

Sharon and Darryl are right. It is wrong for the Government to punish people who decide to get married. We must end the marriage penalty; we must pass a bill and send it to President Clinton that would eliminate that penalty, and when we do that, we will show that the Government is on the side of families, not working against them.

We will show that Government is not going to discriminate against women who go back into the work force, and we will show that Government is going to allow working families to keep more of their hard-earned income and decide how they want to spend it in raising their children, paying the bills, saving for the future, maybe giving them a chance to go to college.

I urge my colleagues to join me in passing the bill to repeal the marriage penalty in our Tax Code, not only for ourselves and all Americans, but especially for Sharon and Darryl, who fondly want to get married, to let them have their dream of having a family together.

STRAUGHN, IN,
February 17, 1997.

Hon. DAVID MCINTOSH,
Muncie, IN.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MCINTOSH: My boyfriend, Darryl Pierce, and I have been living together for quite some time. We would very much like to get married.

We both work at Ford Electronics in Connersville Indiana. We both make less than \$10.00 an hour; however, we do work overtime whenever it is available. Also Darryl does some farming on the side.

I can't tell you how disgusted we both are over this tax issue. If we get married not only would I forfeit my \$900.00 refund check, we would be writing a check to the IRS for \$2,800.00. This amount was figured for us by an accountant at the local H&R Block office in New Castle.

Now there is nothing right about this. After we continually hear the government preach to us about "family values."

Nothing new about the hypocrites in Washington. Why don't we do away with the current tax system? It is old and outdated. Antiquated. The flat tax is the most sensible method to use and no one is being penalized. Everyone would be treated the same.

I don't understand how the government can ask such questions as: single? married? dependents? Employers, bankers, realtors, and creditors are forbidden by law to ask these questions. The same should apply to the government.

Darryl and I would very much like to be married and I must say it broke our hearts when we found out we can't afford it.

We hope someday the government will allow us to get married by not penalizing us.

Yours Very Truly,

SHARON MALLORY.
DARRYL PIERCE.

□ 1845

IT IS CALLED ACCOUNTABILITY

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, in the early morning of April 9, a large group of United States-trained Haitian National

Police forcefully entered and illegally searched the family home of a long-time employee of the International Republican Institute, which is an adjunct of the National Endowment for Democracy, which is of great interest to this institution.

The contents of the home, which were owned by the employee's aunt, who happens to be an American citizen, were destroyed and photographs of the employee and his family were confiscated. We have received confirmation from the United States Embassy officials that the Haitian National Police have taken responsibility for the action, and they have claimed that they were thinking that there was a gang operating out of the home. It is worth noting that they failed, regardless of the merit or lack in the claim about the gang. It is worth noting that they never gained proper authorization to take such an action or stage such a raid.

More troubling still is that this raid comes after an already-harrowing series of specific threats against this employee's family in the lead-up to the latest round of elections some 10 days ago, threats that many believe can be directly linked to the employee's work for the IRI. And those of us who have followed Haiti very closely will recall that this pattern mirrors that which preceded the forced departure of Haitian Chamber of Deputy member Dooley Brutus.

We must ask the administration if in fact the Clinton administration has lost control of the program in Haiti to the degree that we are now supporting blatant human rights violations with United States taxpayers' dollars. In fact, tensions in Haiti have been running so high in recent weeks for IRI that it has had to close its office and move its operations to a new, safe site where security can be provided more effectively. This does not sound like a democracy to me.

Mr. Speaker, an attack of this sort is inexcusable in a democracy, even a fledgling democracy. We cannot tolerate this. Not only is the victimization of an American citizen inappropriate, to put it mildly, but the attack on an individual working to further the development of democracy in Haiti is deeply troubling. The fact that the same type of raid was carried out on the same night, in the same neighborhood, in the home of a prominent business family suggests that these types of raids are not all that uncommon. Sadly, that seems to be so.

Rest assured that we will be looking to the United States Embassy, the Haitian Government, and Colin Granderson's civilian mission for a thorough report on this incident.

