanks, leakage from that, again toxic waste, hazardous waste sites that are not going to be cleaned up.

Very important to the State of New Jersey also is the safe drinking water program, not just to New Jersey, this is important nationally. The EPA estimates that more than 6 million residents of New Jersey are served by drinking water systems that violated public health standards last year. Budget cuts, again the Republican budget cuts, will reduce the funding available to these communities to improve their drinking water systems by about \$5 million.

Now, an area that I am personally very committed to, and it is very important to my district, is clean water.

New Jersey historically has taken a major interest in efforts to improve our water quality. Historically many of its waterways were severely polluted. According to the EPA, about 85 percent of New Jersey's rivers and streams are too polluted for basic uses like swimming. The goal of the Clean Water Act is fishable, swimmable waters. If you cannot achieve those goals, then you are not doing your job here in Congress.

So we have to try to at least move forward in achieving those goals. But under the fiscal year 1996 conference report, again, the Republican proposal, New Jersey stands to lose \$52.05 million in clean water funding that would help stop pollution from getting into the State's waters, lakes, and streams as well as in the Atlantic Ocean. This represents a 53 percent cut from the fiscal year 1995 enacted funding level.

Also, huge cuts in New York's waste water treatment loans and other clean water funding threatens New Jersey beaches through washups of untreated sewage and wastewater. Again, I was elected to Congress for the first time in 1988, after a summer when most of our beaches in New Jersey were closed because of pollution problems, basically debris, medical waste, water quality problems that generated primarily from north Jersey as well as New York City.

If grants and loans are not available to both New Jersey and New York, particularly in the northern part of the State or the New York metropolitan area, then those same pollution problems will continue to exist or get worse. The consequence of that is that maybe not this summer certainly but in a few years if the funding is not available to upgrade wastewater treatment to prevent problems related to combined sewage overflow, where it rains and your storm water and debris from your streets get in to basically bypass the sewage treatment plant and end up into the Hudson and then eventually come down to the coast of New Jersey, if those problems now begin to be aggravated again because there is not enough Federal dollars going back to the States for wastewater treatment, then we could easily see in a few years down the road a repeat of some of the beach closings and similar type problems that we had in the late 1980's in the State of New Jersey.

These clean water efforts are not just water quality issues. They are obviously economic issues because so many jobs in the State of New Jersey are dependent upon clean water for tourism during the summer season. In New Jersey now, tourism is one of the most significant industries in the State. So it has a major economic impact, meaning dollars will be lost. The tax dollars will not be coming from the Federal Government if we do not continue our effort to constantly upgrade our sewage treatment systems and effectuate clean water.

The last thing I wanted to talk about is enforcement. In New Jersey, essen-

tially with these Republican budget cuts, the environmental cop will be off the beat as inspections and enforcement efforts will be severely curtailed on the Republican budget proposal which represents a cut of 25 percent below the President's budget request. So with regard to enforcement alone, we are talking about a 25 percent cut.

Decreased inspections due to cuts create public health threats that would have to be addressed by a staff much smaller by the budget cuts. And in region 2—region 2 for the EPA includes New Jersey as well as New York—there are reports that as a result of the ongoing budget problems there is a growing backlog of permits which they have been unable to process.

In other words, again, we will not even get to the issue of proper enforcement or inspection because they would not even be able to review the whole question of permits, discharge permits for clean water or permits for any other kind of environmental activity.

