

UNEMPLOYMENT AND UNDEREMPLOYMENT IN AMERICA

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, shortly before Christmas, all in the same week, we received the news that three separate plants in my district were closing.

The two largest employers in Tellico Plains, in Monroe County, TN, announced that they were moving, one to Honduras, one to Mexico.

The largest employer in Etowah, in McMinn County, TN, Morgan Manufacturing Co., a blue jeans manufacturer, announced that it was going into bankruptcy, due primarily to NAFTA.

Tellico Plains is a town of about 1,000 people. Etowah is a town of about 4,000. These are beautiful, wonderful places to live, but jobs are not easy to come by.

These three companies meant a loss of about 1,000 jobs within roughly a 25-mile radius, and these were devastating blows to both these communities.

I got Gov. Don Sundquist and his economic development commissioner to go to both places with me, and we are trying to get some help for these people.

But, I wonder how much we can do when there seem to be more companies moving out than moving in, and downsizing seems to be the trend of the day.

Then shortly after the first of the year, I discovered that two small textile companies in my hometown of Knoxville were closing due to NAFTA.

In this same period I read that Hershey has moved most of its production from Pennsylvania to Mexico, that Fruit of the Loom closed a United States plant and opened a new one in Mexico, and on and on.

And of course, AT&T announced that they were downsizing, getting rid of 40,000 employees. Yesterday, Ford announced a cut of 6,000. Altogether, at least 1 to 5 million jobs lost in just the last 3 years to corporate downsizing, and on and on.

You have to wonder, Mr. Speaker, where we are headed. Already, most college graduates cannot find good jobs—so they are headed to law school and medical school, both fields with huge surpluses, just to postpone the inevitable.

Our unemployment rate, while too high, is not bad, but our underemployment rate is terrible. And yet, we seem to be giving our own country away, through NAFTA, GAAT, the World Bank, foreign aid, our megabillion dollar military adventures in Haiti, Rwanda, Somalia, and now Bosnia. Billions and billions and billions to other countries while our own people head for the unemployment office or have to settle for jobs in fast food restaurants.

In the last few weeks, we have been told that last year was the worst ever for the United States from a balance of payments standpoint.

We ran a record \$111 billion trade deficit. Economists conservatively estimate that we lose 20,000 jobs for each 1 billion, so this means that we lost at least 2,200,000 jobs due to foreign imports this past year.

People say don't start a trade war, Mr. Speaker, I certainly don't want one, but it looks like we are already in one and that we are losing.

Senator DOLE said in South Carolina a few days ago that he would not vote for NAFTA now without some changes in it.

This is why many of us are cosponsoring the NAFTA Accountability Act, which says that we need to take another look at NAFTA.

Many people now believe that the Congress was given misleading or incorrect information about the Mexican economy, in part at least possibly because the Treasury Secretary had made millions getting his clients to invest in Mexican bonds.

At any rate, facts and conditions change, and we need to take another look at NAFTA. We should have free trade, but we shouldn't enter into bad trade deals in order to get trade, especially when all these other nations need our markets far more than we need theirs.

I would like to place in the RECORD an article from the February issue of Chronicles Magazine by E. Christian Kopff, a professor at the University of Colorado.

He said an article in Foreign Affairs Magazine in 1994 by Alan Tonelson "proved that the prosperity of the American automobile, machine-tool, and computer-chip industries in the 1980's, while our television and VCR industries were disappearing, was due to protectionist treaties negotiated under President Reagan. The phenomenal prosperity of the Reagan years rested on protectionism. The Bush-Clinton years undermined that prosperity."

Then, Professor Kopff wrote: "In 1993, Goldsmith predicted that multilateral free trade treaties yoking together such unequal partners as the United States and Mexico would cause unemployment in the United States while devastating the Mexican economy. Of prophets and treaties it is true that by their fruits ye shall know them. The December 10, 1994, Economist loudly mocked Ross Perot's prediction of a "giant sucking sound" of jobs being drawn into Mexico an quoted outgoing U.S. Secretary of the Treasury, Lloyd Bentsen, that NAFTA was "a win-win situation." On December 20, 1994, the Mexican peso collapsed. From the United States perspective, this magnified the advantage of Mexican labor costs. In 1992, excluding transshipments, the United States had a \$5.7 billion trade surplus with Mexico. The U.S. Department of Commerce estimated that by the end of 1995 that will have turned into a \$20 billion trade deficit. Add to that \$25 billion deterioration in our balance of trade the \$50 billion bailout loan engineered by Secretary Rubin and Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan.

In Mexico, inflation is estimated at 50 percent, the peso has lost half of its value, but salaries have risen only 20 percent. Unemployment for the poor and bankruptcies for the middle class are at record highs. The Mayans are in open revolt, and the average Mexican is close to despair. "NAFTA is a typical case

of mutual poisoning," writes Goldsmith. Michel Camdessus of the International Monetary Fund warned of a world catastrophe. Goldsmith notes, "Submarines are built with watertight compartments, so that a leak in one area will not spread and sink the whole vessel. Now that we have globalized the world's economy, the protective compartments no longer exist."

The demoralization of First World nations and the ravaging of the Third World are accomplished for the benefit of international corporations. Goldsmith's summary is as clear as it is chilling: "Some can still remember the old adage: 'What is good for General Motors is good for America.' But that was in the days when the corporate economy and the national economy had the same purpose. Now there are two distinct economies. Not only do they have different interests, but those interests are conflicting. As corporations switch production to the areas with the cheapest labor and then import the products made abroad, they destroy jobs at home and increase the Nation's trade deficit."

□ 2000

CHANGES TO EPA BY THE REPUBLICAN MAJORITY

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

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, Winston Churchill, who was one of my favorite speakers, said that truth is incontrovertible. Malice may deride it. Ignorance may attack it. But in the end, there it is.

John Adams, who I think was a Member of this body at one time, said essentially the same thing, far more simply. He said, facts are stubborn things. We can ignore the facts. We can deny the facts. But in the end, facts are facts.

So tonight, for at least a few minutes if not the full hour, and I think we are going to be joined by some of my colleagues, we are going to talk about some of the facts, not only about the budget and some numbers and some facts about what we are really talking about and the consequences it brings for the American people, but also talk about some of those environmental issues.

