

actions were taken. This legislation is identical to a measure I introduced with bipartisan support in the last Congress, and it was the model for a provision I secured in last year's Clean Water Act reauthorization bill, H.R. 3948.

Currently, there is no guarantee that fines or other moneys that result from violations of the Clean Water Act will be used to correct water quality problems. Instead, some of the money goes into the general fund of the U.S. Treasury without any provision that it be used to improve the quality of our Nation's waters.

I am concerned that EPA enforcement activities are extracting large sums of money from industry and others through enforcement of the Clean Water Act, while we ignore the fundamental issue of how to pay for the cleanup of the water pollution problems for which the penalties were levied. If we are really serious about ensuring the successful implementation of the Clean Water Act, we should put these enforcement funds to work and actually clean up our Nation's waters. It does not make sense for scarce resources to go into the bottomless pit of the Treasury's general fund, especially if we fail to solve our serious water quality problems due to lack of funds.

Specifically, my bill would establish a national clean water trust fund within the U.S. Treasury for fines, penalties, and other moneys, including consent decrees, obtained through enforcement of the Clean Water Act that would otherwise be placed into Treasury's general fund. Under my proposal, the EPA Administrator would be authorized to prioritize and carry out projects to restore and recover waters of the United States using the funds collected from violations of the Clean Water Act. However, this legislation would not preempt citizen suits or in any way preclude EPA's authority to undertake and complete supplemental environmental projects [SEP's] as part of settlements related to violations of the Clean Water Act and/or other legislation.

For example, in 1993, Inland Steel announced a \$54.5 million multimedia consent decree, which included a \$26 million SEP and a \$3.5 million cash payment to the U.S. Treasury. I strongly support the use of SEP's to facilitate the cleanup of serious environmental problems, which are particularly prevalent in my congressional district. However, my bill would dedicate the cash payment to the Treasury to the clean water trust fund.

The bill further specifies that remedial projects be within the same EPA region where enforcement action was taken. Northwest Indiana is in EPA region 5, and there are 10 EPA regions throughout the United States. Under my proposal, any funds collected from enforcement of the Clean Water Act in region 5 would go into the national clean water trust fund and, ideally, be used to cleanup environmental impacts associated with the problem for which the fine was levied.

To illustrate how a national clean water trust fund would be effective in cleaning up our Nation's waters, I would like to highlight the magnitude of the fines that have been levied through enforcement of the Clean Water Act. Nationwide, in fiscal year 1994, EPA assessed \$35 million in penalties for violations of the Clean Water Act. These penalties represented 27 percent of all penalties assessed by EPA under various environmental statutes.

My bill also instructs EPA to coordinate its efforts with the State in prioritizing specific

cleanup projects. Finally, to monitor the implementation of the national clean water trust fund, I have included a reporting requirement in my legislation. One year after enactment, and every 2 years thereafter, the EPA Administrator would make a report to Congress regarding the establishment of the trust fund.

My legislation has garnered the endorsement of several environmental organizations in northwest Indiana, including the Grand Calumet task force, the northwest Indiana chapter of the Izaak Walton League, and the Save the Dunes Council. Further, I am encouraged by the support within the national environmental community and the Northeast-Midwest Institute for the concept of a national clean water trust fund. I would also like to point out that, in a 1992 report to Congress on the Clean Water Act enforcement mechanisms, and Environmental Protection Agency workgroup recommended amending the Clean Water Act to establish a national clean water trust fund.

In reauthorizing the Clean Water Act, we have a unique opportunity to improve the quality of our Nation's waters. The establishment of a national clean water trust fund is an innovative step in that direction. By targeting funds accrued through enforcement of the Clean Water Act—that would otherwise go into the Treasury Department's general fund—we can put scarce resources to work and facilitate the cleanup of problem areas throughout the Great Lakes and across this country. I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

BURTON AND TORRICELLI BLAST IDEA OF EASING CUBAN EMBARGO

HON. DAN BURTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1995

Congressman DAN BURTON, chairman of Western Hemisphere Affairs Subcommittee and ROBERT TORRICELLI, ranking minority member of the subcommittee expressed strong opposition to any easing of United States economic sanctions on Cuba.

According to a report in the Washington Post today, several of President Clinton's advisers are recommending that the economic embargo on Cuba be eased, allowing dollar remittances to be sent to Cuba, and making it easier to travel to Cuba. In response, Congressmen BURTON and TORRICELLI have issued the following statement:

We are absolutely dismayed over reports that the Clinton Administration is considering easing certain aspects of the United States economic embargo on Cuba. We believe that any easing of pressure on the Fidel Castro regime will only prolong the suffering of the Cuban people and will send the wrong signal to the dictatorship.