I see that one of my colleagues from Minnesota is here, Mr. VENTO. I am glad that he is joining us here today. I would yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and commend him for his order talking about the environment and the effects of the curtailment of funding that has persisted this fiscal year, the fiscal year that began October 1. And for 4 weeks of that period of time the programs that affect the environment, the EPA, the Department of Interior, and numerous other programs that through the Department of Commerce, such as NOAA and so forth were in shutdown. There is no funding for them. That was a contest because there was a difference in priorities, sometimes between the House and the Senate, sometimes within the Senate and the Senate and the House and the House, and sometimes even with the President that did not agree with the actions of this Republican-led Congress. So for 4 weeks, 20 percent of the time, we end up spending \$1.4 billion in terms of employees' wages that could not work. But more importantly than that is that the cost of that goes well beyond, well beyond the dollars spent on the employees and the work not accomplished, because as we learned on Monday, yesterday, the fact was that the EPA director, the Secretary of the Interior, the Justice Department is unable to do its job. It is unable to collect the information and the data that they need to, for instance, enforce laws that deal with clean air, that deal with clean water, that deal with toxic substances that might be and do occur regularly in the environment.

The fact is that if you have a shortfall without funding in the collection of the database of information on what is happening, that is the first thing that will raise reasonable doubt in a court of law. I am not an attorney, but I do not think it takes an attorney to

understand the fact that when you have holes in your body of knowledge and information, that it is impossible to bring an action, legally, a legal action to in fact enforce these very, very important laws.

Now, I think that it seems like it is almost a prerequisite of all the Members of Congress to attest that they are, as a condition of their employment, as a condition of their service in this body, that they are all avowed environmentalists. But there are environmentalists and there are environmentalists. There are those that I am not so interested in what the nomenclature is that they claim or the identity that they claim for themselves as I am in what the actions have been in this Congress and what the consequences are. So I think we ought to understand that when we defund various types of investigatory work, various types of legal work that affects the environment, that we are actually, we are actually in a way repealing the very effect of those laws that are so important to the protection of our health, to our safety, and to the environment.

This morning I had the opportunity to listen to some of the technical experts from the Department of the Interior, from the Fish and Wildlife Service. And last year what happened, in 1995, is the Congress, through a rescission bill, repealed or forbid, put a moratorium on the listing of threatened or endangered species.

I do not know if the gentleman from New Jersey had mentioned that because I was on my way to the floor, but today we have 243 endangered species of plants and animals that are unable to be listed. We have done all the work on them. We have cooperated with the States. We have gone through the scientific evidence. We have explored all the ramifications of it, that is to say, that the Fish and Wildlife Service has, who are legally charged with this, but they cannot list these particular species as to their protection.

The general policy, the law signed by Richard Nixon in the early 1970s, the Endangered Species Act, said that we were, as a community, as a Nation, as a policy were going to try and protect these threatened and endangered species. In addition to that, there are 180 some other, 182 other candidates species that would be listed. So here we have a collection of some 425 species that are probable for listing under the Endangered Species Act. And by action of this Congress, we have unilaterally, without a vote on this floor necessarily or any other action, just cut off the funding so no one can do any listing, put a moratorium on it, no funding, no listing, put a moratorium on it.

And the fact is the problems with this grew out of the same sort of attitude in the past administration. The then Bush administration had a lawsuit that was filed on the part of various groups that he was not in fact, they were not, under then Secretary of

Interior Manuel Lujan, actually proceeding properly with the listing of endangered species. They agreed, prior to the new administration taking power, incidentally, that they would accelerate the rate of listing of endangered species.

So when President Clinton and Secretary Babbitt took on the responsibility of the administration in 1993, they already had problems in the sense that there was a significant number of species that had not been listed, plants and animals, that actually, of course, caused some degree of acrimony, because it was the sort of fits and starts type of effort with people taking their own, that is to say, an administration taking its political view, its own personal view and superimposing it over what the normal law should be in terms of listing this.

I think the American people have spoken loud and clear with regards to their views and the polls, as we read them, concerning the environmental policies and laws that have been enacted over the past 25 years. I think it is patently ridiculous for this Congress to try to hide behind the spending bills, to fold into them all sorts of changes, dramatic changes. They have overreached in terms of the environment. A lot of people want to get up and proclaim, as I said, that they are environmentalists. But when they vote for spending measures and policy changes inherent in those spending measures, or shortfalls, I mean we keep saying that most of the damage has not been done to the environment. That is not correct. If you do not fund these, you stop the proper flow of lawsuits. In fact, you destroy the database which is necessary for the prosecution of lawsuits for a long time into the future.