We also expect the administration to place a priority on ensuring that this assault against an American citizen and property is thoroughly investigated by the Government of Haiti. We know from our experience with the Gonzalez and Bertin cases that the in-

vestigation stage is generally where the Haitian judicial system breaks down totally.

The involvement of United States-trained Haitian National Police also means that there are questions to be answered about the apparent lack of progress on the rule of law in Haiti after so great a commitment of United States personnel and tax dollars. One certainly must ask if the wanton destruction of property was included as part of the training we provided with U.S. tax dollars. I hope that is not so.

How many American or Haitian citizens have to be traumatized in this way before the Clinton administration will be willing to take off the rose-colored glasses and give us an honest assessment of the situation in Haiti? It appears that it is quite a sad saga.

If we have a serious problem in Haiti, a problem directly linked to United States tax dollars, let us acknowledge it and get on with the process of fixing it. That is called accountability and the American people expect nothing less, even though we have been getting less for some time from the Clinton administration when we seek candor on the subject of Haiti.

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

[Mr. CHRISTENSEN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

[Mr. HUNTER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

EARTH DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to address the House tonight on the subject of Earth Day. Since the House is going out of session this evening and will not be returning because of the Passover holidays until Wednesday for any legislative action, this is the only opportunity before Earth Day, which is next Tuesday, April 22, to talk about the significance of that occasion, not only to Congress but to the American people.

Next Tuesday, April 22, is in fact Earth Day. I believe it is the 26th Earth Day. Earth Day has always been a day to celebrate the environment and our natural heritage. It has also served to raise people's awareness about the quality of their environment and the

importance of environmental protection and responsible living.

In more recent years, however, Earth Day has become a time for people to grandstand on the environment, particularly politicians, and although it is very popular, it is not always easy to be green. We cannot simply feign interest, particularly politicians, in environmental quality, we actually have to do something about it here in the Congress.

Even though the quality of the environment has substantially improved over the last 20 years, the environment is still high on people's lists. If you do poll or talk to your constituents, they always tell you they are very concerned about the environment. That is because, in my opinion, they understand the connection between the environment and public health.

People want their representatives in Washington to be working to protect their families from environmental health hazards, and people want us to help them protect themselves by providing them with the information that they need to formulate their own decisions about the environment.

Finally, people also want to know that their children and their grandchildren will be able to enjoy the same outdoor experiences that they had the opportunity to experience. This also happens to be the Week of the Young Child, and I do not think it is any surprise, if you will, that Earth Day follows on that, because I think in many ways one of the major reasons why adults are concerned about the environment is because they worry about their children and their grandchildren and their future here on this planet.

Mr. Speaker, I have to say, though, that in the last Congress, the Republican majority really launched a relentless attack on the basic environmental protections that ensure the safety of the water that our children drink and the air that they breathe.

In fact, the Earth Day founder, Gaylord Nelson, declared that the 104th Congress had the worst environmental record in history. I think that is very fair to say. Republicans basically showed their antienvironmental hand in the last Congress, but I think that what they found out is that as the election in November 1996 approached, that bashing the environment really was not a very good thing to do politically, and so all of a sudden we saw less bashing of the environment, and I think this year we are not seeing it much at all.

I think there is fear, really, on the part of the majority of further reprisals from the voters if they try to weaken environmental legislation, and so essentially the Republican leadership is trying to avoid openly bashing the environment this year. But as the Los Angeles Times observed on April 7, and I quote, "Their language masks a reality. Behind these gentler words, the Republican majority is still working hard to relax or abolish many environmental regulations."

Just to give the Members an idea in terms of the antienvironmental battle this year, the House Republican whip, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY], who last year said he did not believe that acid rain or global warming existed, this year told the House committee that drinking mouthwash or milk is more likely to give you cancer than air pollution is to be damaging to a person's health.

Mr. Speaker, fortunately we see the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY] making these comments because he is at least openly expressing some of his antienvironmental views, but we do not see as much of it on the floor, and I think what we are seeing is that the effort to weaken environmental laws in many ways is now taking place in the back rooms, or as part of some action that may come later in committee.

