It succeeded in bringing more motivated and higher educated young men and women into the military.

General Thurman was one of the earliest supporters of the Montgomery GI bill when many at the Pentagon and the White House opposed it. He saw immediately that it would help in recruiting and retaining topnotch young people, and history has proved us right on the value of the program.

He was also very proud of the fact that he commanded the U.S. invasion of Panama that ousted Gen. Manuel Noriega in 1989. It was the first major combat operation performed at night by American forces, a move which reduced U.S. casualties and helped set an example for future night-fighting tactics used in the Persian Gulf war.

I knew Max Thurman, and worked with him, for more than 20 years. I know firsthand how committed he was to the military life and to the country he loved so much. He was truly one of our best and brightest. We will miss our old friend.

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

[Mr. MCKEON 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 Missouri [Mr. CLAY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. CLAY 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 Michigan [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

TEENAGE PREGNANCY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, our parents and grandparents have taught us that prevention is better than cure.

Unintended teenage pregnancies illustrate this dilemma.

Contrary to popular thinking, more than 9 out of 10 teenage pregnancies—96 percent—are unintended.

Every year, more than 1 million American teenage girls become pregnant—and, the vast majority of them do not intend this result.

If we had in place a more effective and comprehensive prevention program, in both the private and public sectors, greater than 90 percent of the teenage girls who have babies may not get pregnant in the first place.

If those girls did not get pregnant, we could save millions, perhaps billions, of medicaid and other federal dollars. This is an important observation during our budget legislation.

The delivery of a baby and postnatal care to a pregnant teenager—who cannot afford the pregnency—costs the Government now about $8,400 each time.

Over the years, teenage pregnancies cost continues to rise, through other entitlement programs and other costs associated with these pregnancies that were not intended and were not prepared for properly. A range of prevention activities would cost far, far less than that amount.

The savings that could be experienced through a more effective prevention program could help avoid some of the cuts we are now postured to make. More important, effective prevention would save the teenagers productive life until that person is ready to become a parent. Mr. Speaker, I am sure you have heard that popular commercial that states, ''Pay me now or pay me later.''

On teenage pregnancies, it is better to pay now than to pay later.

There are effective programs, with proven track records, that reach about half of the girls who need help. With more effort, we can reach most or all of these girls. The proportion of sexually active adolescent women over age 15 increased substantially from the seventies to almost 50 percent in the early eighties.

Although data for the first half of the 1980's suggested a leveling off to 44 percent, the data for 1988 was more than 50 percent and indicates a resumption of the increase rate.

Available data for adolescent men over age 17 also shows a substantial increase in the proportion sexually active—up from 66 percent in the late seventies to almost 80 percent in the late eighties.

And, by 1992, the adolescent birth rate was more than 60 births per 1,000 adolescents over age 15. Out-of-wedlock childbearing has increased steadily and markedly among adolescents.

The birth rate for unmarried adolescents over age 15 increased from more than 22 births per 1,000 in 1970 to almost 45 births per 1,000 in 1992.

Moreover, in 1970, 30 percent of births to adolescents over age 15 were out of wedlock as compared to 70 percent in 1991.

The United States has one of the highest teenage pregnancy rates of any western industrialized nation.

These are unintended and preventable pregnancies—so why are we standing idly by?

I issue a challenge to all my colleagues. We must do more than legislate, legislate, legislate. We must reach out with a caring hand to our youth and their families. We must try to stop these unintended pregnancies. Prevention is the key. An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure.

REPUBLICANS ROLL BACK ENVIRONMENTAL GAINS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening in very strong opposition to Speaker GINGRICH's and the Congressional majority's attack on clean water, clean air, and our national parks.

No one who has followed the legislative activities of this Chamber over the last several months can deny that there has been—and continues to be—a concerted effort underway to roll back a host of laws that protect our natural resources and the environmental health and safety of the American people.

Already this body has voted to gut the Clean Water Act, to cut hundreds of millions of dollars from grants to local communities that help keep drinking water safe and beaches swimmable, to allow oil and gas drilling in the pristine wilderness of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge— America's last frontier, to cut the Environmental Protection Agency's budget by 33%, including a 50% cut in enforcement activities and a 19% cut in the program that cleans up hazardous waste sites, to slash funding for land acquisition for national parks and wildlife refuges by 40%, to cut major wetlands habitat conservation programs by 24%, and terminate altogether the EPA's role in protecting wetlands, to accelerate timber sales and logging road construction in our national forests, including the Tongass, a vast temperate rain forest in southeastern Alaska, to cut by one-third the recovery program for the grey wolf in Yellowstone National Park, to repeal a key component of the California Desert Protection Act, to cut climate and global change research by 41%, and to terminate recovery research programs on whales and other marine mammals.

Thankfully, an attempt to sell off our national parks was defeated. But the list goes on and on.

This summer, the Republican majority voted in favor of seventeen special interest loopholes that would restrict the EPA from enforcing programs important to public health, such as controls on airborne emissions of benzene, dioxin, and other cancer-causing pollutants from oil refineries, cement kilns, and paper plants.

When the American people found out about these outrageous provisions, it did not take long for some Members to do an about-face. Most of those special interest riders have been removed. However, we are still faced with a bill that imposes deep cuts in the EPA.

Mr. Speaker, the American people want to know what is next on the Republicans' environmental chopping block. Well, the Endangered Species Act, for one, is on life-support in critical condition. Apparently some feel that because the bald eagle is no longer

in imminent danger, we do not need to worry about endangered species any more.