□ 1730

So tremendous damage is being done by this lack of funding. Of course there are some direct policy implications, as I said, with the Endangered Species Act. I think on another occasion we might want to talk about the so-called timber salvage in the clear cutting of old growth forests in the Pacific Northwest and the types of policies that are flowing from that particular law and the lack of consideration of forest health. I mean, we may want to talk about that, but there is enormous damage that is being done and has been done by this Congress because the President cannot spend money that he is not provided. He cannot move forward on legislation when there is not funding. The Congress is absolutely responsible. Congress has a tremendous amount of power in terms of the purse strings, and my problem with this Congress is that it is conducting itself in an irresponsible way by not funding properly the laws that are in place. If you want to change the policy, let us have a vote on this floor and vote it up or down. But to undercut it by not funding these particular policies and hiding behind that particular artifice I

think is wrong, I think it is irresponsible, and I think it is inconsistent with the sound policy making that should characterize this body. We ought to be looking at what the impact is on the economy, we ought to be looking at what the scientific evidence is, we ought to be looking at what is morally right or wrong with regards to these issues, and we ought to be looking at what the people we represent think, what their views are. All of that ought to be considered.

But that is not what is being considered in this instance. What is being considered and what is dominating this Congress on the environment is an overreach, an extremism and anti-environmentalism, an attitude of policy making by anecdote, by not considering properly the issues and how they will effect us, and we are having and this Congress itself is having an adverse effect, a very negative effect, on what the future or what our role is as stewards and what the legacy is that is going to be left for future generations by destroying our clean water.

The progress we have made I might say has been very grudging, it has been expensive, it has been inconvenient. We have caused great anxiety because we have taken on and tackled these problems in past decades, and it was not me. I have not been here as long as many that came before us, and it has been bipartisan, but that is not the case in this particular Congress. This Congress is ideologically hell bent to undercut the environmental progress and to serve the needs of special interests.

That is how it adds up, that is the bottom line. Look where the money goes, look who benefits from these particular changes. They are not measures to fight the deficit, they are creating an environmental deficit in this country that our grandchildren and children will be paying for a long, long time. I think these arguments of balancing the budget and claiming that they are doing that on less government—you want less Government, you want dirty air, do you want dirty water, do you want to destroy the pristine resources that we have in this Nation? I think the American public would answer that very loudly with a no, in the negative, and I think that, I hope, this Congress can wake up and stop some of the damage that they are causing by these shortfalls in terms of funding that have persisted and persist right now.

If we do not stop it, we are going to see a defunded and a much reduced ability of the EPA and the Justice Department and the others that we charge with the responsibility, a much reduced ability to carry out that particular responsibility, and I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for asking for this special order and for the work he is doing on the Task Force on the Environment.

Mr. PALLONE. I want to thank my colleague from Minnesota for the

statement and the comments that he made. One of the things that the gentleman pointed to was the fact that in many cases the ideology, if you will, that the Republican leadership is articulating really is not true in terms of what the actual effect is. I mean one of the things that they keep stressing is how they have to cut the budget for environmental protection in order to save money, that somehow that is going to, you know, lead to serious deficit reduction, and in fact when we look at some of the cuts and some of the changes that they are proposing, it has just the opposite effect. I thought some of the strongest testimony at our hearing yesterday was by the assistant attorney general and also by Carol Browner, the EPA Administrator, where they were pointing out that because of the Government shutdowns, because of the cutbacks in funding for personnel, that they have not been able to basically prosecute polluters and collect penalties that come back as a result of successful prosecution, and they have not been able to find those who violate their permits, and so are actually losing a tremendous amount of money that comes back from the penalties and the loss of income that results from not getting the penalties and the fees from that during this process.

