leadership, his example, and his many contributions, and to wish him a very happy birthday.

REVIEWING THE TRAVEL BAN ON LEBANON

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1995

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of State decided on February 28 to renew the ban on the use of U.S. passports to travel to Lebanon. This decision followed United States-Lebanese security discussions in Washington earlier last month. While the State Department acknowledges that the security situation in Lebanon has improved in the past few years, it maintains that there continue to be significant threats to the security of American citizens in that country.

I have recently spoken to several prominent Lebanese Americans who have visited Lebanon. They are very persuasive in arguing that the current travel ban impedes their legal ability to visit their families. I also believe that American businesses are losing the opportunity to compete for contracts to rebuild Lebanon. I have urged the Secretary of State to review the travel ban and to consider options for revising it in light of the changing conditions inside Lebanon.

Given the importance of this matter for the Lebanese-American community, I request that my exchange of letters with the Department of State be entered into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS,
Washington, DC, February 16, 1995.

Hon. WARREN H. CHRISTOPHER,
Secretary of State, Department of State, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: It is my understanding that the Department of State is currently reviewing the travel ban on Lebanon because the current six-month extension of the ban expires later this month.

I urge the Department to review the present total ban carefully and consider options to revise the ban and take steps in the direction of a combination of partial ban and partial travel advisory.

I am persuaded that Lebanon has taken a series of steps in improve security in the country. I also believe that further steps are needed. In this situation, however, I believe it is in our national interest and in the interest of encouraging further steps by Lebanon to take steps ourselves to match action by Lebanon.

The report by several prominent Lebanese Americans on their trip to the country as well as the recent visit here by a Lebanese Security delegation suggest changes are warranted. American businesses are currently locked out of many reconstruction efforts in the country and Lebanese Americans are legally unable to travel to Lebanon for family reunification purposes.

I appreciate your consideration of this matter and I am available if you want to discuss this matter further.

With best regards,

Sincerely,

LEE H. HAMILTON
Ranking Democratic Member.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, DC 20520.

Hon. LEE H. HAMILTON,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. HAMILTON: I am responding to your letter of February 16 to Secretary Christopher regarding the restrictions on travel to Lebanon by U.S. citizens.

On February 28, Secretary Christopher exercised his authority to extend the restriction on the use of U.S. passports for travel to, in, or through Lebanon. A careful and thorough review of the security situation in Lebanon led the Secretary to conclude that there remained significant threats there to the safety of American citizens.

In meetings here in Washington February 6–7, the Governments of the U.S. and Lebanon engaged in frank and useful discussions of the security situation in Lebanon and our continuing concern for the safety of Americans in Lebanon. We were pleased with the level of expertise the Government of Lebanon brought to these discussions and its avowed commitment to serious and effective action. We expect this dialogue to be an ongoing process leading to significant improvement in the security situation in Lebanon and a reduction in the dangers to American citizens.

We have acknowledged that there has been some improvement in Lebanon's security situation over the past few years. We commend the Lebanese Government for its efforts to diminish terrorist threats and to establish the role of law throughout the country. More needs to be done to address these problems, however, and we look forward to working with the Government of Lebanon on taking the necessary steps to do so.

We will continue to review the passport restriction and other administration measures affecting travel to Lebanon. Our review will be based on a careful evaluation of our own information and the steps the Lebanese government takes to address these issues.

The Department will carefully consider options short of lifting the passport restrictions. In considering these steps, however, the Department will have as its first consideration the safety and security of U.S. citizens.

The Secretary appreciates both your interest and your offer to continue a dialogue with the Department on this issue. The goal remains the removal of these restrictions when security conditions permit us to do so and the return to a mutually beneficial and improved bilateral relationship.

I trust that this information has been responsive to your inquiry. Please do not hesitate to contact us if you believe we may be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

WENDY R. SHERMAN,
Assistant Secretary,
Legislative Affairs.

RISK ASSESSMENT AND COST-BENEFIT ACT OF 1995

SPEECH OF

HON. LYNN C. WOOLSEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1995

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1022) to provide regulatory reform and to focus national economic resources on the greatest risks to human health, safety, and the environment through scientifically objective and unbiased risk assessments and through the consideration of costs and benefits in major rules, and for other purposes:

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1022, the Risk Assessment and Cost Benefit Act.

