

simultaneously, without allies, with no build-up period and with rotation capability for a long engagement—an obvious gold-plated invitation to the “bottom” of the military to plan forces at about the current levels. A bit of top-down guidance might have insisted on a more realistic scenario.

The review did not question some of the sacred cows of current planning: another attack submarine (against which fleet?); a better attack fighter (when our present ones are the best in the world); the Cold War B-2 bomber when modernized B-52's were the main muscle used in the Persian Gulf; a surfeit of aircraft carriers to “show the flag” when Aegis cruisers demonstrated their capability to hit an office complex in Baghdad from the Red Sea and the Persian Gulf; continued land and sea-based nuclear missiles aimed at the open ocean in numbers far above the 100 or so that respected defense experts agree is sufficient for deterrence.

If to these are added 20 more B-2's designed to penetrate Soviet airspace after a nuclear exchange, six huge C-17 airlifters when C-5's can carry what needs to go by air and heavy tanks should go by sea or be prepositioned to be available in real quantity, and new Trident submarine-launched strategic missiles, one can see that the mindset of the planners is clearly to continue to prepare for and deter the now-outdated massive threat from the Soviet Union. At least 24 budget-conscious Republican congressmen deeped sixed the SDI, recognizing that the more proximate threat of a nuclear weapon arriving in the U.S. would be in the hold of a non-descript freighter.

The real post-Cold War world calls for the deployment of new kinds of “secret weapons” such as the diplomatic efforts of former President Jimmy Carter, who has already averted violence in Haiti and North Korea and at least has tried in Bosnia. It calls for programs to reduce the population growth bomb which is already exploding in Asia and Africa. And it calls for carefully planned and conducted anti-terrorist operations with formerly hostile nations and services.

It also calls for more “competition” between the expenditures to fight a Cold War better and the need to keep our nation's economy strong and targeted on the real threats—and opportunities—of the future.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE
DWIGHT EVANS

HON. THOMAS M. FOGLIETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1995

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Speaker, on this last day of Black History Month, I wanted to congratulate the Honorable Dwight Evans for his great accomplishments as a public servant in the city of Philadelphia and in the State of Pennsylvania. Dwight Evans is making history every day for his constituents.

Dwight represents the 203d Legislative District in the Pennsylvania House of Representatives. Throughout his life, Dwight has contributed greatly to the city of Philadelphia. He has made these contributions in many different capacities, but has never failed to make significant improvements in his community.

Prior to his membership in the Pennsylvania State Legislature, Dwight was responsible for revitalizing the abandoned Ogontz Plaza in Philadelphia, turning it into an economically viable shopping district. He was also responsible for bringing a police ministration to the Ogontz Avenue area, making it a safer place

for members of the community. We are working together to develop the Southeastern Pennsylvania Regional Employment and Training Center.

More, recently as the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee in Pennsylvania, Dwight has been able to provide day care services for children, adequate funding for youth programs, and the improvement of educational services to children.

In 1994, Dwight Evans ran as the first African-American candidate for the Governor of Pennsylvania. He surprised the pollsters and the experts, but not those of us who know him by coming in second. He was also endorsed by most of the major daily newspapers in the Commonwealth.

As we mark the end of Black History Month, I would like to recognize and congratulate Dwight Evans for his excellent accomplishments. It is important that we look back at history, but it is also important that we applaud the men and women who are making progress today and tomorrow.

H.R. 450

HON. CARDISS COLLINS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1995

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, last week we were given a real clear picture of what the new Republican majority that now controls the Congress really cares about.

During the consideration of H.R. 450, Members had two opportunities to vote on amendments that would have excluded from the moratorium regulations the Fish and Wildlife service needs to issue in order to establish hunting seasons for ducks and waterfowl.

I offered the first amendment which, in addition to the hunting season regulations, also exempted several other important matters, such as:

Rules the FEC has issued to prohibit personal use of campaign funds; rules to make it harder for aliens to stay in the United States on the basis of meritless petitions for political asylum; rules giving preference to the elderly in section 8 housing; rule pertaining to elimination of drug use in Federal housing; rules designating empowerment zones and enterprise communities; rules compensating Persian Gulf veterans with disabilities from undiagnosed illnesses; and rules for the development of a data base for child molesters, as required by the crime bill.

The Republican majority argued against amending their bill to make it clear that these important regulations could be excluded from the moratorium. They claimed there was nothing to worry about.

Yet, later in the day, they chose to support an amendment which only exempted the hunting season regulations, and none of the other regulations—not for veterans, not for the protection of children against child molesters, and not for the elderly.

I have nothing against duck hunting, but I think it is a sad day when this Congress cares more about guaranteeing there is a duck hunting season, than whether our children are safe, and the elderly and disabled veterans are properly cared for.

RISK ASSESSMENT AND COST-
BENEFIT ACT OF 1995

SPEECH OF

HON. BLANCHE LAMBERT LINCOLN

OF ARKANSAS

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 cost and benefits in major rules, and for other purposes.

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. Chairman, I rise as a strong proponent of risk assessment and effective government and cost-benefit analysis.

Having grown up on a farm in eastern Arkansas and having seen in person both the tremendous waste, that government regulations can assist us in preserving our environment and our surroundings but also in being overburdensome as well as top heavy in regulatory needs. Risk assessment is a vital tool in forming cost-effective and well-reasoned Federal regulations. It should be used to create a better and responsive Federal Government, not stymie things down with court actions or excessive delay.

But I do have some concerns that the bill we are looking at today, this will happen under the current bill. Before we consider H.R. 1022 further, we may have to take a time-out to do a cost-benefit analysis on this bill. CBO has made some conservative estimates that the bill will cost the Federal Government an additional 250 million a year to conduct risk assessment. This breaks down to approximately 5,000 new Federal employees, including many new lawyers hired to defend agency actions.

As we look at this bill today, I hope that we will work in bipartisan fashion to make it better so that it will be of great assistance to all of us across the Nation in making government more effective.

Mr. Chairman, the costs of doing an effective and needed risk assessment doesn't bother me very much if in the long run those expenses are more than covered in the costs saved down the road. However, I am skeptical that the \$25 million threshold is a figure where we can get the biggest bang for our buck. The threshold set out under this bill to conduct risk assessments is \$25 million. However, Executive orders in the past issued by President Ford, Reagan and Clinton set the threshold at \$100 million. OMB in 1993 concluded that 97 percent of the total rulemaking costs on the economy came from rules with a dollar threshold over \$100 million. Like the companies who rightly complain that we shouldn't spend millions of dollars to get Superfund sites, water and air one additional percentage cleaner, I question whether we should be spending so much money in conducting additional risk assessments to reach an additional 3 percent of the regulations that have a financial impact on the economy. Additionally, H.R. 1022 requires a risk assessment for permits under Federal program. Does this mean that every State that issues a Clean Water Act section 402 permit must conduct a risk assessment before finalizing any permit? Let's make sure that we are adopting the most cost effective law as we