Democrats, however, still feel it is very important to move ahead with a proenvironmental agenda, and Democrats will continue to put forward environmental initiatives this year, and will press the Republican majority for action on these bills. I think that we can often get Republican Members to join us, even if the leadership does not necessarily support us with this proenvironmental agenda.

Today, in anticipation of Earth Day next Tuesday, leading House Democrats announced a 5-point environmental challenge to the Republican majority. We issued a special report detailing that challenge. Democrats are basically challenging the Republicans to enact legislation to protect the health and safety of American children and put the Republicans essentially on notice that Democrats will oppose any attempts to roll back environmental protections.

I just wanted to describe, if I could, for a brief time during this hour these five legislative challenges that the Democrats put forward today. The first, and I think a very important one, is the challenge to enact the Defense of the Environment Act by July 4. The Defense of the Environment Act basically allows for a separate debate and vote on any legislative provision that would weaken environmental protection.

Some may say, why do you need something like that? Well, there are a lot of reasons for that. Congress needs to act, I think, as a steward of the Nation's environment and natural resources. We owe that to our children and grandchildren. A critical step we can take for them is to ensure that there is full and open debate on any provisions that would weaken the protection of the environment.

The Defense of the Environment Act will put a spotlight on backroom attempts to weaken our environmental laws. This was a bill that was introduced by the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT].

Basically what it does is allows for a separate debate and vote on these leg-

islative provisions. Mr. Speaker, again, we might say why is that necessary? Well, to be honest, it is necessary because of what we saw happen in the last Congress with the Republicans in the majority.

In early 1995, Congress adopted procedural steps that ensured that unfunded mandates and tax increases cannot be enacted unless specifically considered and approved by the House. The Defense of the Environment Act simply extends this protection to provisions that weaken environmental protection.

The need is clear. When Republicans took control in 1995, they compiled the worst environmental record in history. What we essentially saw was an effort to do this weakening of environmental legislation either in committee or on the floor, but articulating a position that was totally to the contrary.

So what we are saying with the Defense of the Environment Act is that we do not want to let the industry lobbyists rewrite legislation; we do not want, with regard, for example, to toxic waste, to let Republicans turn polluter pays into pay the polluter. We want to be able to bring these provisions, these weakening provisions, to the floor for a separate vote whenever possible, when legislation comes up that might impact the environment.

The second challenge that the Democrats, again, are making to our Republican colleagues is that the Republicans drop the attack on the basic protections of the Clean Air Act. Specifically, Republicans need to abandon their version of regulatory reform that would undermine the fundamental principles of the Clean Air Act, including health-based standards.

I have to say that I believe that the Clean Air Act has been a tremendous success. Nothing, really, has been more important in protecting the health of American children than both the clean air act that was initially enacted in 1970 and the Clean Air Amendments of 1990. If we look at these two and we look at the statistics, they show that the air our children breathe is dramatically cleaner as a result of these two measures.

The EPA recently put out a report entitled "The Benefits and Costs of the Clean Air Act, 1970 to 1990." That just documents some figures that I think are really important; first, that in that 20-year period airborne lead emissions were reduced by 99 percent, carbon monoxide emissions were reduced by 50 percent, and sulfur dioxide emissions were reduced by 40 percent.

If we look specifically at the Clean Air Act amendments of 1990, just to give some of the results of that, over 50 percent of the cities that did not meet the air quality standard for urban smog in 1990 now meet that standard. Over 75 percent of the cities that did not meet the air quality standard for carbon monoxide in 1990 now meet the standard.

So clearly we have had success. But the Republican regulatory reform bills

would roll back basic clean air protections. During the last Congress, House Republicans used these regulatory reform bills to make backdoor attacks on America's most important environmental laws, but most important, the Clean Air Act.