So I think again one of the purposes of our task force is to sort of be a truth squad and say, here, look, you are articulating this ideology that you are going to save money, but you are really not because actually we are getting fewer dollars in here, we are not prosecuting, we are not enforcing the law.

Mr. VENTO. If the gentleman would yield, we are losing the data base in order to successfully prosecute in these particular instances, so the \$1.4 billion lost for 4 weeks, the underfunding; for instance, they cannot even send people in the field because they do not know if they will be able to come back.

We heard from a third grade student yesterday that had asthma that was effected by the smog and the other types of problems that are occurring in the air, and obviously I think that many could benefit from listening to that child, that kid, that was in fact very much affected by the fact that our clean air laws are not being permitted to function, and it is actually causing an adverse effect on his health and his ability to in fact participate in sports and do a variety of other things.

So it is not just the technical aspect, it is a very human aspect of this, and yet there is a sort of a head in the sand attitude with regards to this Republican leadership of extremism and serving the needs of special interests at the same time they are undercutting the very fundamental basic trust to the people we represent.

Mr. PALLONE. Thank you. I would like to yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding and thank him also for his strong leadership on this issue. I am pleased to join

our colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota, [Mr. VENTO], and the gentleman from New Jersey, [Mr. PALLONE] in this special order.

It is very interesting. I recently just had an environment town meeting in San Francisco, and it was environment and health, and we addressed very directly the proposals that are being made in this House of Representatives that effect the environment and just the subject you were talking about and how it effects individual health.

The public is on to this. They are very, very interested in what is happening here in this House of Representatives, and they are very concerned about the riders that were placed on the VA-HUD bill, obviously making that complete veto bait for the President.

But it is not enough for us just to defeat those riders, however important that was, and it took a bipartisan effort for us to have a majority vote to defeat them. However, many of the same Members of this House who voted against the riders then went on to support the bill, which had huge cuts in the EPA budget, thereby tying the hands of the EPA to do its job. Now certainly if there is any alteration that we want to make in regulations, et cetera, governing EPA, everything is up for discussion, but not serious defunding, which says to the EPA, well, we would not have the riders but you would not have money either to enforce it. Right now we are planning another meeting about breast cancer and the environment and the relationship of not having clean air, clean water, whatever else.

I think it is a very explosive issue. As I say, the public is very concerned about it. It is an environmental issue that is distinct from saving certain endangered species that some think is not necessarily important in their lives, although we see the connection in nature among all of us.

But these issues of environment and health, the EPA budget restrictions on enforcement, are issues that are important to our children, and in a Congress that talks about values and in a Congress that talks about our children's future two things are for sure: If we want our children to lead healthy lives we must make sure they live in a healthy environment, and second is we are never going to reduce the deficit as long as we would allow our environment to be polluted, causing illnesses, causing cost, and of course reducing quality of life.

One of the reasons many of us are in politics is to extend the protection that we give our own children as parents beyond the home, but there is only so much we can do, and protecting the environment is one thing the American people look to government to do. It never happened under the honor system, and it requires the government role, government regulation, and it calls for a Federal Government role so that our entire country is safeguarded.

With that, I once again want to thank the gentleman for his leadership on this as well as for holding the hearings yesterday and his ongoing leadership on the issue of protecting the environment, and if the gentleman is not using all of his time, I would like to be yielded to again toward the end of his remarks.

Mr. PALLONE. Absolutely, and I want to thank the gentleman from California [Ms. PELOSI] for those remarks, and you know it is interesting, because when we had the hearing yesterday Carol Browner, who is the Administrator of the EPA, pointed out what difficult choices we are going to face over the next few months or the next year if the level of spending or the budget levels that we are operating under now, if this continuing resolution were to continue through the end of the fiscal year, and she specifically said we are talking about the public health.

