

tried to talk to friends about this, but there is no response. Probably they are worried they will lose their jobs."

It is workers like these whom Ms. Sianipar has been trying to organize for the last seven years, a task that entails the constant risk of arrest.

"If we have a meeting, the police take us to the station and want to know if we want to make a revolution," she said, a laugh breaking over her words. "We had a meeting here last week and the police came. So we changed the topic of the meeting, but they took me to the station anyway. The police got angry and banged the table. But they let me go at 4 in the morning. They had the idea that we were doing underground organization."

Still, she admitted, the attitude of the police has moderated somewhat over the years. "Five years ago," she said, "we would have had much more trouble."

Not all foreign investors who use cheap Indonesian labor have ignored workers' complaints. In 1994, the American clothing company Levi Strauss withdrew its orders from a local garment contractor after reports that the management had strip-searched women to check if they were menstruating.

But many factories that manufacture clothing, shoes or electronic goods for American companies are owned by Taiwan or Korean companies, and labor organizers contend that conditions in these factories are much worse than in factories directly owned by Americans.

"American companies are here because they have to pay very little," said an American who works for a private aid organization, but who did not want his name used. "But American companies are not the worst violators of basic working conditions. The Koreans really stand out for poor conditions in their factories."

Outside the Nike factory, Mr. Situmorang continues his vigil, waiting for a court decision on whether he can get his job back. "I've gone to the labor department and the court," he said. He paused and sighed. "I really don't think in the end I will get my job back. This is Indonesia."

#### COMPARING 104TH CONGRESS TO 103D CONGRESS

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I have a couple of topics we wanted to talk about tonight, and have with me my colleague from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH], and we may have others joining us. But what we were going to do is talk about some of the difference between the 103d Congress, the Congress that was here in 1993 and 1994, and contrast that with the current Congress that was elected and began to serve in 1995.

If you look back 2 years ago, which was my first term in Washington, and think about the changes, in 1993 the President had just passed the largest tax increase in the history of the country and then turned around and tried to nationalize or socialize medicine.

At the same time, the bureaucracy did not want to get left out of the action, and OSHA, the Occupational Safe-

ty and Health Administration, came up with a proposal that said if you smoke in your own house and you have a domestic employee, then you must have a smoke ventilator in your own kitchen.

The EEOC, meanwhile, came out with a ruling that one of the most dangerous hazards in the workplace today is religious symbols. So if you were working at the Ford plant and you had a "Jesus saves" T-shirt on, or if you had a necklace that had a Star of David, that was offensive. EEOC decided it was time to go after those dog-gone religious symbols in the workplace. That was the kind of thing that we had going on in the 103d Congress.

Now, contrast that with the 104th Congress. We have a Congress that has cut staff by one-third, reduced its operating expenses by \$67 million, and put Congress and all of its Members under the same workplace laws as the private sector.

Now instead of debating should we reform welfare, we are debating how to reform welfare; instead of debating should we balance the budget, we are debating how to balance the budget. And when the crisis with Medicare came that was pointed out to us by a bipartisan committee, this Congress did the responsible thing and acted to protect and preserve it.

This Congress, Mr. Speaker, is night and day compared to that that was the 103d Congress. But we have our criticism. A lot of the criticism comes from the press and its allies over at the White House, Mr. Clinton. What we were going to do tonight is talk about some of the criticism.

Education, apparently Republicans do not have children, we do not care if they get educated or not. Seniors, apparently we all came from test tubes and none of us have moms or dads and we do not care what happens to their Social Security or Medicare, according to the President. Of course, the environment, we want to pave Old Faithful and level the Rocky Mountains.

But what is really going on with these issues, Mr. Speaker? We want to talk a little bit about the environment tonight, we want to talk a little bit about taxes and the middle class, and we will continue through a series of discussions to talk about some of these other issues.

I will yield the floor to Mr. HAYWORTH at this time.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I thank my friend from Georgia. I am heartened by the fact that other colleagues from the majority join us tonight to talk about a variety of topics.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia is absolutely correct. There could not be a greater difference in Government than the difference that exists between the 103d Congress, held captive by the proponents of big Government and more and more centralized planning and more and more taxation and more and more spending, and those of us now in the majority in the 104th Congress, unafraid to offer Amer-

ica, Mr. Speaker, a clear, commonsense approach to Government, an approach which really beckons and harkens back to our founders, an approach typified in the first act this Congress passed, which simply said this: Members of Congress should live under the same laws every other American lives under.

Indeed, as my friend from Georgia pointed out, with a litany of progress on a variety of issues, there is one inescapable fact that we confront at this juncture in the second session of the 104th Congress, and that is the criticism, the carping, the complaining, of liberals, both in this city and nationwide, of the powerful special interests who have as their mission in life the maintenance of the welfare state, the maintenance and enhancement and growth of centralized planning; those disciples of big Government who now would criticize the new commerce in this new majority and paint our agenda, indeed, our contract for America, as somehow being extreme.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to point to this simple fact: The only thing extreme about the agenda of the new majority is the fact that it makes extremely good sense.

I take, for example, the comments of my friend from Georgia, who talked about the fact that in the wake of the 1992 election the incoming President, as one of his first acts, chose to proposed and this Chamber approved by one vote the largest tax increase in American history. Emboldened by that victory, our friend at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue worked in secret to devise a plan of government, that is to say, socialized medicine.

The American people said "Enough," and in November 1994 gave this new Congress a mandate.