One such GOP proposal was their risk assessment bill, H.R. 1022, a key part of the Republican Contract With America. This passed on February 28, 1995. The risk assessment bill had a supermandate that supplemented all the public health standards of existing environmental laws, requiring, in effect, that the EPA design all standards to minimize the compliance costs for polluters first.

The bill would have undercut the Clean Air Act standards that are now set solely in the best interests of protecting public health. The EPA would have been compelled to select the cheapest pollution reduction option, rather than the most effective option for protecting America's children at a time when childhood asthma rates are rising very sharply.

The GOP bill would also have added additional roadblocks by dramatically expanding the cost-benefit analyses needed to justify new public health standards and giving polluters broad new rights to sue the EPA to block improvements in clean air rules.

This Republican risk assessment bill would also have allowed parties with a financial interest in weakening clean air requirements to sit on mandatory peer review groups that would assess EPA's proposed air standards.

□ 1900

Fortunately, the House and the Senate GOP regulatory reform bills did not get to conference and therefore died at the end of the Congress, but we expect that they will come up again in some form and we are saying today, do not do it. We are tired of these, the use of these regulatory reform bills as a method of trying to weaken the Clean Air Act and other environmental legislation.

Our third challenge in our report, our third challenge to the Republicans, is to pass the brownfields initiative by July 4. This is linked to the cleanup of hazardous waste material primarily in urban areas but also in suburban areas, old industrial sites, hence the term "brownfield."

Again, it is linked to children and children's health needs. Kids need cleaner cities. They need a strong economy. Democrats have been offering to work with Republicans to promptly move the brownfields legislation, but so far Republicans have refused. They have been saying and insisting on a broader Superfund bill or Superfund reauthorization that would transfer cleanup costs from polluters to taxpayers. And each day of delay, again, on the brownfields measure basically denies funding for another cleanup.

Currently there are about, there are actually several million children who

live within 5 miles of these polluted sites, the so-called brownfields. If you clean up the sites, they can be replaced with different kind of businesses or commercial activities that actually would create jobs in the cities.

Just a little discussion, if I could, about what the brownfields initiative does. It basically provides for the establishment of a new partnership of the Federal Government with States and local governments and the private sector to undertake cleanups.

Two broad purposes: One is to significantly increase the pace of cleanup at the sites by promoting and encouraging the creation, development, and enhancement of State voluntary cleanup programs; and second, to benefit the public health, welfare, and the environment by cleaning up and returning these sites to economically productive or other beneficiary uses.

Essentially, what we are doing is trying to recognize the key role that States have played in cleanup and will continue to play in identifying, assessing and cleaning up brownfields. A lot of people think that the Superfund Program, which is the Federal program for the cleanup of hazardous waste sites, covers all the sites.

Actually, it only covers, I think, certainly less than 50 percent. In my home State of New Jersey, we have about 6,000 hazardous waste sites but we only have less than 150 Superfund sites. So you can see it is only a very small portion of the number of hazardous waste sites.

So to the extent that the Federal Government can expand the Superfund program to provide for more cleanup of sites that are not on the national priority or Superfund list, it actually would help significantly in the State efforts, in the overall effort to clean up a lot of these toxic waste sites.

Under the Democrats brownfields bill, the EPA would give flexibility to the States so that they can get the job done. The bill calls for specific funding for State grants, \$15 million per year for 5 years to develop and enhance State clean-up programs.

It also contains \$45 million per year for 3 years to local governments to inventory and cleanup brownfields where local officials, developers and purchasers and citizens believe that these redeveloped sites have the most chance of creating new jobs and new opportunities.

A lot of my colleagues on the Republican side have expressed support for the brownfields initiative. It has broad bipartisan support. However, what is happening is that the Republican leadership is insisting that the brownfields initiative be tied to much more controversial legislation; that is, the GOP version of Superfund reform.

And, of course, we cannot support that because essentially it is like the Superfund bill that the Republicans tried to push through in the last Congress that would weaken the Superfund law, that would allow cleanup to be

temporary rather than permanent, that would cap the number of sites that can be put on the Superfund list, that would essentially rather than requiring those who caused the pollution, the toxic waste, to bear most of the cost of the cleanup, would in fact put most of the cost of the cleanup on the Federal Government and essentially let a lot of polluters get off.