Again, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] talked about endangered species, and there are obviously a lot of natural resource issues that we are concerned about, but we are specifically talking about public health and how it is going to be impacted, and if I can just briefly mention, because it really did not get a full hearing yesterday, but Browner specifically pointed out that under the budget proposed by the Republican leaders the American people will be faced with terrible choices with regard to public health issues. She mentioned will the EPA set effective standards to control Cryptosporidium and disinfection by-products in our drinking water, or will we set standards that will remove 1 billion tons of toxics and other pollutants each year from rivers and lakes, standards to control water pollution from the pulp and paper industry? Will we strengthen our standards for protecting the public from smog and smoke particles of air pollution or will we issue new standards for industrial toxic air pollutants?

These are standards that they were about to embark on in this fiscal year. In other words, if they had this level of funding that was requested by the administration the EPA would be able to move ahead and regulate these industries in that fashion and meet those standards for public health reasons, and she pointed out, for example, that with the drinking water standards for the Cryptosporidium and disinfection by-products you have associated health risk like severe gastrointestinal illnesses and increased incidences of cancer with the industrial water pollution standards for metal products, industrial laundries, landfills and incinerators, pollution reduction goals where so many millions of pounds per year would not be taken out of the environment if we do not have the level of funding that was requested.

She talked about with air pollution the need to strengthen small particle standards. She talked about burning

diesel fuel, burning garbage, standards that were going to be in place for those this year, and you have associated health risks of eyes, nose and throat irritation, respiratory illnesses, increases in mortality.

Obviously, I could go on and on with this and I would not, but my point is, and I think you made the point very well, is that we are talking about health risks, and that is what this is all about. You know the last 25 years, when on a bipartisan basis the Congress and President sought to improve and strengthen our environmental protection laws and to increase enforcement, were based primarily on the need to protect public health and is certainly one of the reasons why life expectancy is longer, and now there was an article that was in today's paper that said even though people are living longer they are also leading healthier lives, even when they are senior citizens, that they, you know, lead much healthier lives and are able to function in much better ways.

I am very concerned about the fact that what the Republican leadership is proposing here in turning back the clock on environmental protection is really going to have ultimately, if we let it happen, a terrible impact on the Nation's health, but hopefully you and I and the rest of us will make the point over the next few months so that we can prevent this turning back of the clock and maybe even get to some progressive environmental legislation that will improve the public health.

I would like to yield to the gentleman from California [Ms. PELOSI] now for the additional time that she may consume. I know she has something about former Governor Brown that she would like to say.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and once again want to commend him for his leadership on this.

We have talked about the environment for many years in the Congress. The expression "environment and health" now go hand in hand, as they have for a long time, but, as I say, in the public's mind, and I think that if the public is mobilized and understands what is at risk here, then maybe the environment will once again become an issue which has bipartisan support, protecting the environment has bipartisan support, and is no longer an issue of controversy on the floor of the House, and if that is so, it will be in due measure, large measure, to your hard work on this, Mr. PALLONE, and I once again commend you.

□ 1745

TRIBUTE TO EDMUND G. "PAT" BROWN

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I am very grateful to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] for yielding time to me this evening, as I was not on the floor when my 5 minutes came up.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about the former Governor of California, "Pat" Brown. The life of Governor

"Pat" Brown spanned nearly the entire 20th century, and made an indelible mark on the history of California.

Born in San Francisco before the great quake, Edmund G. "Pat" Brown was one of our city's finest citizens, and a leading advocate for progress for California. His death last week at the age of 90 was eulogized at a San Francisco funeral Mass at St. Cecilia with the archbishop present, attended by Government officials, civic leaders and citizens who never ceased to admire his awesome tenacity. As a public figure in San Francisco, Governor Brown's legendary optimism and energy characterized the spirit of his hometown, San Francisco.

Mourners, thousands of mourners, joined four generations of the Brown family, the Governor's wife of 65 years, Bernice Brown, their four children, 10 grandchildren, and many of their 13 great grandchildren in remembering the personal qualities that distinguished Pat Brown throughout his political career and in his later years as a private man. All of these people had many stories to tell. In the interest of time, I will not go into those stories right now, but they will be stories that will be heard over and over about this legendary man and his great heart.