Mr. Speaker, I can vouch as one who watched with interest my colleague from Georgia and my other colleagues here who served in the 103d Congress and served valiantly to point out the absurdity of the extremism of those who always endorse the liberal welfare state, I saw with my eyes their valiant efforts.

□ 2115

But more importantly, through the votes of the good people of the United States of America with a new majority, we have moved to do simple things, ironically, the same things that a candidate for the Presidency, who was ultimately elected in 1992, talked about. My friend from Georgia remembers this well. Remember the campaign rhetoric: I will balance the budget in 5 years?

Mr. KINGSTON. Larry King Live, June 4, 1992.

Mr. HAYWORTH. My friend from Georgia offers the attribution. And if he would continue to yield, we would know that the President has had to be persuaded by Members of his own party to offer a phantom budget that would come into balance in 7 years, and using a personal analogy that I am sure my friend from Georgia can appreciate,

since he is a physical fitness buff, the budget that the gentleman at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue now advocates to try and bring our budget into balance would be akin to me saying I need to go on a diet. I think we can all acknowledge that fact. I think I am going to lose 50 pounds over the next 2 months, but I am going to lose 2 of those pounds in several weeks' time, and I will save the 48 remaining pounds for the final 2 days of the diet. It just does not work.

Theoretically, you can write down numbers on a sheet of paper, but what this new majority has offered is a clear, commonsense plan to bring this budget into balance in 7 years, which this President vetoed; a clear, commonsense plan to reform welfare as we know it, which this President vetoed; and now yielding to my friend from Georgia, I would gladly listen to his points.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I think it is important really when we do have a dialog to be factual about it. We have been accused of cutting student loans, and yet our budget calls for increasing student loans from \$24 to \$36 billion. We have been accused of cutting Medicaid, and yet our budget calls for an increase from \$89 to \$124 billion. Of course, we have been accused of cutting Medicare, but our budget goes from \$180 billion to \$290 billion. I think it is important that when we talk about this that we divide the facts from the rhetoric.

Now, one of the things that we have been trying to do with our reforms is to balance things, and I know our friend from Michigan [Mr. EHLERS] is here, and we wanted to talk about yes, there are things we are trying to fix, but we are not trying to destroy things, specifically in the environment. I do a lot of camping, and I plan to continue to do a lot of camping. I have 4 children, and my 12-year-old daughter last year started hunting with me. My 10-year-old son is coming along, and I want that environment there for them. I want there to be plenty of species out there. I want the endangered species to be protected. I want private property rights to be protected as well.

Mr. Speaker, I really get offended when the President accuses us of trying to gut environmental legislation when the Clean Water Act, the Endangered Species Act, and the Environmental Protection Agency all were created in the early 1970's under a Republican administration.

Let me yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. EHLERS. Thank you very much. I appreciate the gentleman yielding me time, and I would like to take a few moments to talk about some Republican ideas on the environment.

As the gentleman correctly pointed out, we have been criticized severely over the past 2 years for some of the actions taken and some of the votes that were held, but I would like to discuss from my perspective, first of all,

as a scientist. I am sure the gentleman is aware of my scientific background. Perhaps not all of my colleagues are. But I would just simply mention I have a doctorate in nuclear physics, and I worked in the field for a number of years, both in research and teaching, before I entered the political arena. That does not make me an environmentalist or an ecologist automatically, but it at least indicates that I have the ability to establish fact from fiction when dealing with environmental issues.

Mr. Speaker, back in 1968, I first became concerned about the environment, and I noticed a little notice in the newspaper in Grand Rapids, MI, my hometown, that there was going to be a meeting to discuss environmental issues. I went to that meeting. There were a group of citizens concerned about some pollution that was taking place at that time in various areas of the State, and we formed an organization called the West Michigan Environmental Action Council, and I served as a charter member of that and I have also served on the board.

That whetted my interest in what was happening to the environment, and I had a good deal of interest in government but had never thought of running for office. But when our county developed a severe landfill problem and we had the possibility of raw garbage piling up in the streets, I decided to run for the county commission, and I used that as a means to straighten out the solid-waste situation in my county. It took the work of a lot of other people, too. I do not want to claim the credit for it. But it shows what a citizen activist who is concerned about the environment can do.

The interesting thing is, when I was elected to office and came up with some solutions, I soon lost many of my environmental friends who thought I was going to be a total purist and save the world. The gentleman knows as well as I, from working on issues here, there are many sides to issues and you have to use a reasonable, logical approach. When you are faced with mounds of garbage coming in the gate and the threat of it piling up on the sidewalks, you have to make some tough choices.

But over a period of time, we managed to totally revamp the solid waste disposal system. In fact, I suggested renaming it the solid waste storage system, because the gentleman knows as well as I that if you put it in the landfill, you have not disposed of it; you have simply stored it, and it is still there to create problems in the future. But in any event, we did resolve the environmental issues, and I will not go into all the details of that.

Later I moved on to the State senate. I was made chairman of the Environmental Affairs and Natural Resources Committee, and in the course of several years, with the help of John Engler, who was senate majority leader at that time, now the Governor of the

State of Michigan, we got landmark legislation passed and probably had more environmental legislation passed in those 4 years than at any time in the history of the State of Michigan.

Mr. Speaker, I am giving this not to brag about my accomplishments but simply to point out that those people who think the environment is a Democrat issue and not a Republican issue are sorely mistaken. We have different approaches perhaps, but I believe that we can accomplish a great deal in the end on the environment by working together.