I want to first of all turn it over for a few minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA], who would like to share a little information and a few facts about what the President has been saying and what the truth of the matter really is.

Mr. MICA. I would like to thank my colleague for yielding, and also spend a few moments tonight talking about what is going on as far as the environment, what is being said as far as the environment, what is being said as far as the Republican policy and some of the changes proposed relating to the environment by the new majority.

I can tell you, I am a member of the new majority. I am a Republican, but I

consider myself a strong advocate of the environment, of protecting our air, our land, or water, and making certain that it is safe for this and future generations.

But I am also concerned that there has been a great deal of misinformation spread about what we are trying to do and what is being done by our chief environmental enforcement agency, and that is the Environmental Protection Agency. Just in the last day or two, President Clinton has visited New Jersey and he has made some comments relating to the EPA and also the Republican agenda for the environment, and I think that it is important that we respond to those.

He stated in New Jersey that lobbyists for special interests were dictating the environmental policies by the new majority. I am here to tell my colleagues and the Speaker tonight and the American public that that is just not correct, that in fact the agenda that has been dictated on making changes to EPA and to regulations that deal with the environment has not been dictated by lobbyists or corporate interests, but in fact by the mayors, by the Governors, by the legislators, by the county commissioners across this great Nation.

In fact, I have a story dated March 24, 1993 from the New York Times, and it says that in January mayors from 114 cities in 49 States opened the campaign by sending President Clinton a letter urging the White House to focus on how environmental policymaking had in their view gone awry. So the genesis of the changes proposed by the new majority are in fact by our local government officials. They have seen that the regulation and some of the other edicts out of Washington have in fact cost the taxpayers, their local taxpayers, enormous amounts of dollars, and not gotten very good results for it.

Let me just cite, if I may, how some of the money is being spent. In fact, it really concerns me that the moneys are being spent in Washington on administration and on employees in a huge bureaucracy that in fact has been built up over the past few years. In Washington, DC, for example, out of 18,000 EPA employees, there are a total of almost 6,000, nearly 6,000 just within 50 miles of Washington, DC. Part of the argument with the changes that we are trying to make is to stop the command and control and the bureaucracy and administration from Washington.

What is interesting is EPA in fact is a Republican idea. It was founded in 1972 under President Nixon to provide some better regulations, some better national standards in cleaning up the air, the water and the land. What has happened is, over the years we have created a huge bureaucracy, now with 6,000 employees in Washington, and that number, I might say, is about the total figure of EPA employees that was in the entire Agency about a dozen years ago.

Since 1972, I might add, almost every State in the Nation has created their

own department of environmental protection. Each State has created an agency which can deal with enforcement, which can deal with some of the problems, which can take into consideration some of the local issues and factors relating to the land and the water and the air in that particular area.

So we have built a huge bureaucracy centered in Washington that wants to keep command and control. Republicans in fact have proposed that we dismantle some of that administration, we dismantle some of the overhead.

Not only do we have the administration in Washington to deal with, you take, for example, the State of Georgia where 1 of the 10 regional offices is located, and that is Atlanta, GA, there are 1,300 EPA employees located in that regional office, 1 of, again, 10 highly bureaucratized and highly staffed offices that are not out there, again, with the cities and the counties and the special districts and the States tackling the tough environmental problems.

So the money and the bureaucracy is in Washington and these regional offices, and the real problems are not being tackled out there. Let me give you just a statistic. More than 90 percent of the environmental enforcement is conducted by the States today, not in fact by Federal EPA. However, the majority of environmental funding goes to EPA, if we look at the statistics. Furthermore, the EPA has doubled its size during the past 20 years, as I have pointed out, now employing these 18,000 employees and maintaining a budget of \$3.6 billion.

So the question before the Congress and before this new majority is not just how much money we spend but how we spend it.

Let me say that even Carol Browner, who is now the Administrator of EPA, admits there is a problem with environmental problems. She said to the New York Times on November 29, 1993, let me quote, and she was our State administrator in Florida. Let me quote her. Carol Browner said, "When I worked at the State level, I was consistently faced with rigid rules that made doing something 110 times more difficult and expensive than it needed to be." It makes no sense to have a program that raises costs while doing nothing to reduce environmental threats.

What Carol Browner said in 1993 is what we are talking about today in 1996. Even President Clinton proposed a request for a reduction of 400 full-time employees in environmental enforcement for fiscal year 1996. So we have even the President saying we need a reduction in this massive bureaucracy in the proposal he made to Congress. We have Carol Browner in 1993, fresh from Florida and her role there as the State director of our environmental program.

What has happened, again, is we have threatened these 6,000 bureaucrats in Washington. They have a role and they

view their role as pumping out rules and regulations. What would they do if they had some reduction in force? No one wants to see, again, any lessening of regulations, of protections, of standards. What we are saying is let us get the work force where it should be and the dollars where they should be, and that is in our States and local governments, and let the Federal Government set some national standards and also work on international standards.

One of the first bills I introduced in the last Congress was the Global Environmental Cleanup Act, and that dealt with the problem that we have and where some of our focus should be. Countries around the world are polluting the Earth and destroying the planet, in fact, and some of our financing of this Congress and the American people is going to promote that destruction of the planet.

I can tell you, I have been on international business across this hemisphere, across the Southern Hemisphere. You can go through Brazil and see the destruction of the Amazon. You can go to Guatemala, see the destruction, clearcutting of forests on the Mexican border.

You can go to Mexico and see the raw pollution going into the streams and river and land. You can go to China and see the destruction of the planet, raw sewage and raw fluid going into the rivers, and no consideration of protection of the air or water where the largest population of the world is. Then you can go to Europe. I traveled the Tatra Mountains, and you can see the destruction from the former Soviet bloc of the beautiful forests, and again the raw pollution going into the land.

Some of our taxpayer money is going into international financing of projects in these countries without a consideration of environmental cleanup. So we have a role for EPA on the international level, we have a role on the national level with pollution between our States, and we are concerned about that. But we do not need 18,000 full-time employees, the bulk of which is in Washington, not to mention thousands and thousands of employees who are on a contract basis, ruling and dictating from Washington.

We need to get the money where the problem is and to those that are cleaning up the environment. They are State and local officials and our State legislatures. That is the emphasis this new majority is interested in.