Governor Brown's generosity and warmth emanated from his devotion to family. He thrived on the closeness of his growing family, champion their ambitions, proudly cheered their successes. From the 1970's to the 1990's, he campaigned for the two children who followed in his political footsteps to hold statewide office: his son, as you know, Jerry Brown, who served as Secretary of State and as California Governor, and daughter Kathleen Brown, who served as California Treasurer, and who won the Democratic nomination for the Governor in 1994.

At the funeral services, though, even though "Pat" Brown was a very public man, Governor Brown's grandchildren ruled the day. They affectionately recalled that he loved to do whatever the children wanted to do. "He loved us, he loved politics, he loved California, and he loved the law," granddaughter Kathleen Kelly said. She told the crowd that her grandfather cried with joy with learning that she had passed her bar exam to join the profession he so respected.

Though 30 years have passed since he led our State in the Governor's office, Californians are still reaping the benefits of his bold achievements. His accomplishments were many during his years as San Francisco's district attorney, California's attorney general, and the State's Governor for 8 years of tremendous growth. Californians are particularly grateful for the lasting foundation he built to ensure the excellence of California's public system of higher education. Former Governor Jerry Brown described his father's contribution to education as a powerful legacy. His death has generated an outpouring of condolences and expressions of grati-

tude from people who credit Governor "Pat" Brown for the chance to earn a diploma.

Governor "Pat" Brown set a standard for educational opportunity that we, his benefactors, must strive to maintain. The State's universities and colleges were a model for the Nation and a cornerstone of the economic prosperity that California enjoyed for decades. Governor Brown created this enduring legacy of access to higher learning by enjoining all Californians to share his enthusiasm for investing in the future. The people of our State made that commitment under the Governor's leadership. Now we can pay tribute to his public service by renewing a commitment to today's generation of aspiring students.

No tribute to Governor "Pat" Brown could overlook his dedication to the Democratic Party and its principles, that is democratic with a capital D. An outspoken partisan, he built party loyalty, articulated Democratic values, and fully participated in the political battles to determine Democratic leadership. He was a politician in the most admirable sense of the term, believing that the true leaders must activate the citizenry in order to achieve their goals.

Democrats will miss Governor Brown's presence at State and national party gatherings and his abundance of options on the pressing issues of the day, but the education and economic infrastructure for he built for all Californians will live long beyond his time among us, and the intangible monuments to his greatness will always be present in his wisdom and vision, inspired by his genuine love of family.

As his daughter Kathleen described her father, he was a man who, for all his accomplishments, was a man of a singular inexhaustible spirit of love. We all will love and long remember and respect and admire with great affection the legacy and the person that was California Governor "Pat" Brown.

THE NATIONAL CAMPAIGN TO REDUCE TEEN PREGNANCY

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, since I have a few minutes remaining on my time, I believe I have a few minutes remaining on my time, I wanted to associate myself with the time being taken by our colleague, the gentlewoman from North Carolina, [Mrs. CLAYTON], to talk about the promise and potential of our young girls growing up in our Nation today. These young women should have enormous promise and opportunity to succeed and make great and positive change in our world. That opportunity should not be denied or deterred because of the alarming problem of teen pregnancy. There are many ways to combat the rising rate of teen pregnancy. One is to educate State and community decisionmakers about adolescent pregnancy and its causes. Another is to educate youth about their options and possibilities. It is possible that many teens would think twice about engaging in unsafe sexual activ-

ity if they were able to gain clear awareness of the personal cost and responsibilities associated with becoming pregnant and raising a child.

In that spirit, I applaud the efforts of the National Campaign to Reduce Teen Pregnancy. We should all join with the campaign in its goal to take a clear stand against teen pregnancy and to reduce the teen pregnancy rate by one-third by the year 2005. I was proud to be one of a large group of Members who signed the letter of the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON] to President Clinton in support of this campaign.