Mr. KINGSTON. I want to emphasize what the gentleman is saying by pointing out that President Theodore Roosevelt started the National Park System, and, of course, he was a great Republican at the time.

Mr. EHLERS. He was a great Republican, and also started in some ways the political meaning of the term conservationist. I always love to point out to my friends that the root word for conservation is the same as the root word for conservative and that any true conservative should be an environmentalist, because it is important for all of us to conserve what we have for the advantage of future generations.

During my time in the political arena and working on environmental issues, I have learned some lessons which I just want to share with my colleagues here. First of all, the environment is extremely important. I can perhaps draw an analogy to something that we discuss here an awful lot: The balanced budget. We approach this, as Republicans, from the standpoint that we want to protect this economy, this Nation for our children and grandchildren. It is simply not right for us to continue to live in debt and expect our children and grandchildren to pay that debt. We want to leave them a promising future and not a huge debt. Well, that is also true of the environment. That is one of the reasons I am a confirmed environmentalist.

It is absolutely wrong for us to leave a polluted country to our children and grandchildren and to other future generations. We have to give them the same resource opportunities that we inherited from our ancestors. We have to give them the same clean environment that we have inherited from those who came before us. That is why the environment is very important to me. I want my children and grandchildren and their grandchildren to inherit a clean country, a clean planet, and to be able to have enough resources to use and enjoy this planet.

Mr. Speaker, another lesson I have learned is that energy, energy and energy use, are probably the single-most important component of the environment. Not everyone realizes this. But once you begin analyzing the sources of pollution, where it comes from, a lot of it is from improper use of energy or inefficient use of energy, and that is something this Congress has to spend

more time and energy on, just recognizing the importance of energy and working on the efficient use of energy.

Now, let me make it clear, I am not here talking about energy conservation. Some people confuse those. Somehow they think if they are freezing in the dark, they are helping the environment. Well, that may be true, but it certainly is an uncomfortable way to save the environment. What I am talking about is simple, common-sense efficiency of use of energy which can result in less pollution and less cost and a better environment. Everyone wins in that situation.

Another lesson I have learned is that we have to work together on the environment. This is not a partisan issue. I happen to believe that the current Congress is far too polarized on many issues and sometimes polarized on the environment. But they should not be. The Congress should recognize this is a universal problem. The public certainly recognizes. Eighty percent of them favor a clean environment, and we should work together on this issue and recognize it is not partisan but it is important.

As a scientist, I have also learned that correct science is essential. You cannot ignore science and say there is no problem. You also should not manipulate science to prove your point of view, if it happens to be wrong. The facts are the facts, and you have to deal with it.

But another issue that arises when you are dealing with environmental issues is what I call trans-scientific issues, issues that do not have a ready scientific response because the problems are so immensely complicated, and there we simply have to use our best judgment in trying to come up with a workable solution.

Something else that has developed in science is tremendous improvements in detection of toxic materials or other sorts. But out of that comes a big mistake very frequently. A good example is the Delaney clause, which was passed years ago, said no substance used for human consumption can have any carcinogenic or mutagenic element in it at all. Well, as our detection methods got so much better, and we can now detect one part in a quadrillion, that law no longer makes any sense.

Mr. KINGSTON. If the gentleman will yield on that, I think that that is a real important idea or concept.

How it has been explained to me is that if you take, say, a wading pool that kids are in, not a swimming pool but a wading pool, the little blue, pink plastic kind, and you pour a gallon of pesticide in there, then back in the 1930s, that is what they detect. But today, if you take an eyedropper and into mom and dad's big swimming pool, 34,000 gallons, and you put a little drop of the pesticide in that pool, today we could detect it. Yet in many, many cases, that trace of pesticide is negligible, it is noncarcinogenic, it will

not hurt anybody. But because our technology is so advanced, we can detect it, and yet our laws have not kept up with that.

That is what revamping the Delaney clause is all about, and it is so important because there are so many fertilizers that have been taken off the market because of this red tape interpretation of the Delaney clause, and yet other countries are still using those pesticides. So it is affecting us already, and we do need to resolve the issue, again, in a balanced way, protecting the consumer above everything else, but also utilizing the technology for our advantage and not against it.

Mr. EHLERS. Thank you very much. I appreciate that comment, because that is precisely what has happened. I am certainly not arguing for putting toxic materials in food or using the wrong fertilizers or anything like that. I am simply saying that our laws have to keep up with scientific changes, and if you demand a zero tolerance, as we did originally with the Delaney clause, it is a mistake, because there is no such thing in this life as zero risk.

Mr. Speaker, that leads to my next point, and that is, we have to learn as a nation to prioritize, to decide what is good and what is bad, and recognize, everyone has to recognize that there are certain risks to every part of life. For example, it is commonly assumed by many that natural is good. Something that is natural is good. Something that is artificial is bad. That is not necessarily true. For example, peanut butter. Perhaps I should not mention this in the hearing of those who are from Georgia. But peanut butter is a fairly carcinogenic material, and the lab tests have shown that. And if we truly enforce the Delaney clause, we would probably have to ban peanut butter.

Mr. KINGSTON. I do want to ask how you people in Michigan consume peanut butter. I would like to know more about that.

Mr. EHLERS. Well, in fact, everyone consumes peanut butter, and that is why it has not been banned. It is a food staple for so many people. I am simply pointing out that what we have to do is analyze the risks in every situation and prioritize the risks. There is a great deal of concern, of course, in our Nation about toxic waste, but yet, if you analyze in a hard-headed manner what really are the environmental risks we have today, what is the highest environmental risk, you are likely to find that there are many things other than improper disposal of waste that are higher up on the list.