The communist dictatorship in Cuba is one of the most notorious violators of human rights in existence today. Despite the monumental changes in the world over the past six years, Fidel Castro remains as committed as ever in his nefarious, failed ideology.

The loss of over \$6 billion a year in subsidies from the Soviet Union has caused the Cuban economy to contract by sixty percent. It is for this reason that Castro, desperate for foreign currency, has been forced to adopt superficial measures aimed at increasing foreign investment. There is no mistak-

ing the fact that Castro is only interested in perpetuating his own dictatorial rule.

At a time when the Castro regime is clearly on its last leg, the United States should maintain pressure and resist any calls to lift the embargo. This was the clear message of the Cuban Democracy Act of 1992, which the President supported; and it is the aim of the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity Act (Libertad), which we recently introduced.

Any easing of the U.S. embargo at this time would send the absolutely wrong message to Fidel Castro, and to the Cuban people. We will fiercely resist any such move.

PRIVATE PROPERTY PROTECTION ACT OF 1995

SPEECH OF

HON. RONALD D. COLEMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 3, 1995

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 925) to compensate owners of private property for the effect of certain regulatory restrictions.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the bill H.R. 925. I am disappointed because there were a series of important measures that would have modified the legislation in such a way that I could have supported it. Unfortunately, those measures failed, and the bill that we are left with has extremely alarming implications. Were this legislation enacted, the Federal Government would be saddled with a huge new entitlement program, with unknown costs. Not only will this legislation be tremendously expensive in terms of Federal dollars, but the limitations that it will impose upon the regulatory power of Federal agencies could exact a huge toll upon human health and the environment.

Many of the proponents of this bill have tried to argue that the decision before us is essentially a constitutional question. They have frequently read from the fifth amendment provision which bars the Federal Government from taking private property without just compensation. But H.R. 925 raises a constitutional question only insofar as the bill requires us to expand upon how this body chooses to define "takings." In the past, this interpretation has been left to the jurisdiction of the courts. As the takings question is fundamentally one of constitutional interpretation, the court system is probably the most appropriate forum for determining the proper answer to this question.

Yet, the precedent adhered to by the Supreme Court dictates that Government action must reduce the value of private property by almost 90 percent before the owner can be compensated. Many of my colleagues felt that such a threshold was unreasonably high, and wished to take steps to compensate property owners suffering large financial losses as the result of regulatory action. I strongly supported such initiatives. I feel that it is the proper role of the Congress to craft legislation to meet the changing needs of our society in a manner consistent with the intent of the Framers of the Constitution. I firmly believe that property owners should not be subject to undue financial burdens as a result of Government actions.

However, this bill is not crafted simply to set new limitations on Government regulations. Indeed, this bill fundamentally redefines the "takings" question, giving it a meaning so broad that it has in effect been rendered meaningless.

Under the provisions of this bill, any property owner who can demonstrate a loss of value to their property of 10 percent or more will be entitled to Federal compensation. Unfortunately, this threshold is absurdly low. Landowners will be tempted under the terms of this provision to subdivide their property to meet the threshold, thereby resulting in a plethora of cases brought against Federal regulatory agencies. The bill makes no provision to prevent this from happening. The bill also fails to make any provisions to prevent speculation. If an individual buys land with the full knowledge of pending regulations that will impact upon the value of their property, they are nonetheless able to seek compensation under the terms of this bill should those regulations go into effect. Although I am certain that this is not an intended result of the bill, it is important to note that efforts to remedy this oversight failed in committee.

Aside from the technical problems of the bill, we must also face the fact that the language of this legislation threatens to vastly increase the size of the Federal Government. In establishing procedural channels for direct negotiations between Federal agencies while simultaneously promising to compensate all property owners who lose even 10 percent of their property value through regulations, we will open up a floodgate of litigations aimed at our various regulatory agencies. This bill will certainly increase the size of these Federal agencies. The agencies will be forced to hire a huge legal staff to help them determine the validity of claims brought against them. In effect, this bill ensures an increased bloating of our Federal bureaucracy. It seems strange to me the very people who are attacking big Government are actively engaged in the process of creating one.