So what we are really calling upon the GOP leadership is to say, look, pass the brownfields initiative that can expand the Superfund Program in a very effective way by giving money back to States, which is something that many Republicans say is part of their ideology, but at the same time let us get that bill passed. That would be a very proenvironment bill that would help a lot with toxic waste cleanup. Do not link it to this overall effort to weaken the Superfund Program, because all that means is that nothing is going to pass and nothing progressive to move on an environmental agenda will occur here in the Congress.

The fourth challenge that Democrats are making again to the Republicans for Earth Day this year is to increase funding for national parks and to reform unjustified natural resource subsidies. Right now we know that, I should say that we know that beginning with President Teddy Roosevelt, who was a Republican, preserving our natural resources has been a bipartisan enterprise. But unfortunately that was not the case in the last Congress.

We need a bipartisan effort in this 105th Congress in the tradition of someone like Teddy Roosevelt. With regard to the need for funding for national parks, the inadequate funding for national parks is highlighted by a statistic, if I could just quote, that says in constant dollars the total National Park Service's appropriation has declined by more than \$200 million between fiscal year 1983 and fiscal year 1997.

In the 104th Congress, the last Congress, the Republicans constantly voted to cut the funding for the National Park Service many times. I do not want to get into all the details but there were actually park shutdowns, the Republicans actually shut down and closed every park for the first time since the National Park Service was created in 1916. At that time, when the Government was shut down because of certain actions that were taken here, we actually had about 725,000 visitors that were turned away at the park gates.

There are also a number of tax subsidies, if you will, unjustified subsidies to natural resource companies that also need to be addressed in this Congress. Part of our challenge with regard to natural resources also affects these subsidies. The most egregious example of the need for reform is with regard to an 1872 mining law. Many people are familiar with this but not everyone. It is an anachronism, basically, from the 19th century that allows the

mining of gold, silver, and other valuable minerals on public lands without payments of royalties to the Treasury.

The 1997 annual report of the Council of Economic Advisors points out that between May 1994 and September 1996, the Interior Department was forced, by this 1872 mining law, to give away over \$15.3 billion worth of minerals in return for which the taxpayers received only \$19,190. This is probably the most egregious example of a government subsidy. Imagine, \$15.3 billion in revenue lost, and we received only \$19,190.

I could go on with some of the other subsidies, but there are a number of natural resources subsidies that are just totally unjustified and need to be reformed and should be addressed as part of this environmental challenge.

The last Democratic challenge to our Republican colleagues is, some may say that is not very significant, but I think it is, because one of the things that is so important is that Congress set an example and apply the laws that it passes to itself.

We actually have a rule or provision that was passed in the last Congress that says that you have to do that. But it is, nonetheless not always followed in practice, even if it is theoretically the law.

So our fifth challenge refers to the House of Representatives recycling program. We are calling upon the Republicans to repair the House of Representatives recycling program. We know millions of kids carefully recycle their glass bottles and paper but not the Congress. If you talk to your children or your grandchildren, you know that most of them are very concerned about recycling. It is the way for an individual to interact and get involved in environmental protection. So all the kids around the country or certainly a good portion of them are out there recycling their glass bottles and paper but not the Congress. SAM GEJDENSON, a Democratic Congressman from Connecticut, has introduced a resolution that will ensure that Congress plays by the same rules that our kids do with regard to recycling.

Specifically, he has introduced a resolution that provides for a mandatory recycling program in the House of Representatives. And we challenge the Republican Congress to adopt this resolution over the next few months and get the House back on the right track on recycling.

Just to give you some example of how recycling has declined under the Gingrich Congress, I think it is very important that we set an example. Under the leadership of the Speaker, it has declined.

I just want to give you some statistics, because I really think it is interesting. Since the Republicans took over, the percentage of House offices participating in recycling programs has declined, dropped from 90 percent in the 103d Congress to about 50 to 60 percent in the 105th Congress.