In the interest of time, Mr. Speaker, I will submit the rest of my statement for the RECORD, because I took this time because it was the time that was available, but the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON], is our leader on this issue. If there is any time remaining, I would like to yield some of it to the gentlewoman from North Carolina, in addition to the time that she will have on this subject, commend her for her leadership, and thank her for calling us to the floor on this subject today.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about promise and potential. Young girls growing up in our Nation today should have enormous promise and opportunity to succeed and make great and positive change in our world. That opportunity should not be denied or deterred because of the alarming problem of teen pregnancy.

There are many ways to combat the rising rates of teen pregnancy. One is to educate State and community decisionmakers about adolescent pregnancy and its causes.

Another is to educate youth about their options and possibilities. It is possible that many teens would think twice about engaging in unsafe sexual activity if they were able to gain clear awareness of the personal costs and responsibilities associated with becoming pregnant and raising a child.

I applaud the efforts of the national campaign to reduce teen pregnancy. We all should join with the campaign in its goal to take a clear stand against teen pregnancy and to reduce the teen pregnancy rate by one-third by the year 2005. I was proud to be one of the large group of Members who signed Representative CLAYTON's letter to President Clinton in support of this campaign.

I believe that for this campaign to be successful we need to do much more than take a firm stand against teen pregnancy. To succeed in reducing teen pregnancy, we must succeed in fostering the self-esteem of young girls and boys. We are responsible to let each of them know that there are people who love and support them. That love and support does not have to come from a child of their own. That love is something they can give to themselves—a feeling of self-worth that will allow teens to say no in the face of difficult decisions or pressures to be sexually active. That sense of self-worth comes from family, from school and from the community.

Funding for the title X Family Planning Program is also a key component in our fight

against rising rates of teen pregnancy. Preventing unintended pregnancies among sexually active teens through counseling and education is the highest priority of Federal family planning programs.

Community based teen pregnancy prevention programs place a strong emphasis on avoidance of unprotected sex, or avoidance of sex completely during the teen years. The community level is where we all need to get involved to assist young people through the difficult prospect of growing up in this uncertain world we have made for them.

We can offer teens activities like summer youth employment, like school-to-work programs, like after school programs and activities. We can encourage them to become involved in their communities—to volunteer their services to help the lives of others, rather than creating a life in a difficult environment.

And we can definitely help by refusing to make out-of-wedlock childbirth and pregnancy the scapegoat in the welfare reform debate. Denial of AFDC benefits to unwed adolescent mothers is cruel. This is not the way to deter teen pregnancy. This is the way to increase the number of poor women and children in this Nation.

We can achieve a significant reduction in teen pregnancy the same way we can achieve real welfare reform—by offering positive, long-term solutions.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON].

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I just want to thank the gentlewoman for joining me. I will have the opportunity to address the House for 5 minutes, but I think your approach is correct, that to indeed approach the community and raise their awareness as to their opportunity to encouraging young people to be positive, and at the same time, we provide the young people with the option of development skills and life skills that they would elect to go forward with their lives and develop, and would not, perhaps, engage in destructive behavior.

I would say part of this is economic, and the other is social. All of us have the responsibility. Finally, to the extent I do have a moment, I would say this is not something that Congress itself can do, this is something that all society has to be part of. I would encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle that this is an opportunity where we work can work together. It does not make any difference of party affiliation or politics or philosophy. I think all of us would rather see young people develop their skills and be mature when they became parents. It would give an opportunity for our society to be better. Thank you for allowing me to participate as well.