The takings problem is large enough that it deserved a substantial portion of our time and effort toward the creation of an effective solution. Instead, the Republicans in this body acted hastily to present us with a bill that is clumsy and will doubtlessly prove ineffective. Surely there were better ways to address the problem. Instead, we have just established a brand new entitlement program, with uncertain costs and a vast scope. Just as Republicans are attacking Democrats for failing to endorse the balanced budget, they establish a program that may render such a balance impossible. Without calculating the costs of this bill, they have proposed a new program that will certainly cost the American taxpayer billions of dollars. Of course, many of those dollars will go not to small property owners. Under the terms of this bill, we will be taking money out of necessary programs, and using it to line the pockets of many wealthy landowners and industrialists, a new breed of speculators, lawyers for the Government, lawyers for those who file claims, and the Federal bureaucrats who will be central to sorting out this new law long after we are gone. Language to prevent this outcome was presented in the Porter, Farr, Ehlers, and Bryant amendment. Unfortunately, this effort failed.

While I would like to see the role of the Federal Government limited in relation to the rights of the owners of private property, I do not feel that H.R. 925 achieves that goal.

TRIBUTE TO ELINORE MANDELL

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1995

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to acknowledge Ms. Elinore Mandell, a native of Brooklyn. Ms. Mandell was born, reared and educated in Brooklyn. Her children are products of the public school system. And her grandchildren currently attend public school. Elinore Mandell has always been concerned about the quality of life for children. Her concern and devotion was quite evident during her children's formative years when she participated in various community activities. She served as an assistant leader for both the Brownies and Girl Scouts, and as a den mother for the Cub Scouts. And she also held a number of positions in the parents association.

In 1980 Elinore moved to East New York/Starrett City and ran successfully for membership on the district 19 school board, where she served for 10 years. She retired from the school board in 1993. Elinore is employed by Assemblyman Anthony Genovesi as his administrative assistant, and has ably served him for the past 20 years.

RECOGNITION OF NATIONAL SPORTSMANSHIP DAY, MARCH 7, 1995

HON. PATRICK J. KENNEDY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1995

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of March 7, 1995 being recognized as National Sportsmanship Day. Since its inception in 1991, over 7,000 schools nationwide have taken part in celebrating the essential life lessons that are developed through participation in sports. The participants, who range from elementary students right up through the university level will spend the day in constructive competition.

For the past 5 years, the Institute for International Sport, located at the University of Rhode Island, has worked hard to help establish greater awareness in the area of physical fitness. In addition to National Sportsmanship Day, the institute works all year to promote initiatives like the Student-Athlete Outreach Program, where student-athletes from high schools and colleges travel to local elementary and middle schools to serve as positive role models and promote good sportsmanship.

I fully support these initiatives and would like to acknowledge all the individuals who have devoted their time and efforts to broaden participation in the arena of friendly competition and sportsmanship.

TRIBUTE TO JUDGE JUDITH M. ASHMANN

HON. HOWARD L. BERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

HON. ANTHONY C. BEILENSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1995

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, we are honored to pay tribute to Judge Judith M. Ashmann, supervising judge of Los Angeles Superior Court's North Valley district, who has been named Judge of the Year by the San Fernando Valley Bar Association. Judge Ashmann, a friend for many years, has a distinguished legal career, including her tenure on the superior court bench, nearly 6 years spent as a municipal court judge in Van Nuys and a decade working in the city, State and Federal attorney offices.

Last year, in the aftermath of the devastating Northridge Earthquake, Judge Ashmann had her finest hour. The San Fernando courthouse suffered severe damage, rendering it uninhabitable. Without quick action by Judge Ashmann, the result could have been chaos.

But she kept her cool under fire, supervising the orderly transfer of judicial duties to other locations, including trailers outside the Van Nuys courthouse. At the same time, Judge Ashmann embarked on an ambitious, time-consuming but absolutely essential project to eliminate the backlog of civil cases created by the earthquake, the most expensive natural disaster in American history.

During a 2-week period, teams of volunteer attorneys and judges assembled by Judge Ashmann disposed of more than 1,000 cases in San Fernando Valley courts. Along with community leaders, Judge Ashmann has been responsible for restoring a sense of normalcy to the earthquake zone.

Mr. Speaker, we ask our colleagues to join us today in saluting Judge Judith Ashmann, who combines a sound legal mind with exceptional qualities of leadership. She is an inspiration to all of us.

TRIBUTE TO SUSAN PINTO

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1995

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to highlight the contributions of Susan Pinto who was born and raised in Brooklyn. Susan is that rare person who travels to the beat of a different drummer. She attended parochial elementary and secondary schools, and graduated from Brooklyn College. After completing college, she began performing drug-free treatment work. Susan helped design and open treatment and prevention programs in East New York, Brownsville, Bed-Stuy, Sheepshead Bay, and Canarsie. She is a certified substance abuse counselor [CSAC].

Susan is a woman of commitment to everything she is involved in, particularly her immediate, extended family, and circle of friends. Her other endeavors include work in real estate sales and management, construction, and