With regard to bottles, since the Republicans took over, the tonnage of

bottles that are recycled has fallen by 83 percent. Specifically, the tonnage of recycled bottles has fallen from 109.76 tons in 1994 to 18.15 tons in 1996.

Let me give you some statistics with regard to recycled cans. Since the Republicans took over, the tonnage of recycled cans has fallen by 74 percent. Specifically, the tonnage of recycled cans has fallen from 10.76 tons in 1994, to 2.83 tons in 1996.

Now, specifically, what Congressman GEJDENSON's resolution does is mandatory implementation. It provides in the resolution that each Member and each employing authority of the House of Representatives shall participate in the office waste recycling program. The Architect of the Capitol has to ensure that all employees of the House of Representatives whose responsibilities include custodial duties are adequately trained in the implementation of the office waste recycling program. The Architect of the Capitol shall require any contractor under a contract with the House of Representatives for carrying out the office waste recycling program has to ensure that all personnel are adequately trained in the implementation of the program. And finally the architect has to submit semiannually to the Committee on House Oversight a progress report on compliance with the office waste recycling program.

Again, I think this is important. Democrats are calling upon the Republicans to adopt this resolution and work with us to turn the House into a model for recycling for the country, rather than an embarrassment, which I think in many cases we have become with regard to this recycling program.

Again, before I conclude, I just want to say that I think that we need to all join together on this anniversary of Earth Day. And I am pleased with the fact that at least on the floor so far this session, we have not seen any overt efforts to turn back the clock on environmental protection, but I believe very strongly that there is certainly momentum out there on the Republican side with the Republican leadership to start moving towards some of the same measures last year with regard to the Clean Water Act, with regard to the Superfund program, with regard to the Endangered Species Act that would seek to bring up legislation that would weaken some of these very important environmental provisions. And rather than even have the status quo, I think we need to move forward on progressive legislation such as some of the things that I mentioned as part of this Democratic 5 point challenge.

The bottom line is that although the environment has been significantly cleaned up, there is still a lot that needs to be done. The health and safety of our children and our grandchildren depend upon our taking action in a positive way towards cleaning up the environment and setting an example, if you will, for the House of Representatives in that regard.

I wanted to talk a little bit more, if I could, about the brownfields program, because I think that that is something that right now we could move on a bipartisan basis and that there is essentially a consensus to get it accomplished.

Just to give you a little more information about the brownfields program, essentially what it consists of, it is called the Community Revitalization and Brownfield Cleanup Act of 1997. And I think I mentioned before the specific amounts of money that are dedicated, both for inventory, doing an inventory of sites that would be potential cleanup sites for this program and also the amount of money that the Federal Government would provide.

But it also allows a State to request the EPA to make a determination that the State's program is a qualified program, if it provides, one, for response actions that are protective of human health and the environment; two, opportunities for technical assistance; three, meaningful opportunities for public participation. And let me stress that. One of the best aspects of the Superfund program now has been community involvement.

I know that in my own district in New Jersey, the sixth district of New Jersey that I represent, many of the local community organizations, citizens action organizations, if you will, have become directly involved in proposing cleanup and the way to go about cleaning up a Superfund site.

□ 1915

So we are asking that the same thing be done with the Brownfields Program, that basically the community be involved in the decisions about how to go about the cleanup.

That is really a very important part of any environmental initiative. Anything that we pass in Congress should contain a community involvement program, a citizen action program, because that basically gets the initiative from the grassroots and at the same time teaches local citizens, if you will, about how they can become involved in environmental protection.

I think that is a very important aspect of Earth Day, and part of the lesson of Earth Day is getting people involved on an individual basis as well as on a community basis. But ultimately we in Congress have to make the decisions, we have to move forward on a positive environmental agenda and hopefully this Earth Day next Tuesday will be our opportunity to launch that and to get our Republican colleagues involved as well in a bipartisan way.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

CHILD LABOR AND THE CRUSADE OF IQBAL MASIH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN] is recognized for the