Then if we look, and the President talked yesterday in New Jersey about cleanup and Superfund. Superfund must, in fact, be one of the worst government programs ever devised. Its original intent, now, was good. It was designed to clean up hazardous waste sites and have polluters pay for polluting, and in fact it has not done that. In fact, polluters do not pay. We find that and I have evidence of, in fact, polluters not paying, and also EPA letting the statutes of limitation expire, according to one of the reports from a

subcommittee on which I served during my first term.

□ 2015

So polluters get off the hook. They do not pay under the current system. The President says this is a successful program.

Then would you think that in fact we are cleaning up sites that pose the most risk to human health and safety and our children's safety? The fact is a GAO study in 1994 said no, that is not the truth, that in fact we do not clean up sites on the basis of risk to human health and safety and welfare, that they are chosen basically on the basis of political pressure.

So we are not cleaning up these sites, we are not cleaning up the sites that have the most risk.

These are just a few of the studies about EPA, the failures of EPA on the subcommittee on which I sat for my first 2 years in Congress. This first study talks about EPA's pesticide program, and food safety reform and the disaster in that agency. This particular report talks about the impact on safe drinking water regulation and small systems, drinking systems, how the regulations have forced our local governments to the point where it is almost cheaper to deliver bottled water than it is to comply with some of these regulations. We had testify the mayor of the city of Orlando at a field hearing, and she said that EPA requires in the treatment of water, and water comes in, to take out certain natural occurring substances, one part of the process at the beginning, and then put them back at the other end, and she said this makes no sense and it costs hundreds of thousands of dollars to comply with these ridiculous regulations.

So another report that details Superfund and the liability provisions, how now under Superfund, and again the President talked about the success of Superfund and the need for Superfund, and we agreed that there should be a Superfund. But when 80 percent plus of the money in Superfund, a program that was supposed to start out at 1.6 billion and has grown to \$75 billion, when 80 percent of the money, in fact, goes to attorney fees and studies, there is something wrong with what we are doing with Superfund.

So we do not want to let polluters off the hook. We think that they should pay. But you find, in fact, that EPA gives them a free ride under current law. They do not enforce the current law; they let the statute of limitations expire. They are letting it happen now, that polluters not pay, and we think there should be a change there. And then also spending all of the money for a cleanup program again on attorney fees and studies and ignoring the real risks makes no sense.

So all this is documented in hours and hours and days and days of hearings.

Then you look at the management problems in contracting activities at EPA. The American people would be appalled to see the waste. We held one hearing on this particular matter, and they said that this particular activity with EPA laboratories is out of control, mismanaged, examples of abuse.

Then we held another hearing on information management systems, so the right hand of EPA would know what the left hand of EPA is doing, to better communicate. I could not believe the hearing, and it is detailed also in these reports, that, in fact, they had spent almost a half a billion dollars and had no clue as to what they were going to do as far as a real management information system.

So one problem after another at an agency again that is out of control.

I spoke just a moment ago of the contract employees. I spoke about 18,000, nearly 18,000 full-time employees that have mushroomed this agency to a huge bureaucracy in Washington.

We found in one of the hearings, and this is interesting to note, that of the thousand of contract employees and the hundreds of contracts that are let out there that nearly all of the contracts that are let by EPA go to former EPA employees. So they have a revolving door, an incestuous relationship, that really would not be permitted under any other circumstances.

So almost every program we look at as far as the management of this agency is again out of control.

Here is another report on clean air protection problems at national parks and wilderness, and this details how EPA cannot even get its act together at it relates to Federal operations.

So each and every one of these reports, and these are just a few tonight that I detail, tell about a story of failure, and that is the Federal EPA program.

And let me say that between the House of Representatives and the other body there are many disagreements. You rarely find the two houses agree on anything. But there was unanimous consent on both this side and the other side, in fact both sides of the aisle, the majority and the minority, that we needed to make some changes in the administration and management of EPA. The House recommended a cut in their funding of somewhere in the neighborhood of 30 percent. The Senate was somewhere in the neighborhood of 20 percent. And rarely do you find that unanimous agreement that an agency should be cut in that fashion.

But these are the reasons, in fact, that I presented tonight that there is unanimous consent on both sides of the aisle, Republican and Democrat, and both of the Houses of Congress, that there needs to be change there. So we have presented changes, we have said that we should look at the way the money is being spent, not just throw money at problems, but in fact try to get a better result so that taxpayer hard-earned dollars are expended in ap-

propriate fashion, that we clean up the environment, that we clean up the real risk areas for our children, that in fact the money does not go just to attorney fees and to studies, that we work with local governments, with State governments, with local authorities, with business and industry, trying to resolve some of the environmental problems, that we renew our emphasis on international problems, that we look at problems that do, in fact, transcend the State and local boundaries, and concentrate on where EPA can do a better job.

So these are some of the issues that we wanted to bring up tonight, and then you think you have got it all together, and you think that EPA has been criticized by Members of Congress, again from both sides of the aisle, and you think that we are trying to get our message across, and maybe it has gotten across. You read articles like the article that I found last week in EPA Watch, which says that in fact EPA's office of enforcement and compliance has circulated a memo of January 19 that notes that staff from no fewer than 11 EPA offices are working with PTA on a project to protest budget cuts in the department. And I think that that is rather sad, that an agency that has been criticized also for misusing its resources and not cleaning up the environment, protecting the environment, but in lobbying Congress and coming after Members of Congress, is now using its limited funds from the office of compliance and enforcement in a lobbying campaign that brings in the children and the PTA with the misinformation campaign. So I think that is the wrong way to spend these limited resources.

When I found this article, I asked the appropriate chairman of the House committees and subcommittees to investigate now their activities. Even after being criticized, even after being asked not to conduct this type of activity, today you find EPA spending again limited resources, taxpayer dollars, on lobbying the Congress and on misleading the parents, and teachers, and schoolchildren of our country in their campaigns.

So it is disturbing, and I think that that should be thoroughly investigated by the appropriate subcommittees of the House of Representatives and the Congress.