□ 2130

For example, urban sprawl with its destruction of habitat, and destruction of habitat of course is key in the endangerment of species, and that leads to something that my colleague from Maryland sitting here is an expert on, the Endangered Species Act. These are all very, very complex issues. We

have to look at all aspects of these and recognize precisely what the problems are, and what the dangers are, and what this leads to, as my final point in this list before I summarize, and that is what we need is common sense regulation. That is something I have strived for throughout my legislative career.

It is very easy to adopt what is called the command and control approach where you simply say something is bad, let us regulate it out of existence. If you do that without looking at the benefits and the costs, you can go down a very dangerous path, dangerous both in terms of health and our economy.

What we, what I, typically did in the Michigan Senate, when we encountered a problem, I would get representatives gathered. I would get scientists together, environmentalists, industrialists, everyone possible, get a representative group together, sit down in a room and pound it out, week, after week, after week, educate each other about the problem and come up with a solution.

Mr. Speaker, frankly, that is what I believe that we have to have the Congress doing as well. That really results in good common sense regulation which gives the maximum return on laws and the maximum return on the investment of time and energy as well as money.

Mr. KINGSTON. If the gentleman would yield, I wanted to illustrate that on a true case that happened in Riverside, CA, where the residents in a neighborhood were not allowed to dig fire trenches because it would endanger kangaroo rat habitat. And so fire breaks were not dug, and a fire came. Thirty homes were destroyed, but, in addition to that, over 20,000 acres of kangaroo rat habitat was destroyed.

Clearly, using what you are saying, common sense approach, this certainly does not benefit the home owners, but it also defeated the whole objective, which was to protect the rat.

So we can clearly, without endangering the animal, we can clearly have more flexibility of the law and get away from the command and control which leaves out common sense.

Mr. EHLERS. Let me give an example, too, that occurred in Michigan.

Years ago it was discovered that the Kirtland's warbler in Michigan was an endangered animal. Everyone loved the Kirtland's warbler, a wonderful bird, beautiful song. It was endangered because of some very peculiar mating habits. This bird is very selective about its habitat for mating. It would only mate in jack pine trees which were less than 6 feet tall. As the forest grew, the jack pine were too tall, and the birds would not mate. So they were becoming extinct.

The initial approach suggested setting aside vast acreages so that there be at any given time enough jack pine available so that the birds would nest and proliferate. In fact, a different approach was developed, and that was to

use smaller acreage and provide for selective cuttings of timber in such a fashion that there is always ample jack pine of the appropriate height.

The Kirtland's warbler has flourished. It is no longer endangered. It has become a major tourist attraction in that area. So we find that we have improved the habitat for the Kirtland's warbler. It has benefited the community as well, and it is a good example of meeting the needs of the environment, meeting the needs of the endangered species, and yet not with any undue takings, or anything of that sort.

Mr. Speaker, that is what I mean by commonsense regulation. There are ways of handling most of these problems if we simply take the time to address them properly and study them thoroughly, use scientific evidence, and do not get all wrapped up in rhetoric, or taking sides, or polarizing the issue.

Now this will not be true in every case, but it is true in many cases. Sometimes we will have really tough issues, but if we remember our environmental principles of saying the environment is very important, we have to find a solution, let us find the best possible solution, I think it will serve all of us well.

Well, I have given this as an example of a Republican approach to the environment, and I think it is the approach that we have to take here, that we have to follow, get away from some of our polarization.

To summarize, I would make a few key points. First of all, we must protect the environment; we have no choice about that; for the betterment of our planet and for the benefit of our children, grandchildren and future generations. We must do it scientifically. We cannot do it haphazardly. We have to analyze the risks as best we can and not simply say, "Oh, that is a terrible danger, let us address that and ignore something over here that might be even worse."

We must do it in priority order. We have to develop a method of prioritizing the demands, the problems in the environment, so we are putting our money where it makes sense, and we must use common sense in doing it.

But above all, we must do it for our children, our grandchildren and for any future generations. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan.

We have also been joined by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GILCHREST] who wanted to comment on a couple of points as well.

Mr. GILCHREST. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I wanted to just say a few things.

Mr. Speaker, we are here talking about a number of issues, one of which is policy relating to environmental issues. The gentleman from Michigan, the gentleman from Arizona, and the gentleman from Georgia, I think, all discussed the direction that we need to

move in. The gentleman from Michigan said we need to protect the environment. There is no one in this room that wants to dirty the air, and I do not think there is anybody in this room that says the water is too clean, and I do not think there is anybody in this room that wants to do away with species that we are able to enjoy in the wild so that in years to come they will become extinct.

But there is a way that we can go about doing this in a fundamental manner that will bring more people into the process, and in the long run and in the short run, I believe, we will be more successful.

A hundred years from now, and I am sure that there are people out there listening, Mr. Speaker, that knew people that were alive in 1896. And we will know people that will know people in 2096. I am not sure any of us will know people that are alive in 2096, but our great grandchildren, perhaps our grandchildren, will know people that will be alive in the year 2096. So a hundred-year time span is not very long. And for us to protect the resources that we have right now, I think, is crucially important so that future generations will be able to enjoy the blessings that we have inherited.