Another area in jeopardy concerns global warming. Despite the clear consensus of the international scientific community, some politicians are disputing the role that chemicals such as cholorofluorocarbons have in the depletion of the ozone layer. Unbelievably, we have leaders on the Republican side of the aisle who claim they know more about the threat to the Earth's ozone layer than Nobel prize-winning scientists and who are working to repeal bans on these harmful chemicals. Is this how public policy is supposed to be made? Certainly not.

What seems to underlie all these environmental attacks is the false assumption that a strong economy and a clean environment are natural enemies. Because the vast majority of Americans do not support their attack and the facts do not back their arguments up, the proponents of these rollbacks have to resort to polarizing the debate into a choice between jobs and environmental stewardship.

Well, my colleagues, do not be fooled. A strong environment and a strong economy go hand-in-hand.

I come from an area in New York that borders Long Island Sound. The people I am privileged to represent in New York know first-hand that pollution-based prosperity is short-sighted and ends up costing more than it gives back. That is why business leaders, labor groups, and environmental organizations in New York and Connecticut have come together and are working in unison to restore the ecological health of the Sound. With the help of the EPA and the Federal rules it enforces, Long Island Sound is slowly coming back to life. Now is not the time to turn back the clock.

Many in this Chamber like to talk about the importance of learning from history, lest we repeat the mistakes of the past. Well, history around the world has clearly shown that there is a high price to be paid for abandoning environmental stewardship.

Mr. Speaker, what it all comes down to is a choice between the philosophy of Teddy Roosevelt—a Republican, I remind you—and James Watt. One saw the wisdom of preserving nature's beauty for future generations, the other sought to sell off national parks to the highest bidder.

The American people know who is right. It is high time that Speaker GINGRICH and the Republican leadership wake up and recognize this too.

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

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

REPUBLICAN CUTS HURT THE ENVIRONMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to express my dismay at the devastating cuts to the environment and environmental programs that my Republican colleagues are really shoving through this Congress. Without question, these cuts will spoil our Nation's water, air, and land.

I am delighted to join my colleague the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY], in listening to her comments, and I applaud my colleague the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE], who is organizing people tonight to speak on this issue. I commend him for his leadership on environmental policy.

I am pleased to join my colleague the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY] also in sponsoring legislation for the cleanup of Long Island Sound.

□ 1930

This is one of our real concerns about what is happening with regard to the environment, and without question, the cuts, as I said, will spoil our Nation's water, air, and our land.

Americans can take great pride in the progress that we have made over the years in cleaning up our Nation's environment.

But Republicans, the Republican majority, are really turning back the clock. They are wiping out decades of improvement to the environment and giving polluters a license to pollute. They are not achieving this through open debate where we could have a back and forth on these issues, but they are doing it through funding cuts that are hidden in massive spending bills that the Congress is taking up.

I also want to commend my colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle who, in fact, have stood up to the pressure and turned back legislation that is harmful to the environment. Time and again, this year and over the decade, Democrats and Republicans have come together in a spirit of bipartisanship to protect the environment. That has been true over and over again in our Nation's history, and unfortunately that kind of bipartisanship is being rent and pulled apart. Despite the bipartisan efforts, the Republican majority is taking a wrecking ball to environmental protections in this country.

More than $1.5 billion will be slashed from the Environmental Protection Agency's budget next year. Slashing EPA's budget by more than 20 percent will cripple the agency's ability to ensure that our water is safe to drink and our air is safe to breathe. The Federal Superfund Program, which cleans up our Nation's worst hazardous waste dumps, will be cut by nearly $300 million in 1996. This is another 20 percent cut from current spending levels. In my own congressional district, the Superfund has been responsible for clearing up the Raymark Superfund site. From 1919 to 1984, Raymark Industries spewed asbestos, lead, dioxins, and PCB's throughout Stratford, CT. The homes of neighborhood families and local businesses as well as the parks where children play and the schools they all attend were all severely contaminated by this toxic waste, and now, due to Superfund, this site may soon become clean enough to develop as a retail shopping center. As a matter of fact, there is a developer who is ready to put in a $50 million project in this area.

EPA's work at Raymark is a wonderful success story in the making, and working with State and local officials, the EPA has been effective, efficient, and responsive, and I might add the State has been effective, efficient, and responsive, as well as the local community and the local government. Their tireless efforts have made Raymark the Nation's model for accomplishing the cleanup work that Superfund was designed to do.

Do my Republican colleagues really believe that Americans would rather balance the budget than clean up toxic waste in American communities? Look at any child, look them in the face and explain this to them. The question is, as the President has done this evening in vetoing the budget, which, I might add, 60 percent of the American public wanted him to veto the budget because of what was being done in Medicare, Medicaid, the environment, turning the clock back on environmental legislation, and in tax fairness to working Americans; the public does not want to see the budget balanced under any set of circumstances and giving up our principles and giving up the movement forward we have made in these areas.

Let us have individual votes on environmental cuts. Then Americans will truly understand what this new majority in the Congress stands for. I urge my colleagues to vote against spending bills that contain environmental cuts.

EXPRESSING CONCERN ABOUT DEPLOYMENT OF TROOPS TO BOSNIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ENSIGN). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MARTINI] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARTINI. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to express my concerns with respect to policies on the deployment of troops in Bosnia.

This past year this Congress has experienced many highs in the legislative process. However, at this moment, I have a great sense of frustration with the current policies of deploying ground troops in Bosnia. We have spoken out on several occasions, and I would like to reiterate here what has occurred here on the floor of the House of Representatives over the past several weeks.