Ms. PELOSI. It is under your leadership that we are here today.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that in addition to what the gentlewoman is saying, we must do all we can in succeeding to foster the self-esteem of our young women and actually our young men today. We are responsible to let each of them know there are people who love and support them,

that love and support does not have to come from a child of their own, and that love is something they can give to themselves, a feeling of self-worth that will allow teens to say no in the face of great decisions or pressures. That sense of self-worth comes from the family, from school, and from the community.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, unless the gentlewoman from North Carolina would like this time, I would like to yield back the balance of my time. I have spoken on three issues: Supporting the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] on the subject of the environment and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] on the importance of the environment to the health of the American people; and on the subject of teen pregnancy.

In my close, I would like to say, once again, thank you to Edmond G. Brown, Junior, for the—Edmond G. Brown, "Pat," Senior, for his contribution. I know I speak for every member of the California delegation when I say to the Brown family that we are grateful for their unselfishness with "Pat" Brown in making him part of our State's history, and his great legacy is one that will live for a long time to come, and extend on behalf of our delegation condolences and deepest sympathy to Mrs. "Pat" Brown.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina). The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, is it not correct under special orders, the individual managing the time is supposed to be here in the Chamber when the special order is underway?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct, ordinarily, but during the first hour the minority leader and the majority leader may reallocate the time as they see fit.

Mr. WELDON. I thank the Speaker. I just asked that question in case it arises again. We did not object, and I would not object, but I just wanted that clarified for the RECORD.

DEMOCRATS CONTINUE TO IGNORE IMPENDING MEDICARE BANKRUPTCY

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

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, Medicare is in critical condition. For nearly a year now, the President and the liberal House Democrats have refused to address Medicare's impending bankruptcy. In fact, they have ignored the warnings of the Medicare trustees and instead demagogued this issue, waging a campaign of fear and misinformation.

When the Republican-led Congress sent a bill that passed the House and

the Senate to the President which would have saved Medicare from bankruptcy and preserved it for future generations, the President vetoed the bill. Yet, 3 weeks ago yesterday, new evidence revealed that Medicare is indeed going bankrupt faster than the Clinton administration admitted. Three weeks ago yesterday, there was an article in the New York Times, not exactly a conservative publication, that said the Medicare insurance trust fund lost money in 1995.

This little article reads: "Medicare's Hospital Insurance Trust Fund lost money for the first time since 1972, 2 years earlier than officials in the Clinton administration had predicted." That is what the New York Times reported, again, 3 weeks ago yesterday. "We had projected that 1997 would be the first fiscal year with a deficit," said Richard S. Foster, chief actuary of the Federal Health Care Financing Administration, which runs Medicare. "Once the trust fund starts losing money, the losses are expected to grow," the New York Times reported.

Then the next day the Washington Post reported the following: "The White House confirmed a report yesterday that suggested the Medicare hospital trust fund may be hemorrhaging even faster than previously expected—ending fiscal 1995 with a balance that was \$4.7 billion lower than predicted."

In April 1995 the Medicare Board of Trustees, including three Clinton Cabinet officials and the commissioner, or the Director, of the Social Security Administration, warned Congress and the President that Medicare would be bankrupt by the year 2002 unless it took steps to preserve Medicare from bankruptcy and to reverse the soaring spending rate, the exponential spending rate path Medicare was on to bankruptcy.

The Clinton administration, of course, tried to sweep these findings under the rug. When the President spoke to the White House Conference on Aging just a month later, in May of 1995, he never mentioned the Medicare trustees' report. Instead, the President and the liberal House Democrats spent most of last year, and again, the early part of this year, blasting Republican plans to save Medicare. But as I mentioned earlier, according to the New York Times, the Clinton administration had data as far back as last October that indicated that the situation was far worse than predicted.

While the administration had estimated a projected surplus in the Medicare trust fund of \$4.7 billion for 1995, in fact the balance in the trust fund fell by \$35.7 million; as I mentioned, the first time since 1972 that the trust fund has lost money. So clearly we now know Medicare is headed for bankruptcy even earlier than 2002, and the President and the liberal House Democrats have no plan to save it.

In fact, they have done virtually nothing to address the problem. For 10 months the President and the liberal