So those are some of the points that I wanted to bring out tonight. Again, when the President makes these statements, I think that someone should address that in fact the new majority is interested in protecting the environment, that we have children, that we care about the environment, we care about the future of the environment of this great country, we would do nothing to lower the standards. But in fact when you see the misuse and abuse of power, and authority, and an important charge given by the Congress, you become concerned, every American

must be concerned, and every American should also have the correct information, that in fact what the President is saying is political rhetoric, in fact political rhetoric. It is not based on fact or the action of this agency. What Carol Browner is trying to do with the resources of that agency are, in fact, not a proper expenditure of those resources. If she would concentrate in remembering what she said, and I quoted it to you 3 years ago about how she is forced to spend 110 times the energies on things that do not make sense, then we could all be better off.

So this is a debate about command and control in Washington. It is a debate of how our limited resources, your taxpayer dollars, the American taxpayer dollars, are expended, and how we really go about facing the problems of pollution and cleanup across, again, our great lands.

So tonight I wanted to bring some of those facts to the House, and to my colleagues, and to the Speaker's attention. We can do a better job, we must do a better job, we do not need a huge bureaucracy to do it, and that is a part of what we have proposed here, and again I think I share the concern of everyone on this side of the aisle that the environment, clean air, clean land, clean water are our priorities and part of our agenda, and we can do a better job, again with limited resources.

I thank the gentleman for yielding and wanted to make those points tonight.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. I would like to thank the gentleman from Florida because I think he makes some very good points.

My grandma always said if you always do what you have always done, you will always get what you have always got, and unfortunately one team is saying that the real way to clean up the environment is to spend even more money on the failed programs we have had in the past, and I want to thank the gentleman from Florida for bringing those studies. Those are not Republican studies, those are not Democrat studies. Those are independent studies done by the General Accounting Office which, I think, demonstrate that what we have done in the past has not really helped solve the problem.

And I served with you on the Committee on Government Reform. I also serve on a separate subcommittee that looks at regulatory reform, the McIntosh subcommittee, and we have had some of those field hearings as well. And I remember just a few weeks ago we had some hearings in Iowa, and the mayor of Manson, IA, came to that meeting, Mr. Speaker, and talked about what they had had to do. The EPA came in, and they have had no problems with their water for 75 years. The EPA came in and tested, and they found 1 milligram more than the allowable EPA standard of one chemical, and they forced this relatively small town in Iowa to install over half a million dollars' worth of reverse osmosis

filtering equipment to remove that 1 milligram.

Now that dangerous chemical that they were required to remove at substantial expense was fluoride. Now fluoride is a chemical, as most of us know, that many cities, in fact virtually every city in the United States, now puts into the water. They were required to take out that 1 milligram.

And frankly, we also at one of our other field hearings, we had a gentleman who helped develop the spectrometer. Now I am not a scientist, but a spectrometer is that thing that allows us to measure parts per million and parts per billion.

□ 2030

He said, "Sometimes I rue the day that we developed that technology, because just because we can now measure parts per billion does not necessarily mean they are statistically significant, or that they are dangerous."

Again, we see that \$50 solutions imposed on \$25 or \$5 problems.

Mr. MICA. If the gentleman will yield, Mr. Speaker, I am glad the gentleman mentioned one case. I would like to mention another.

In Hastings, NE, that community began a review of its environmental costs and concluded that the single biggest drain on the Treasury was the \$65 million it would take to build a treatment plant to meet a proposed EPA rule for removing radon from the city's water. Now, radon is a radioactive gas that occurs naturally.

Before the EPA proposal, almost no public health specialist had considered radon in drinking water to be any sort of a threat. Independent radiation health experts said that in virtually every area of the United States, the amount of radon that evaporates from water is only one-thirtieth to one-one hundredth of what is really naturally in the air. So here is another example of a small community that had imposed on it a burden from EPA that made no sense. This is what we are talking about. This is not some fancy lobbyist coming in here asking for changes. These are our cities, our counties, our States, our legislatures asking us to look at what we are doing.

Again, even Carol Browner said before she got into the empire and bureaucracy-building business in Washington that what the Federal Government was doing to her as a State director of the EPA in Florida made no sense. That is what this argument is about. The rest is just not the truth.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman. President Kennedy once observed, "We all inhabit this same small planet. We all breathe the same air. We all cherish our children's future." One of the things that is most frustrating to me as a parent and one who cherishes my children's future and one who enjoys the out-of-doors, I enjoy the environment, I like to hunt and fish, one of the things that disturbs me so much is

when we start talking about finally using cost-benefit analysis and good science to determine whether or not these solutions that are being imposed from Washington really makes good economic sense. When we start talking about real reform, the other side seems to always question our motives; that we somehow want the world to live with dirty water, that we want to put raw sewage into Americans' drinking water.

Nothing could be further from the truth. But they measure success by how many dollars go into the programs. We are trying to measure success by what we really, ultimately get out of it.

I want to give one more example. We have the director of the waterworks of the city of Des Moines, IA, who came and testified at one of the field hearings. He said, "The EPA requires us to test for 53 different chemicals and organisms in the water. I have worked for the waterworks here in Des Moines for over 20 years, and nobody knows more about the water that goes in and out of these pipes than I do."

As a matter of fact, he said, as far as he could tell, only about 16 of those chemicals or microbes could ever be found in the water surrounding Des Moines, IA, and yet they are required to spend over half a million dollars a year in testing for chemicals and testing for microorganisms which will never be found in the water around Des Moines. He said it is just nuts.

He said, "The other thing that is important is if somebody should get sick from drinking the water in Des Moines, IA, they are not going to call the bureaucracy out in Washington; they are going to come to me, because ultimately I am responsible for the quality to the water in this city." Really, that is also what we are talking about. We are talking about more responsibility down at the area where the people actually can have that responsibility, can exercise responsibility, and ultimately get the job done.

Mr. Speaker, having a large bureaucracy, I think that the gentleman mentioned 6,000 people here in Washington—

Mr. MICA. Just in Washington.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. It does very little to ultimately guarantee we have clean water. As a matter of fact, one of my first trips to Washington a few years ago, and I had been to Washington maybe one or two times before that, maybe you remember this, there was a scare that came through in the water system here in Washington, DC. They thought it was somehow infected with *Cryptosporidium*. This is just blocks away from the EPA offices. They have their own water system. But the EPA did not take responsibility for that. Ultimately, the city of Washington, DC, took responsibility.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I am glad the gentleman mentioned *Cryptosporidium* and contaminated water supplies. I sat on the subcommittee, of course, that oversaw some of

these issues in the 103d Congress. One of the things we have heard folks talk about here on the floor was Milwaukee and how their water supply became contaminated. We questioned, in fact, some of the people who were involved in the problem. I think there were some deaths there, and many people were sick.