H.R. 1022 is not a regulatory reform bill as the new Republican leadership claims. It is an attempt by supporters of the Contract On America to destroy environmental protections which the American people fought for long and hard. Landmark environmental legislation such as the Clean Air Act, the Clean Water Act, and the endangered Species Act will be superseded by H.R. 1022, leaving our air, water, and wildlife unprotected.

Under H.R. 1022, 12 Federal agencies including the Environmental Protection Agency, the Energy Department, and the Interior Department will be required to follow a single set of new, government-wide principles for risk assessment activities in order to carry out their regulatory responsibilities. This one-size-fits-all approach to risk assessments will prevent Federal officials from developing sound public policy. Instead, H.R. 1022 will lead to long delays of important environmental protection programs, and more red tape.

Mr. Chairman, this bill will impact not only our nation's environment, but our nation's taxpayers as well. The Congressional Budget Office estimated that risk assessment proposals similar to H.R. 1022 would cost affected federal agencies $250 million annually. H.R. 1022 does not contain provisions to offset the bill's potential costs. Therefore, it will result in increasing the deficit or cutting desperately needed funds for education and other social programs.

Mr. Chairman, it seems that lawyers are the only ones who benefit from H.R. 1022. The bill opens up numerous new pathways for litigation, and it gives lawyers interested in holding up valuable environmental regulations a powerful new tool to prolong agency actions.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to oppose the Republican leadership's efforts to hamper the government's ability to protect the environment. Vote no on H.R. 1022. Thank you.

ED ROBERTS

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1995

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to sadly note the passing of one of the great people of our time, Ed Roberts, the former secretary of rehabilitation of the State of California, the cofounder of the Center for Independent Living, and the founder of the World Disability Institute.

I knew, admired, and worked closely with Ed Roberts throughout my entire adult life, in Sacramento, and as a Member of the House of Representatives. Ed was as dedicated, insightful, determined, and skilled as any person I have ever met in public life, and his singular contributions to the disabled community throughout America is, simply stated, unparalleled.

Ed deeply understood the need for the law, and for government, to defend the rights of those who had neither power nor influence. And he forced dramatic changes that broke

the barriers for millions of disabled men, women, and children.

I wish to submit for the RECORD the following editorial from the San Francisco Chronicle paying tribute to this great American, and good friend.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Mar. 18, 1995]

THE TRANSCENDENT LIFE OF EDWARD ROBERTS

''What I want and a lot of other disabled people want is to live, to experience, to be a part of society. And that's nothing extraordinary. So when we do things and do become successful, it doesn't make us different from any other successful person.''

Even though it was not what he was seeking, Edward Roberts died a hero at age 56 this week, having lived up to such admiring sobriquets as ''the Gandhi of disability rights'' and ''the Cesar Chavez for the handicapped.''

A budding athlete who became a paraplegic at age 14 from polio, Roberts was an in-your-face kind of guy because society gave him no other choice. When his principal balked at graduating Roberts from high school because the teenager hadn't completed required physical education courses, Roberts fought the decision with such vigor that the principal was forced to relent.

When a counselor at the state Department of Rehabilitation sided with the University of California in denying Roberts admittance to Berkeley because the school had never had a wheelchair-confined student who required a respirator and iron lung, Roberts argued until he was enrolled. He lived at Cowell Hospital and later organized successfully for dormitory housing for disabled students.

He co-founded the Center for Independent Living at Berkeley, which promoted the idea of integrating disabled people into the mainstream and making available to the disabled such essentials as housing, transportation and wheelchair-accessible ramps and curbs. The establishment of 400 similar centers nationwide followed.

Roberts' longtime work received official affirmation when Governor Jerry Brown appointed Roberts to head the California Department of Rehabilitation in 1975. He was a familiar sight in Sacramento in his motorized wheelchair, and his presence alone helped many lawmakers understand for the first time the needs of people who desperately seek independence—despite not being able to use either arms or legs—and yet are constantly stymied by thoughtless policies.

In 1984, Roberts received $225,000 in a MacArthur Foundation ''genius'' award for his work with the disabled, and he created the World Institute on Disability, an Oakland-based think tank on disability issues with a $3.3 million budget.

Roberts' life was not only heroic, because of the many personal obstacles he overcame, but in the end, transcendent, because of the way he helped transform the way we think about and act toward disabled people.

''As an international leader and educator in the independent living and disability rights movements, he fought throughout his life to enable all persons with disabilities to fully participate in mainstream society,'' said President Clinton. ''Mr. Roberts was truly a pioneer . . . His vision and ability to bring people together should be an example for all Americans.''

