

antienvironmental voting record of the Republicans in this Congress.

HAITI

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to address the subject of the environment today, but I happen to be a Republican. I believe that the environment knows no partisanship and it should know no extremism.

I think the environment is something we are all concerned about. I am proud as a Republican that under Republican leadership we have finally gotten some kind of relief for the Florida Everglades in my home State under Republican leadership, something we have been trying long to do. So there are indeed many sides of the story about who is doing what to help out the environment.

Mr. Speaker, I return to the floor to talk about Haiti today because I want to be certain that all of my colleagues are aware of the staff delegation report on Haiti that was issued last week. Although I hoped for good news for both the American taxpayers who footed the \$2 billion plus bill for United States operations in Haiti and for the Haitian people, there doesn't seem to be much. In fact, more than anything, this report reinforces the idea that the White House has been glossing over the rough spots in Haiti—hailing it as a success—and hoping that no one would dig deep enough to know the difference. The staff delegation concluded that little progress, if any, is being made on compliance with the Dole amendment regarding political murders in Haiti. In fact, they see little chance of those conditions being met in the foreseeable future. These investigations may in fact be irreparably tainted because the Haitian special investigative unit has been colonized by three American lawyers working for the Government of Haiti.

Whether or not these individuals will be more interested in protecting their meal ticket or in getting to the bottom of the killing remains open for question, but it is a question that should be asked.

Beyond these specific investigations, the report also notes that the United States embassy in Haiti continues to have a passive policy on human rights violations. One might ask why the White House does not seem to understand the actions they decried during the coup are no less unacceptable in post-Cedras Haiti.

The report also finds that there are probably more rough spots than smooth ones with regard to law and order. The Haitian National Police are not always readily accepted by the Haitian people, but nothing can excuse the heavyhanded responses we have seen from them in places like Cite Soleil.

In addition, the staff delegation reports that there are at least four other armed governmental security units with unclear chains of command, but about whom there are credible reports of serious human rights abuses.

On the economic front, the news is little better. More than 60 percent of the Haitian national budget is still sustained by foreign dollars and Haitians still rely heavily on food aid and remittances from abroad. The lack of tangible progress on privatization and other reforms, added to the pervasive breakdown in law and order, continues to act as a damper on investment. Ultimately, the staff delegation concluded that private investment in Haiti is unlikely to even reach the low baseline level of 1985 before this century ends.

In terms of United States development projects in Haiti, the delegation found that the majority of the projects they reviewed failed to meet the one test that matters: Sustainability. In other words, we are feeding Haitians fish today but we are not teaching them to catch their own for tomorrow.

There are many more issues raised in the report, but I want to draw attention to the section entitled "Clinton Administration Politicization of Haiti Policy." The Congress has long been frustrated by the lack of good information from the administration regarding United States operations in Haiti, but that is only half of the story.

The staff delegation found that the administration is going beyond mere stonewalling to scapegoating and what they called a sustained and coordinated interagency effort designed to blame the legislative branch for the shortcomings of its own policies in Haiti.

This finding is based on numerous instances when incomplete, inaccurate, and intentionally misleading information about the role that this Congress has played in Haiti was provided by the White House to staff, the AID mission, officials of the Government of Haiti, and to the Haitian business community.

This just adds to the evidence to suggest that of all of the items on the list of things the Clinton administration's policy in Haiti has lacked over the past 3 years, the most important item is candor. Whether we are fibbing to ourselves about what is happening in Haiti or to the Haitians about what is happening in Washington isn't the issue. Either way, the net effect has been to undercut genuine efforts to bring peace, prosperity, and democracy to that small Caribbean nation.

That, Mr. Speaker, is the real tragedy here and we should begin hearings based on the staff report.

REPUBLICANS AND EARTH DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, April 22, was Earth Day, the 26th

anniversary of Earth Day. Because we were not in session yesterday, we had an opportunity to be in our districts and in my case in New Jersey and to celebrate the day by participating in various events and talking about some of the environmental issues that are important to America these days.

It is very unfortunate though that last year, in 1995, when Speaker GINGRICH and the Republican majority and the Republican leadership first took office and it was the 25th anniversary of Earth Day, we saw a systematic effort on the part of the Republican majority, the Republican leadership, to try to tear down 25 years of environmental progress that had been made on a bipartisan basis in this Congress and with the cooperation of Presidents, again both Democrat and Republican.

Today, because of the fact that many in the Republican leadership—specifically the Speaker—saw that the efforts, those efforts to tear down environmental protection, to weaken environmental laws, to not provide funding for enforcement and for investigation against polluters, because that effort did not meet a favorable response with the American public and because the polling the Republican leadership did showed very emphatically that the public did not like the antienvironmental tactics that the Republican majority here was taking, all of a sudden now we see Speaker GINGRICH and the Republican majority saying that, or trying to give the impression that, somehow they are pro-environment.

Today for the first time we have three or more environmentally friendly bills that are going to be brought to the floor of the House. It is no accident that it is the day after Earth Day. Just like planting trees and visiting zoos and other things that GINGRICH had suggested that Republican Members do, now he is proposing legislation on the day after Earth Day to try to basically give the impression that the GOP is environmentally friendly. They are not. Like a wolf dressed in sheep's clothing, many of the Republicans in this body are trying to give off the false appearance of concern for the environment and the health and safety of the American people. But they have worked consistently in this Congress to gut successful environmental laws such as the Clean Water Act, the Clean Air Act, Superfund, and the Safe Drinking Water Act. They have voted to substantially reduce funding for key environmental agencies such as the EPA and the Interior Department. They have tied the hands of these agencies by attaching antienvironmental riders onto their appropriation bills.

These bills that we will be voting on today are nothing more than a figleaf being used to hide the shameful voting record of many Republican Members on the environment. Unfortunately, the leaf they have chosen just is not big enough.