Now in order to do that I do not think you can do that from a centralized authority like the Federal Government. We have been accumulating more and more responsibility with the States and the local governments and even private citizens. So, we create environmental legislation which is important for a lot of reasons.

For example, about 40 percent of the pollution problem in the Chesapeake Bay, where I come from, the Chesapeake Bay watershed; I live on the eastern shore of Maryland; about 40 percent of the problem in the Chesapeake Bay is air deposition. That means air pollution, and there is very little you can do about that, and about 60 percent of that air pollution which pollutes the Chesapeake Bay from the air is from automobiles.

We are increasing the number of cars every year; we are increasing the number of people that live in the watershed every year. So we have to begin to find solutions to problems that are difficult to solve because very often, if not always, the problems are as a result of increased population.

The way to do that, I think, is to begin cooperating and consulting with these environmental pieces of legislation, with the State government, with the local government and private citizens developing policies that can actually work. Future generations will not care who cleaned up the pollution, or even who polluted. The fact is they are going to live with what we do.

One other comment about clean air and clean water. Very often the Republicans are tagged with causing gridlock in Washington, with causing partisan politics in Washington, especially when it relates to environmental issues. I

would just like to send this message, and that is gridlock. Arguments in Washington are not bad. You do not see the North Koreans arguing. You do not see gridlock in Cuba. What you see here in Washington is an argument about the best way that America should move forward. These arguments are actually bringing out more information. In fact, I would say that the people with the most credibility in Washington right now are not the ones with long years behind them. They are not the powerful committee chairmen that might have been elected in the 1950's. We do not have that anymore.

Mr. Speaker, the people with the most power in Washington right now are the ones with credibility, and people with credibility are people with information. If we can begin to share information from Member to Member and develop legislation so that we can share responsibility, cooperate with the States, have consultations to do the best that we can with environmental legislation, then I think we are going to move forward to protect the environment.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield on that point, first of all, I have the utmost respect for my colleague from Maryland. We serve together on the Committee on Resources. It is no secret that we may not agree on every single jot and tittle with reference to policy.

Yet at the same time I am heartened by the fact that the gentleman from Maryland, as well as my friend from Michigan and my friend from Georgia, all recognize this central theme, that it is not centralization of power or a one-size-fits-all philosophy that oft times is outdated with reference to new technologies that develop, but, instead, the realization that there must be a spirit of conciliation, a spirit of cooperation and the notion that is really quite common sensical when you think about it, the acknowledgment that Phoenix is not the same as Philadelphia, that Monroe, LA, may not be the same as Grand Rapids, MI, that Savannah, GA, may not be the same as St. Louis, MO. There are different issues that confront us all.

So in that spirit, even while there may be some disagreements on how we get to a cleaner environment, how we recapture for the American people the true spirit of conservation, let us start with that premise, and also what the gentleman from Michigan talked about, and that is the sense of balance that must be there, preservation of the environment, a true spirit of conservation, and at the same time a preservation, if you will, of the fragile rural economies this Nation has; for example, in the Sixth District of Arizona.

So it is a challenge. It is not easy to face up to many of these questions, although common sense will rule the day, I believe, and we will ultimately come to some agreements. But let us also categorically reject even amidst the gridlock that my friend from Maryland talked about this need on the part

of some within this body and at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue to try and demonize those who will take another approach, indeed along the same lines of the school lunch debate, really the school lunch scare, and with reference to the medicare debate. I have yet to see starving children in the streets or the elderly thrown in the streets. And by the same token, I do not believe the vast majority of Americans are turning on their taps and drinking sludge.

So let us articulate up front that, while there may be some slight differences in approaches, the bottom line remains true for members of the new majority. We want to find constructive, common sense solutions that preserve the environment, that preserve the economy and do exactly what the gentleman from Maryland talks about, offers an environment to generations yet unborn that is clean and that may be used, not only for emotional well-being, but for economic well-being for that is the challenge we face in the last decade of the 20th century.

So I am heartened by my friend's remarks and look forward to working with him, even acknowledging some differences along the way. I yield to my friend from Georgia.

Mr. KINGSTON. What is important though is we bring our laws up with our technology and bring our laws up with other levels of government to realize that when the Environmental Protection Agency started in the very early 1970's, it was just about the only and certainly the premier environmental protection agency in the country. Today in Georgia, in Maryland, in Michigan, and Arizona you have narrow groups. You have your own Environmental Protection Agency, which probably is about 10, 15 years old at this point.

□ 2145

Mr. Speaker, I had the honor to speak to the Association of State Environmental Protection Divisions a couple of months ago. I was a little bit worried because I was afraid that, well, I do not know if I am walking into a lion's den or not. They said, "We are ready. We can handle this. We can probably do a better job of attacking pollution cleanup because we are closer to the sites, we can work with turning, or the State legislative, we can get it turned around. Do not run from it, but do not get in our way, either." I think that is important.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I would just like to comment on this little discussion, and especially commend the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GILCHREST], who is, I believe, without doubt, the wetlands expert of the Congress. He knows a great deal about it, and has made some very important contributions to that.

As I mentioned earlier, Mr. Speaker, I have been involved in the founding of the West Michigan Environmental

Council. That group plus another group were instrumental in making Michigan the leader in writing State laws, in many cases before any other State or the Federal Government had. We wrote a wetlands law in Michigan over two decades ago. Michigan still is the only State that has been delegated authority by the EPA to administer its own wetlands law, and is not subject to Federal wetlands law.