A memorial service will be held at 1:30 p.m. tomorrow at Harmon Gymnasium on the UC Berkeley campus. Memorial endowments have been set up for Roberts' son, Lee, and for the institute. Contributions may be sent to the institute at 510 16th Street, Oakland, CA 94612.

THE INNOCENT LANDOWNER DEFENSE ACT OF 1995

HON. CURT WELDON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1995

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the Innocent Landowner Defense Act is to clarify what is required by ''all appropriate inquiry into the previous ownerships and uses of the property'' as contained in the 1986 Superfund Amendments Reauthorization Act (SARA) to Superfund.

The 1986 SARA amendments included several exemptions for the liability of site cleanup—an important one being the innocent landowners defense provision. This provision allows for an exemption of liability to a landowner who has not contributed to the contamination of a site and has made all appropriate inquiry into the previous uses of the property.

The intent of the innocent landowner defense was to encourage the uncovering of contaminated sites which could then be cleaned up. It was meant as a narrow exception to protect those considering the acquisition of land from future liability. Unfortunately, the definition of all appropriate inquiry was never made clear in the SARA legislation, resulting in confusion as to the requirement for assessing a site for contamination. This lack of clarification has left the land purchaser with a dilemma. Even the most expensive and extensive site assessments may not prevent the landowner from later being held liable for contamination.

The Innocent Landowner's Defense Act is designed to define what is meant by ''all appropriate inquiry,'' putting an end to the confusion and allowing landowners to protect themselves from liability. Specifically, this legislation calls for a phase I environmental audit—an investigation of the property conducted by an environmental professional—defined in the legislation to discover the presence of hazardous substances through the following sources: (1) chain of title documents for the past 50 years; (2) available aerial photographs of the property; (3) Superfund liens against the property; (4) Federal, State, and local government records of activities causing release of hazardous substances; and (5) a visual site inspection of the property. If these criteria are met, an individual would be recognized as having conducted all appropriate inquiry.

This legislation in no way changes the liability scheme of Superfund. It is a clarifying correction which enables courts and potential landowners to determine exactly what is needed to fulfill all appropriate inquiry requirements. Not only will this legislation clear up a very confusing situation, but it will restore the original intent of the innocent landowner defense—it will encourage the testing of sites for contamination, increasing the likelihood that contaminated sites will be found and cleaned up.

This legislation provides the guidance crucial to assessing the risk associated with hazardous waste sites. It would allow for the realization of the original goals of the Superfund legislation, while leaving the original statute unchanged in terms of liability.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TOM A. COBURN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1995

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Speaker, due to travel delays on Tuesday, March 14, I unavoidably missed several votes. Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye'' on the passage of the following bills: H.R. 531, H.R. 694, H.R. 562, H.R. 536, and H.R. 517.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR ADDITIONAL DISASTER ASSISTANCE AND RESCISSIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1995

SPEECH OF

HON. NANCY PELOSI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1995

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1158) making emergency supplemental appropriations for additional disaster assistance and making rescissions for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes:

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my opposition to the Republican rescissions bill before us. With this bill, the Republicans end the war on poverty and declare war on the poor, instead. I am saddened that my Republican colleagues have turned their energy, their fervor and their fury toward attacking the most vulnerable among us. I note with particular concern the impact of the proposed funding cuts on housing programs designed to help the neediest and the most vulnerable in our society, children, the elderly, the disabled, and people with AIDS.

More than 40 percent of the cuts in this bill come from low-income housing programs. The $7.2 billion in Department of Housing and Urban Development [HUD] cuts equals ¼ of HUD's total budget. HUD estimates that the rescissions will affect 530,000 elderly households and 630,000 families with children. The complete elimination of the Housing Opportunities for People with AIDS [HOPWA] program will deprive at least 50,000 people with AIDS and their families of much-needed housing assistance. Public housing takes a direct hit. Efforts to improve public housing facilities and in some localities, to demolish unfit buildings and replace them, will be stopped dead in their tracks.

The cuts in the low income housing preservation program will result in the displacement of countless low income families from affordable housing. Estimates of the impact of losing preservation funds range from a low of 27,000 families losing their apartments to a high of 75,000. In most of the affected communities, there is no other housing available for these families. The affordable housing stock is disappearing at an alarming rate and these cuts will only hasten the process. Where are these people supposed to live?

At the same time that these important programs are being cut, the Republicans are also cutting incremental rental assistance, the Section 8 Program. The funds the Republicans