I want to use this chart to talk about the battery recycling bill, which is going to come up today and is a very good bill; but many of the Republicans cannot hide, by voting for this bill today, their previous votes on issues that are related.

For example, most of them voted—if I could turn this over, Mr. Speaker—basically against protecting children from arsenic in their drinking water. They voted against adequate funding for our Nation's toxic waste cleanup programs. They voted to stop the EPA from protecting Americans from exposure to arsenic, dioxin, lead, and other cancer causing pollutants and to allow corporate polluters to dump up to 70,000 chemicals into our Nation's rivers, lakes and streams and, finally, to allow industry to pollute our drinking water.

I want to make certain that the American public knows what is going on here today on the floor of this House. I will be supporting these bills today, the Coastal Zone Management Act, the battery recycling bill, the national wildlife refuge bills, and I have supported pro-environment initiatives throughout this Congress. Unfortunately, many of my friends on the other side of the aisle cannot say the same.

For that, we are going to give them today the figleaf award. The figleaf award is given to those Republicans, the majority of them, who are essentially using Earth Day antics to try to cover up their environmental records.

Mr. Speaker, it is not fair. When I came to Congress in 1988, I came here because many of my constituents were concerned about the environment and hoped that by coming down here I could do something to turn around the dismal situation at the Jersey Shore where we had medical waste and a lot of debris washing up on our beaches and our beaches were closed. I am very proud to say that Democratic Congresses, in cooperation with Republican and Democratic Presidents over the last 8 years, have done a lot to clean up our water. But this Congress has tried to turn back the clock.

The Republican majority and its leadership should not be allowed to hide what they are doing behind a figleaf.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman's figleaf, if they wore that figleaf in public they probably would be arrested for indecent exposure. The fact is, there is not any figleaf that is big enough to cover up the damage and the effort to undo environmental public policy that this Congress has done. In fact this Congress has not done the big things right. It is not doing the little things right.

Earth Day is not just the 26th day. Earth Day was not just yesterday. It is every day, not just 1 week but 52 weeks a year.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments of the gentleman from Minnesota.

GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, today is the day after Earth Day, and I am one of those Members of Congress from the Republican side who feels that every day should be an Earth Day because really, if you stop and think about it, most of the rest of the world is destroying our planet.

We have taken some corrective actions in this Congress and through Republican efforts. The Environmental Protection Agency was first proposed by President Nixon in 1972. Republicans have a long history of supporting cleaning up the environment, not only in this country but also in the world. One reason I came to the floor today is to announce that I am reintroducing legislation that I introduced in my first term. I have only been here 38 months, but this was probably the first place of legislation I introduced as a new Member. It deals with cleaning up our global environment.

As a former businessman, I had a chance in the international trade field to travel the world and see the mass destruction of our planet by so many nations. What disturbed me in traveling around the world and looking at what is going on was that in fact the U.S. policy, the U.S. financial backing was supporting some of these efforts at destruction of our planet.

So one of the first bills I introduced was called the Global Environmental Cleanup Act. I introduced it; it never got a hearing with the old majority. Really never got a fair airing. I felt that it was important that the United States, through legislation and through a directive from Congress, state as a firm policy that countries who receive any type of financial assistance should in fact be obligated to clean up the environment.

That is exactly what this bill will do. And I invite my colleagues to join me in being cosponsors of the legislation this week when it is introduced. Basically what it says is if you receive U.S. financial assistance, financial aid, that a certain percent of that financial aid, and whether it is to build a dam or whether it is to create an industry or some activity in a foreign nation, that in fact that portion of those funds from the United States and the taxpayer goes to clean up the environment in these countries. It is a reasonable approach and a reasoned approach.

The other thing that I noticed is that because of the way other countries, third world countries and other competing countries compete with the United States in manufacturing and other activities, often using lower environmental standards. They bring products into the United States at a lower cost, with less environmental protection, less attention to environmental

cleanup and protection and they compete with our businessmen and women on an unfair basis. So this is a little bit of an equalizer.

This bill is also interesting because it also impacts every agency of the United States that deals in financial support or assistance or backing. The United States actually supports the finances of almost all third world nations. If we pulled out our financial backing through the United Nations, through the World Bank, through the various development banks and regional banks, many of these countries could collapse.

What this bill says, in its second part, is in fact that cleaning up the environment and environmental policy will be part of our policy and our financial backing. We will direct our representatives to these organizations to express not only by their voice but also by their vote support for environmental cleanup so our taxpayer dollars will help clean up and establish a policy for cleaning up these third world nations that abuse the world environment.

Let me provide examples. In Egypt, the second largest recipient of United States foreign assistance and we see pollution that would startle any environmentalist, and certainly should be a concern to every American. If you look in the Western Hemisphere in Mexico, a major trade recipient, a recipient of the largess of the United States, environmental pollution is a disaster. This bill and my colleagues' action in cosponsoring will help clean up that mess.

VARIOUS REFUGEE BILLS ON SUSPENSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HINCHEY] is recognized during morning business for 4 minutes.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, I am from the State of New York where we have a long history of protecting the environment on a bipartisan basis. As a matter of fact, New York was the State that gave to the Nation Theodore Roosevelt, who more than any other person was responsible for the establishment of our system of national parks. It is also the State where Nelson Rockefeller was the Governor, a great Republican Governor, one who led the fight in the early 1960's for environmental protection and particularly in cleaning up our waterways with the New York Clean Water Act.

Unfortunately in this Congress the sense of bipartisan responsibility and protection for the environment has just flown out the window. It is completely absent. However, later on this afternoon, we will see part of what can only be described as a great American confidence game, a con game.

In a con game what happens is this, the confidence man or person tries to gain your confidence so that he can put