It has always puzzled me why other States have not done that because, precisely as the gentleman from Maryland pointed out, each State is often better able to judge the situation within their State. Michigan is a very wet State. We are surrounded by Great Lakes, we have many inland lakes, we have many wetlands, and we have developed a wetlands law that works very well. I do not want to imply that it is without trouble and without dispute, but I can tell the Members from my experience in working with that and slogging through wetlands and working with the laws and working with the people, we managed to work things out.

Mr. Speaker, I was astounded when I came to Washington and discovered the antagonism toward the EPA in most parts of this country with regard to wetlands. I think part of it is, as the gentleman from Arizona mentioned, we have tried to pass one-size-fits-all legislation, and certainly the wetlands requirements in South Dakota and Arizona are different from those in Michigan and in Maryland. I think it is important for us to recognize that. It is also important for the States to take on that responsibility, as Michigan has done in passing its own wetlands law.

Similarly with takings laws, that is a real legal morass, and I regret the takings legislation that passed this body earlier this year, because I think, again, it was an attempt to be a one-size-fits-all, and it certainly did not fit my State. We have struggled with that for years with the wetlands law, with the Sand Dune Protection Act. We have come to a reasonable working arrangement on that, and keep working on trying to improve it.

Again, realize that the real objective is to protect the environment and work in a common-sense fashion that works, that gets the job done. When you were talking about clean water and clean air a moment ago, I was reminded, when I moved to Grand Rapids, Michigan, in 1966, the Grand River, which was a beautiful river flowing right through downtown, was filthy. No one would swim in it. No one boated on it. No one would think of catching fish from it. Now the river is clean enough so it has become a major fishing attraction. People boat on the river, and some even dare to swim in the river.

So we have made considerable progress in the past couple of decades, and I think it is a tribute to the progress we have made. We should never forget that. We have cleaned up most of the biological pollutants in the water and in the air. Now we are work-

ing on the chemical pollutants. It is a much tougher problem and much more scientific in nature. We have to, as I said earlier, use good science to do that.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman points out, though, the need for honesty and integrity in the debate is so important. We have a Superfund bill we have been trying to get reauthorized now for 2 years, and while we are speaking, only about five of the national priority sites get cleaned up each year. Only 12 percent of the polluted national prioritized sites have been cleaned up, after 15 years and \$25 billion of Superfund law. It is broken. Let us fix it. There is going to be a little bit of disagreement between the manufacturers in the private sector and the environmental community, but I would suspect there is still 75 percent or 80 percent of the issue that could be moved forward right now.

Mr. Speaker, I am very frustrated by the fact that in Washington, we always have to have this debate from both sides of any issue. "The sky is falling," and the other side wants to accelerate the fall, join me in this fight. It is very difficult in that kind of atmosphere to have an honest debate.

I know the gentleman from Maryland has been in the very center of some of these things.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia is correct about the Superfund situation. I think this Congress has begun the process of resolving the vast differences in that complex piece of legislation so we can have as our priority spending the money on cleanup costs rather than litigation costs.

I would like to mention just one thing to the gentleman from Michigan. I know Michigan has assumed the enforcement of the Federal wetlands regulations, and Maryland is about to do the same thing. I would like to make a comment on wetlands, the Endangered Species Act, and these other pieces of environmental legislation which are sometimes very emotionally discussed.

In the State of Maryland, as a result of the Chesapeake Bay improving and having clean water, much of that is attributed to wetlands filtering out a good deal of the nitrogen that comes in as a result of farming, or filters out a variety of other pollutants that get into the groundwater and spawning areas for fish, but wetlands is key to the economic boom in Maryland. There is about \$2 billion worth of tourism, commercial fishing, recreational fishing, hunting, boating that comes to the State of Maryland as a result of the type of environment we have, so wetlands regulations help us to manage our resources.

The Endangered Species Act, which in the State of Maryland is actually stricter than the Federal Endangered Species Act, that might cause some alarm for some people, but for the State of Maryland, it assumes that our rural areas, through certain management tools on the Federal, State, and

local level, when we work in a pretty cooperative consulting fashion, ensures that our number one industry, or number one and number two industries in the State of Maryland are fishing, tourism, and agriculture. To save these particular industries, we need to work together and now apart.

We do need to recognize the differences in a regional way, but people in Louisiana want clean water, as the people in Maryland want clean water, so it is the consulting process. It is getting involved from all the different levels, including elected officials getting involved in the consulting process.

I just want to close with this one point, Mr. Speaker. I read recently a book from a Montana mayor, and I can't remember his name, the mayor of Missoula, Montana, wrote a book about community and place, and how we can reconcile the difference, especially that seem to become political differences. The essence of the book, without going into it, and I recommend the book to people to read, it is called "Community and the Politics of Place," I think that is the name of it. But the essence of the book is, he said that America used to be a frontier. People used to be able to go places if they did not like where they were. If they had religious differences or had any kind of quarrel or wanted to seek adventure, they could go to the frontier that seemed endless. Now America does not really have a frontier. America is filling up with people, and we are a prosperous Nation, so the next frontier will be the frontier that is based on our ability to consult, to cooperate, to use our intellectual skills to manage the limited resources that we have so that they will still exist for future generations. We cannot do that and argue.

My son told me a couple of years ago when he was in high school, when he sort of was getting ready to look at the world, he said the world to him seemed like two people in a big truck driving down the highway at 90 miles an hour, and the highway ended at a huge precipice, a 10,000-foot drop, and the people were not only not paying attention to where they were going, they were arguing.