In fact, it turned out, and the gentleman spoke about the 53 or 54 water contaminants that are mandated by Congress and the EPA for each area to look at. And the folks from Milwaukee told us in fact that they were busy checking on some of these mandated contaminants that actually had no opportunity to occur in that area, and had to use their resources on these edicts that were sent out from Washington, when in fact Cryptosporidium, which is caused by deer or animal feces, I think, is the root of it, was ignored by the community.

So we are requiring, with these edicts and mandates from Washington, them to spend their limited resources not looking at where the real risks are, and that is part of what we are trying to change.

I had another example of an area, and it is good to cite these, engineers in Columbus, OH, were Attempting—the city was attempting to build a parking lot behind a city garage. They discovered traces of chemical in the dirt. Federal hazardous waste required a \$2 million cleanup. This is over a parking lot.

The city was required to dig up 2.4 million pounds of dirt containing no more than a few pounds of toxic chemical from a patch of ground no larger than a baseball diamond. They shipped that dirt 1,500 miles to the south of Texas to be burned in an incinerator. They had to install detection equipment to monitor the air for up to 25 years for traces of any contaminants that might be remaining. All this is to build a parking lot.

These are the examples of an agency and regulation out of control. The cost is being passed to the cities, the counties, the special districts, the States who have asked us to make these changes. These are the interests we are talking about.

This kind of regulation accounts for the largest percentage of increase over the last 10 years in local taxes. All of these regulations are passed on to cities and counties for compliance, and then in fact we make them spend this money, whether it is for water treatment, whether it is for building this garage in some expensive, not cost-effective fashion, and it results in higher taxes for the local property owner. So this is another example of an agency and regulation out of control.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. We do cherish our children's future, and we all breathe the same air and we all want a clean environment, but we want results. We do not want 70 percent of the Superfund cleanup money being spent on lawyers and consultants, we want results. That is what this Congress is really all about.

I think particularly those of us in the freshman class came here to change the way Washington does business. We want to talk a little bit tonight, too, about the budget. We are being joined by the gentleman from South Carolina, Mr. LINDSEY GRAHAM, and perhaps the gentleman from Connecticut, Mr. CHRIS SHAYS, is going to join us as well. I am not sure.

We want to talk a little about some of the budget numbers, where we have come from, what it is going to take, the kind of discipline. Again, I restate, if you always do what you have always done, you will always get what you have always got. Unfortunately, where we are today is at least some of the people in this Capital City want to continue to do what we have always done. That is, "Well, we will continue to spend normally; but manana, or next year, or 5 years down the road, then we are going to start to really get serious."

As somebody said the other day, it is a little like saying you are going to lose 20 pounds by the end of the month, but you are going to gain 5 pounds during the first 2 weeks, and you really will not get started on it until the last 3 days. That is sort of the way Washington sort of looks at balancing the budget. We have said that is not acceptable.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my good friend, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM].

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, along those lines, President Clinton had a good quote. A good definition of insanity was doing everything the same and expecting different results. That would be crazy. If you do everything the same, it will probably turn out the same.

The budget debate is often talked about in my district, "Why can you not come to an agreement on the budget? What is wrong with all you guys and ladies up there?"

I ask this to the audience that comes to my town meetings: "Have you ever had a disagreement in your family about how to spend and how much to spend?" And everybody laughs and everybody raises their hands. It is probably not uncommon for American families to have arguments at times over how to construct the family budget and how much to spend and where to spend it.

That is exactly what is going on in this Congress right now. We are having an overdue, long overdue debate about how much money to spend at the national level and where should it be spent. Let us kind of give people at home an update of where we are right now in the process.

Here we are in March 1996. We have had a couple of budgets vetoed. One budget that would have balanced in the year 2002 was offered by the Republicans that spent \$12 trillion, \$12.004 trillion, to run the Federal Government over the next 7 years. When you compare that \$12 trillion expenditure

to the last 7 years, it was a 26-percent increase in Federal spending. This harsh budget that you hear about that the Republicans have offered increased Federal spending 26 percent, it increased Medicare spending 63 percent, it increased Medicaid, welfare, by over 50 percent, it increased spending on student loans by 50 percent.

Instead of being accused of being harsh, I ought to be apologizing to people for spending that much money to run the Federal Government over the next 7 years. Again, it is a 26-percent increase for the next 7 years compared to the last 7 years. Most people are not going to get that much increase in pay.

So the first thing you have to come to grips with is, is \$12 trillion enough. I guarantee you, it is enough for LINDSEY GRAHAM. If you spend 63 percent more on Medicare over the next 67 years than you did in the last 7 years and that is not enough, there is something wrong with Medicare; and there are two things wrong with Medicare. It is very inefficient, and it is going broke.

Our budget addresses the Medicare problem. It addresses the entitlement problem, because when we look at the budget and we look at the national debt, which is \$5 trillion, under the Republican budget, it goes up to \$6 trillion. The budget we came up with is not one bit harsh. As a matter of fact, we should apologize for taking 7 years. The freshmen put a budgets together that balanced in 5 years. You can do it in 5 years and not hurt anyone if you just have a little discipline, you work together, and you work smart.

But one thing you have to understand about \$1 trillion, most people do not know what it is. I certainly still cannot imagine \$1 trillion. But if you spent \$1 million a day, do you know how long it would take you to spend \$1 trillion. Two thousand seven hundred years. It you started at the time of Christ spending \$1 million a day, you still would not have spent the first trillion.

We have appropriated \$12 trillion, not \$1 trillion. To get \$1 trillion in taxes from the American public is the equivalent of \$3,814 from every man, woman and child in America. The truth is, every man, woman and child in America is not paying taxes. Those of us that are paying a lot. So \$12 trillion is enough. You need to say no somewhere, and \$12 trillion is where I am saying no.

But when you look at the budget and figure out why you are \$5 trillion in debt, one thing jumps out at you, I believe: 50 percent of the Federal budget is entitlement spending, 16 percent of the budget is interest payment. The interest payment on the national debt this year will be over \$400 billion. We will pay more in interest this year than the entire Defense Department budget. That is a fact that astonishes me, that we have to really do something about this debt situation. Fifty percent of the budget is on auto-pilot.