So if we are going to be legislators that are going to deal with the problem of the Nation, we have to, together, set the example so we can cooperate here and disseminate that sense of policy to the rest of the country.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I simply wanted to comment that I agree wholeheartedly with that. I think, getting back to the theme of what we have been talking about, we are simply trying to demonstrate that we are Republicans are trying to develop a responsible approach to the environment here.

I appreciate the comments that have been made. I thank the gentleman from Maryland especially for his views on wetlands, and obviously, it is very similar to Michigan. There is just one

minor correction, by the way. Michigan has its own wetlands law, whereas Maryland and New Jersey will administer the Federal wetlands law.

It was interesting, when I was in office there I heard a lot of complaints about the wetland law, and one legislator proposed repealing the Michigan wetland law. The two groups that argued the most against that were the sportsmen, who think the wetlands law is wonderful, because Michigan has great hunting and fishing and so forth, and business. They said, "We know this law. It works for Michigan. We do not want to be under the Federal law." That shows how each State can design the law that accomplishes the goals better than we can with a one-size-fits-all approach from Washington.

I think we have to set a minimum standard, but encourage the States to go beyond that. As Republicans who are talking about devolution of power, of letting the people in the communities have a say, I think this fits in beautifully with that.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I appreciate the gentleman making this point, and I simply want to make this point that I think it transcends almost every debate we have here, and it is a philosophical point of view that I think rings true with the majority of the American people.

As you relate to us the experiences of Michigan, as our colleague from Maryland relates the experiences in his State, certainly none among us would argue that at certain time in our history, the Federal Government has played a genuinely worthwhile role in serving as a catalyst to deal with some dramatic issues, but history does not occur in a vacuum.

Therefore, the challenge for us at this juncture in our history is to ask this question: Who do we trust? Do we trust the American people, do we trust local officials, elected by the people close to home, officials elected to State government, the State agencies that have grown up in the last 25 years to confront these problems, or do we always and forever turn these problems over to Washington bureaucrats to offer a Washington solution which may fit Washington, DC, but which might not fit Washington State? That is the essence of the debate that we have on a variety of topics.

I thank the gentleman from Michigan for drawing that distinction yet again when it comes to environmental legislation, the true meaning of conservation, and what it will mean to protect and preserve the environment as we move into the next century.

Mr. EHLERS. I would simply say, Mr. Speaker, we need both. Take clean air, for example. We have to have a Federal law, because the transport across distances is so huge, but we also need local law to regulate how this is applied locally, and do it in a common-sense fashion. Only with everyone working together are we truly going to achieve a clean environment.

#### THE URGENT NEED FOR MEANINGFUL TAX REFORM

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, we wanted to touch base on the tax situation, with April 15 approaching quickly. I will yield to the gentleman from Arizona on this, but I want to start off with a couple of fun facts, first, about our tax system, because if you are like many of your American friends this last week or two, you took time filling out your tax form.

On an average, it takes 12 hours for you and your family to fill out your tax forms to the degree that you can, and then you take it to your accountant, and pay anywhere from \$150 to \$700 or \$800, depending on where you are and how much you own and so forth. If you are a small business, it takes you 22 hours.

Here is a statistic that I really like, Mr. Speaker. The IRS has 480 tax forms, and 280 of them are forms that tell you how to fill out the other forms. That is absolutely absurd. The West Publishing Co., one of the official publishers of the Federal Tax Code, published the 1994 Tax Code in two volumes. Volume 1 contains sections 1 through 1,000, and it is printed in 1,168 pages. Volume 2 is page 1,500—1,500. We have a 1,564-page Tax Code, Mr. Speaker. It is absolutely absurd. The need for tax reform is urgent, it is great, it is right now. It is appropriate to look at while we are trying to balance the budget.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH].

□ 2200

Mr. HAYWORTH. I thank my friend the gentleman from Georgia.

In this Chamber where it is oft decried, the level of verbosity that often emanates within this Chamber, you have not seen words, Mr. Speaker, until you take a look at the Tax Code. The gentleman from Georgia talked about it. By wording, the Tax Code as it exists today consists of 555 million words, 555 million words in the last 10 years. In the wake of tax reform of a decade ago there have been 4,000 changes, resulting in the verbiage piling up.

Mr. Speaker, if you think you are paying by the word, that is certainly the case. Because in the wake of our last tax increase, the largest tax increase in American history, the President of the United States, who talks about tax breaks for the middle-class, offered a tax increase so regressive that with the retroactivity attached to it, people who had passed away still owed more from beyond the grave due to retroactivity.

It is the height of absurdity when the American family in 1948, an average family of four, surrendered about 3 percent of its income in taxes to the Federal Government, to where last year the average American family of four surrendered virtually one quarter of its income in taxes to the Federal government. That affects everyone.

Mr. Speaker, we need to make a change. We have taken a look at priorities and we see that clearly, in the wake of these expenditures, Washington's priorities have totally gotten out of whack.

Mr. KINGSTON. What is so important is that the average family in the 1950's paid 3 percent and today pays 24 percent in Federal income taxes. When you add in the other taxes, State and local taxes, the average middle-class family pays about 25-percent taxes.

I had an opportunity to talk to a driver with UPS, United Parcel Service, in my district. He said, "My wife works. She teaches school and has a good job, and I get a lot of overtime driving this truck. We have got three kids, and at the end of the month we do not have anything because it goes into washers and dryers and taxes and regulations and so forth."