Entitlement means the following: There is a computer somewhere in this town that takes Medicare and Medicaid and welfare spending, looks at the growth of these programs, builds into the computer their growth rate, and in Medicaid it has been 19 percent growth rate since 1990, adds inflation to the growth rate, anticipates the number of people who are going to be on the program, sends us a bill in Congress, and we cannot say no. No matter how out of control Medicare is, no matter how inefficient Medicaid is, no matter how unwise welfare is, we cannot say no to the bill. And when the bill comes to Congress, 50 percent of the budget is on autopilot and we cannot say no. We do not have enough cash on hand to pay that bill, and we have to go borrow money. That is why we are \$5 trillion in debt.

We are going to talk about the President's budget, but let me tell you the difference between the President's budget. He is over four in balancing the budget, and on the fifth try he got to a balanced budget in the year 2002, but here is what he did not do. That 50 percent of the Federal budget that is on autopilot that led us to a \$5 trillion national debt, Medicare alone went up 2,200 percent since 1980. All the President has done is for a 7-year period he has slowed the growth of spending on Medicare, Medicaid, and welfare, but he has not changed the reason we got in debt.

In other words, he spends less on welfare, but he does not change the reason people stay on it a decade. He has spent less on Medicare, but he has not changed the reason that the program has grown 2,200 percent. He has spent less on Medicaid, but he does not change the reason it is growing at 19 percent. He has suppressed the growth, but he has not changed the reason we got in debt.

I will not vote for a budget that does not address the reason we got in \$5 trillion worth of debt. If that is harsh, mean, cruel, so be it. I think it is wise. I think it is smart. I think it is long overdue.

Mr. GUTKNECKT. I thank the gentleman, Mr. Speaker. I want to also restate a couple of important points. One that I think gets lost in all this debate that the gentleman has made that I did not completely understand, and I dare say most Americans do not understand, is that half of the Federal budget right now is effectively on autopilot. These things we call entitlements, Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, welfare, those are on autopilot, and Congress really has very little control over it. That is one of the reasons it is so difficult.

The other point, if you add in the 16 percent we are paying in interest, which really is an entitlement, you are really talking about two-thirds of the Federal budget which is essentially an entitlement program.

□ 2045

We are trying to balance the budget here in the Congress and really only have direct control over that one-third of the budget.

I want to point out something else that has been lost in all this debate. This is in the Constitution of the United States. A little over 2 months ago we were sworn in, and we were sworn to uphold the Constitution of the United States.

It is pretty clear, reading article 1, section 8 of this Constitution, that the power of the purse is vested with the Congress. It really is ultimately the responsibility of the Congress to balance the books of this Government.

Something happened in 1974, that the Congress began to turn over the power of these entitlements, in other words, divorce them from the congressional oversight that I think they should have. That is one of the other issues I think we ultimately have to deal with if we are going to balance the budget.

I want to welcome to our little discussion tonight the gentleman from Connecticut, CHRIS SHAYS, author of the Shays Act—I always try to work that in for the gentleman—one of the really powerful speakers on behalf of a balanced budget, who serves on the Budget Committee. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SHAYS. I thank the gentleman.

I remember the first day when we started this new Congress, and the gentleman basically introduced the Congressional Accountability Act, getting Congress under all the laws that we impose on the rest of the country, to the Congress. This was his first act on his first day as a freshman. The gentleman and his colleagues, other Members who had just joined us, did such a wonderful job of introducing that bill, the rule and so on, and getting that bill passed. I think we Republicans and Democrats alike can take great satisfaction that we now are looking to be under all the laws we impose on the rest of the country, something that we had not been for the last 30 years.

I have been wrestling with really what is concerning me most. I cannot really speak to what is in the President's budget or what is not. All I know is that when I was elected in 1987, the gentlemen all triggered that major point, that I voted on one-third of the budget. Gramm-Rudman, which dealt with what came out of the Appropriations Committee, the 13 budgets out of the Appropriations Committee, the defense budget which was equal to the other 12 appropriations bills, was what I voted on.

Yet we tried to control the growth of spending by basically squeezing the annual votes on the appropriations bill. While we were doing that, we had Medicare, Medicaid, food stamps, agricultural subsidies, and a whole host of what we call entitlements. You fit the title, you get the money. We do not vote on them, they are not sunsetted, they were growing at 10, 11, 12 percent.

In fact Medicaid a few years grew at about 20 percent a year. They double every 5 to 6 years. Now they are 50 percent of the budget, and if we do not do anything by 2002, they will be about 65 percent of the budget. We really need to get a handle on it.

The thing that concerns me I think more than anything, and I do not think that history will be kind to Congress over the last few years or the President over the last few years. I am candidly bringing in Republican Presidents as well. Republicans did not want to control the growth of defense and Democrats did not want to control the growth of entitlements, and they both agreed to just let things happen and ignore that we were creating these large deficits.

But what I am most afraid of is, in the last 12 years since 1974, since the end of the Vietnam War, we have had our national debt grow from about \$430 billion to \$4,900 billion, a tenfold increase.

So what do I think history is going to say about Congress and the White House? I think they are going to say there was a time when they basically decided to let their children and their children's children pay for the bill.

Mr. Rabin, the former Prime Minister of Israel, pointed out on more than one occasion that the job of an elected official, they are elected by the adults but their job is to represent the children. That is really what this is all about: How do we save this country for future generations? How do we leave it better for future generations?

What we attempted to do was get a handle, slow the growth of Medicare, slow the growth of Medicaid, allow those programs to grow and to meet all the needs that they have to meet. But if I could just conclude, I am constantly hearing in this place that we are cutting, and we are cutting some programs but not the ones that are identified. We are consolidating certain departments and agencies. We are eliminating some programs and discretionary spending, but the earned income tax credit, a program to help the working poor, that is growing from \$19 billion to \$25 billion. The school lunch program, which we were told we were cutting, is growing from \$5.2 billion to \$6.8 billion.

The student loan program, that is the one that really gets me, it is growing from \$24 billion to \$36 billion, a 50 percent increase. Hardly a cut. Maybe in this place a cut, but anywhere else around the world it is known as a 50 percent increase.

Just to end, Medicaid growing from \$89 billion to \$127 billion in the seventh year of our program; Medicare, \$178 billion to \$289 billion. Only in Washington when you spend so much more do people call it a cut.

We are spending 60 percent more total amount on Medicare. Per beneficiary 49 percent more, from \$4,800 to \$7,100.

I just hope that we keep the course, I hope we do not let up, I hope we try

to get a handle on this budget for the future generations that ultimately would have to pay the bill if we do not.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. I thank the gentleman. I started this special order tonight quoting Winston Churchill and John Adams' famous quotation, "Facts are stubborn things." I think that we have to continue to share with the American people those facts, because I have found, and we have had an awful lot of town meetings back in my district, when people are confronted with the truth about what is really in this budget, I think overwhelmingly what they are saying is, "My goodness, you're being far too timid."

In fact, in the Medicare numbers alone, when you tell people we are going from \$161 billion to \$244 billion, as a matter of fact, in one of my town meetings I had some school children, and I went through that fairly slowly with them. I said, "Now, if you go from \$161 billion to \$244 billion, is that a cut or is that an increase?" They all looked kind of funny and said, "Well, that's an increase." And I said, "You're right, but sometimes in Washington that's called a cut."

Then I go through the numbers again with some of the seniors and I say that we are going from \$4,800 average per recipient, because there are going to be more senior citizens in 7 years, we know that, but from \$4,800 to \$7,100. That is not a cut. That is a big increase.

I think again when you are talking to people who have common sense, whether it is in South Carolina or Connecticut or Minnesota or Florida, anywhere around the country, people recognize that these are significant increases, and if anything we are probably being far too timid in our budget changes.

I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. GRAHAM. I thank the gentleman very much. I have got to let the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] come in on us in a minute.

We are talking about how much money we are spending over the next 7 years on Medicare, Medicaid, and welfare. But let us look at the reason why we have spent so much money in the past. Why is Medicare growing at 4 times the private sector?

We have increased spending over I think the next 7 years by 63 percent. A lot of money is going to be spent on senior citizen health care at the Federal level. But if you want to get the budget balanced and you want to keep it balanced, you better start now and you better start with entitlement reform. Senator KERREY, a Democrat, said in his commission report that if nothing changes in the next 17 years, the entire Federal revenue stream, all the money coming to Washington, will be consumed by entitlement spending and interest payment on the debt. That there will be no money for the Department of Defense. That is how quickly the interest element and entitlement

spending is taking over the revenue stream.

Mr. SHAYS. There will be no money for any department, and any grant and any program for those departments according to Senator KERREY.

Mr. GRAHAM. Right. The good news may be that Congress will not get paid, too. They may like that part of it, but they will not like the other parts, the Government they have come to rely on in the discretionary side of the budget.

But let us talk a minute about what we have done. We have spent a lot of money in additional spending but we have done the most responsible thing you could do, if you have a chance to participate in this great democracy at this level, and that is change the reason we got in debt.

Let us talk a minute about not just how much we spend on Medicare but the improvements we have made to make sure that, one, it does not go broke, and two, that we will have a Medicare system for our generation.

What we have tried to do is we have looked at the private sector, which is a new and novel idea up here, instead of looking to another bureaucracy and to another agency and building more buildings in Washington, we have looked outside the institution itself, outside the Beltway, we have looked in the heartland of America and we have found out that there are some great ideas in health care. Let us create some of those ideas and give options to senior citizens, something new and novel in Washington also for people who rely on the Government to have a menu of things to choose from.

As a Congressman I think we have 3 or 4 health care plans to choose from.

Mr. SHAYS. We actually have 10 programs we can choose and then variations within those programs, so we have lots of choice and we want seniors to have that same choice.

Mr. GRAHAM. Let me give one option that would be put on the market if our bill passed. It is called a medical savings account and I am going to apply it to two people I know and love, my aunt and uncle. When my parents died, I was about 21, I had a sister who was 13, we were taken in by an aunt and uncle whom I am very close to. They worked in the textile industry all their lives in South Carolina. I doubt if they ever made over \$8 an hour but they had a good job and proud to have the job. They are retired now, been retired about 3 years. They live off Social Security, they have Medicare as their primary health care, and they have a paper route. They are healthy seniors and God has been good to them. But under the current Medicare system, they have about \$46.10 taken out of their Social Security check. That is their part B premium. That money is taken out of their check and it is taken out of Ross Perot's check if he happens to be Medicare eligible and it goes into a fund and it pays doctor bills for senior citizens, 30 percent of the doctor bills. All doctor bills paid under Medi-

care the funding comes from two sources, a senior citizen premium, like my aunt and uncle pay out of their Social Security check, and 70 percent of it comes out of the Treasury. Medicare has been growing at 12 and 13 percent a year. A huge bill is being sent to the taxpayer because of Medicare growth. They have \$110 a month they pay for a Medicare supplement policy because under Medicare it does not pay everything and seniors know this very well. You have got deductibles, copayments. They are paying out of their pocket over \$300 a month for the Medicare system that we have today. A medical savings account option, if available, would have saved my aunt and uncle \$10,000 in the last 3 years and would save the government a great deal of money.

Here is how it would work. The average senior citizen gets about \$5,000 a year from the Federal Government on Medicare. We are going to take a portion of that money, the vast portion of that money, and put it into a medical savings account and do something really extreme, we are going to let my aunt and uncle manage their own health care and take care of the money. They can take out of that account about \$4,000 and buy a catastrophic health insurance plan that will be sanctioned by the Federal Government, that will take care of their health needs as Medicare would for any illness over \$10,000. They will have a catastrophic health insurance plan bought by the Federal Government, not money out of their pocket. There will be \$1,000 left over, and the game goes as follows. From zero to \$10,000 is the game that they are going to be willing to play. In my aunt and uncle's case, in the last 3 years, they have never spent over \$450 to go to the doctor or to the hospital. They have been lucky. They have taken care of themselves. Under the medical savings account plan, \$1,000 would be left over in this account. They could use it to manage their health care needs. That \$1,000 would have taken care of every medical bill they have had. They would have had no out-of-pocket expenses, they would have saved over \$10,000 over the last 3 years and the Federal Government would have saved money. Why should that option not be available and if they did get sick, if they did have a catastrophic illness, they would have been able to opt into another plan.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. We are doing some remarkable things. What we are talking about with Medicare—let me jump in, and I want to yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA]—we are talking about using market forces, personal responsibility, and competition to help control costs. It works everywhere except in Federal programs. That is what we want to experiment with.