That is the story of the middle-class American family today. All they are doing is working for the government. Then we turn around and make them fill out a tax form that is absurd, which they cannot do.

Mr. Speaker, you are on the Committee on Ways and Means. I bet you most Members of Congress cannot even fill out their own tax form. I believe that is real important. If we cannot do it, we who are setting the law, what do we expect of the American people?

Mr. HAYWORTH. If my friend would yield, there is something fundamentally wrong when the average American family pays more in taxes than on food, shelter and clothing combined. There is something wrong when Washington sends its resources to pay for 111,000 IRS employees, and yet can only have 6,700 DEA employees and only 5,900 border patrol employees.

What does that say to the American people? The Washington bureaucrats are saying, "Oh, we do not have time to staunch the flow of illegal drugs. We do not have time to guard the borders, though that is one of the prerogatives of the Federal Government as mandated in the constitution. But we do have time to audit you, Mr. and Ms. America. We do have time to cast aspersions on your honesty. We do have time to try and find our way into your pocketbook again and again and again and again."

Mr. Speaker, there is nothing ignoble or dishonorable about hard-working American taxpayers hanging onto more of their hard-earned money and sending less here to Washington, DC. Indeed, in the days to come once again, I know my friend Georgia disagrees with this notion, we extend our hand in cooperation to the minority. We extend our hand in cooperation to the President of the United States.

We have talked the talk for too long. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is time for us to walk the walk. We voted that way in this Chamber. We hope that those who would give lip service to these ideals would join with us and get about the business of governing. The American people deserve no less.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we have worked to repeal the 1993 Clinton tax increase on Social Security recipients. We have worked to increase the earnings limitations for American seniors. We have worked to increase the estate tax threshold from \$600,000 to \$750,000, and we have worked to end the marriage tax penalty and the capital gains tax, and the President vetoed that. Along with that, he vetoed a \$500 per child tax credit for middle-class families.

Right now in America households all over this land, from Maine to Miami to California, you can reach in your pocket and say here is \$500 that was a dividend for my work this year, but it was vetoed by this President of the United States.

We are not going to stop, Mr. Speaker, and talking about taxes is going to take a lot more time. We have with us the gentleman from California who wants to talk about another waste of manpower and money, and that is illegal immigration, so I want to yield to him.

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, I would first like to echo my colleagues' comments. My wife runs our family business which happens to be an income tax business. I heard a lot of talk in 1993 that the Clinton tax increase was only going to be a tax on the rich and the seniors who were wealthy. Well, I do not think the Members of the House really realized what they were doing. I will say this, and I need to say this so that I can go home to my bride in California this weekend.

The fact is that she showed me one individual and talked to one individual who was a classic example of the so-called tax on the rich. This person made less than \$14,000 a year, but because he happened to be a Latino who had very strong religious beliefs, he did not divorce his wife. He was married and filing separate. Eighty-five percent of his Social Security is being taxed.

You remember in 1993 they told those of my colleagues who were here, this is only a tax on the wealthy Social Security recipients; it is not on the poor. Well, this man would like to ask: Would somebody in Congress tell him how rich he is?

I think that that is one issue that is not discussed enough and we need to start bringing it up. As somebody who is involved in doing tax returns for the working class in my community in San Diego, Mr. Speaker, I hope to bring up more of those items, talking with the constituents who are being taxed by this Congress under the guise of taxing the rich, when it is the working class that is getting harmed by this unfair and unjust legislation.

Mr. Speaker, another item that is unfair and unjust is that we have been trying to address this last week the fact that this Government of the United States has in the past rewarded people for coming across the border and breaking our immigration laws and

then getting welfare, free education and free medicine, to the point where it is costing the State of California immense amounts of revenue, and the Federal Government has been walking away from this expense. The people in States across this country are paying this expense because the Federal Government has ignored it.

Mr. Speaker, with the passage of H.R. 2202, Mr. SMITH's bill, we are finally now seeing this Congress recognizing its responsibility under the constitution to address the fact of illegal immigration. But there is one part of the illegal immigration issue, Mr. Speaker, that has not been addressed.

Mr. Speaker, I will just ask that we all consider the fact that giving automatic citizenship to children of illegal aliens is a problem we need to address. My bill, H.R. 1363, will address that, and we hope to work on that in the very near future.

#### WOMEN, WAGES, AND JOBS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, this special order on women, wages, and jobs comes during Women's History Month, but more pertinently it comes because finally the issue of declining wages in our country has made it onto the national agenda.

The underlying discontent that has been there for two decades have come forward, and we see it in the Republican primaries. It is interesting that at least since the early 1980's many of us have been pointing to this un-American phenomenon where the stock market does well and people do poorly. Somehow or other it never caught on. There has been some attention paid to it as it affects men because the manufacturing sector has been so decimated as jobs have moved offshore. Now that the country is beginning to recognize that something different is happening, it is important that we look at all of those of whom something different is happening, and that is why I choose to raise it in relation to women.

As a former chair of the Equal Opportunity Employment Commission, I have long had an interest in discrimination against women. More is at work here than simple discrimination, however. What is at work here is the nature of our economy itself, some historic changes that are underway that reflect upon the kinds of jobs that are being produced and who gets those jobs.

The effect is felt in the widest gap in incomes we have seen since we have been keeping these records. We need to look at how this phenomenon affects women in particular because with the change in the economy there have been the greatest changes in women in the work force.

I want to point to a bill I have introduced, the Fair Pay Act, which in its