I yield to the gentleman from Florida for a quick minute, as well.

Mr. MICA. I wanted to comment, and I thank the gentleman for yielding. I come from the State of Florida. We

have a very large elderly population that rely on Medicare and some who rely on Medicaid. In fact, if you just spend a minute and look at what has been going on in a State like Florida, for example, the Miami Herald did a story last year and identified in Medicare \$1 billion worth of waste, fraud, and abuse.

I sat on one of the other subcommittees in what was Government Operations that oversaw Medicaid. We identified about \$1 billion in Medicaid in Florida in fraud and abuse. One of the cornerstones of the Republican plan is to create some penalties, to root out waste, fraud, and abuse.

That is the main, major change we have proposed. People can still stay on Medicare. We do offer choices. But, again, we must address the problem of waste, fraud, and abuse.

Let me talk for a second, too, about nursing homes. The proposals that the Republicans have advocated, we provide some change there, also addressing fraud.

But the other major change we have that affects the folks in Florida is, we are not advocating lessening of regulations or wheeling people out on the street from nursing homes. What we have said is we should give people some more compassionate, some more cost-effective alternative. Right now people have to divest themselves of any savings. They must expend all their savings and basically go on this program for the poor or transfer their savings to their relatives.

□ 2100

Once they have done that, they lie, cheat and steal in some cases to get on the programs or divest themselves of life savings. And then what do we do? We give them one choice. You go in a nursing home.

What we said is why not allow the elderly to live with their families, pay for some attendant care. It could cost one-third, it could cost 20 percent, and they could live with their families. Why not, in fact, give some alternatives they they could stay in their own home and not be forced into a nursing home, and we live longer and can live longer by ourselves with a little bit of help from our friends rather than this one forced option that we are forcing. So we can and we should make a difference for the elderly. And these are the choices we hold out for them.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SHAYS. If the gentleman would yield, just to close the loop on both programs, the bottom line to our Medicare plan is we do not increase copayments, we do not increase deductibles, we allow the premium to stay at 31.5 percent, we provide choice.

It is true, we ask the wealthiest of wealthy to pay a higher part for the premium for part B. I think sometimes Republicans do not like people to know we are asking the wealthy to pay more, and Democrats do not want people to know Republicans are asking the

wealthier to pay more, but we are in that instance, and that makes sense.

Most importantly, we are allowing for choice in the program and providing for the kind of innovation you and others have talked about. In this way we are trying to work to save the program from bankruptcy and to make sure it can continue for future generations.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. I yield for one last minute to the gentleman from South Carolina. We are just about out of time. The clock is ticking.

Mr. GRAHAM. Welfare as you know it, we want to change it. One key difference, President Clinton's welfare bill says you cannot stay on welfare for more than 60 consecutive months. You can get off for 1 month or 1 day, and have 60 more months waiting on you. Our bill says 2 years, 5-year lifetime, big difference.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. I thank everyone for joining us tonight. As we started with Winston Churchill's quote, "Truth is incontrovertible. Malice may deride it, ignorance may attack it, but in the end there it is."

Mr. SHAYS. If we can end with Mr. Rabin's quote that, "The politician is elected by the adults to represent the children."

Mr. GUTKNECHT. We have a moral responsibility to make sure we preserve this last best hope. If we do not make some changes, whether in Medicare entitlements, the way the Federal Government spends money, we are going to leave our kids a legacy no one can be proud of. If we continue down the same path, continue to do the same things, we are only going to get the same kind of results.

I wish we had more time to talk about the President's budget. Recently he gave it to us. It is 20 pages, now, not a whole lot of detail, but it really, you know, back in January he said that the era of big government is over, but on the other hand, when you take a look at the budget and get the facts about this budget, you start to see that that obituary may have been written prematurely.

CUTTING ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight because of my concern over some of the statements that were made by my colleagues on the Republican side during this last 1 hour where they talked about the Republican cuts, budget cuts on the environment and the changes that the Republican leadership have proposed with regard to environmental protection.

Particularly, reference was made to the fact that President Clinton was in my State, New Jersey, yesterday and was highlighting the fact that this

Congress, this Republican Congress, under Speaker GINGRICH and the Republican leadership, has done everything possible to turn back the clock or try to turn back the clock on environmental protection. The President was in New Jersey because of this concern over the Superfund Program, which is used by the Federal Government to try to force polluters, those who caused hazardous waste sites, to clean up their pollution, to spend the money to do it, and where the polluter cannot be found or the polluter is bankrupted or the corporation has ceased to exist anymore, the Federal Government steps in to do the cleanup itself.

The President was highlighting the fact that under the Republican leadership's proposals and the vast cutbacks that they have made in appropriations or spending for the Environmental Protection Agency, a number of Superfund sites in the State of New Jersey will not be cleaned up this year. In fact, the many shutdowns of the Federal Government which affected the EPA at many Superfund sites, the cleanup has either not occurred or was slowed down completely, in many cases at a considerable cost to the Federal Government. And what he was saying is that this cannot be allowed to continue, that we cannot allow this Republican leadership to turn back the clock on the Superfund Program to make it so that our environmental laws are not even enforced for lack of money to hire people to do the enforcement, which is essentially what is happening.

Now today, our environmental task force on the Democratic side, we have a task force that is trying to address environmental concerns and point out how the Republican leadership is cutting back and turning the clock back on the environment. Well, our Democratic task force issued a report based on a hearing we had a few weeks ago. The report, which I have here, shows dramatically the impact of the budget cuts that the Republicans have put forward on the environment.

What it shows, essentially, is that the Republicans are trying to hide a very dismal record. Anti-environmental legislative riders have been attached to appropriation bills, disproportionate budget cuts have targeted environmental programs, and curbs on enforcement activities have been widespread, which let polluters off the hook and sends the cleanup bill to the taxpayers.

We talk about, in the report, how the Republicans have specifically targeted environmental programs for particularly deep budget cuts. In other words, we know that we have to spend less and we have to downsize the Federal Government, but the Environmental Protection Agency has received a disproportionate share of these overall cuts. Overall funding for the EPA was cut by 21 percent. Pollution enforcement, the cops on the beat, the environmental cops on the beat, have been