

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

BROWNFIELDS LEGISLATION INTRODUCED

HON. SHERROD BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1995

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing legislation along with my colleagues Mr. DINGELL of Michigan, Mr. GEPHARDT of Missouri, Mr. BORSKI and Mr. KLINK of Pennsylvania, Mr. RUSH of Illinois, Mr. STOKES of Ohio, and Mr. MANTON and Mr. TOWNS of New York, to address the dire need for the development of so-called Brownfields.

Those of us who have seen industries come and go in our congressional districts know the problems resulting from land that had been used for industrial purposes which is now abandoned—left barren and often contaminated—with no hope of productive use. Our legislation will address this problem in four important ways.

First, the bill would establish a grant program for local communities to use to determine the extent of the contamination of the property. While many sites could be re-developed with a minimal investment, local communities cannot be sure of this until the assessment is done. This bill offers these communities an opportunity to assess the situation so that prompt action can be taken to clean up the site.

Second, this legislation would establish a revolving loan fund for local governments to fund the actual clean-up actions. Mr. Speaker, we know it is essential that we be fiscally responsible in the development of new Federal programs. For this reason, we established a loan program for the local governments to assist them in getting the land to a place where it will begin to produce revenue. But we require the loan to be repaid over 10 years—a time frame which allows them the opportunity to begin to recoup their investment.

Third, the bill would protect the purchaser of such properties as long as the purchaser does due diligence to find the problem and cooperate with the clean-up response. Under the current Superfund law, purchasers could be liable for clean-up even if they did not own the land when it was polluted. This provision should help attract new purchasers to these lands and encourage the voluntary clean-up of sites.

Fourth, and finally, the bill would protect the lending institutions from becoming the deep-pockets at sites where their participation was limited to the lending of money. Unfortunately, the current laws has allowed innocent lenders to be held liable for the clean-up of properties for which they provided the financial backing and nothing more. It is contrary to the intent of the Superfund Program to discourage voluntary clean-up actions such as those that would be backed by financial institutions. Yet, that is the result of the current law. Institutions are afraid to lend the financial backing when they could be held liable for millions in clean-up costs.

Mr. Speaker, I believe our legislation will provide a boost in the arm to local communities across this nation which are struggling to re-create productive properties. It will revive local economies, reduce threats to public health and improve the environment. I hope my colleagues will offer their support by co-sponsoring this bill.

A TRIBUTE TO KANWAL SIBAL

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1995

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, during the past 3 years the relationship between the United States and the Government of India has dramatically improved. India is no longer a country with which our Government has a reserved relationship. It is now a nation which is one of our Nation's major emerging markets. There are many reasons for the improvements in our relationship with India.

Prime Minister Narashimha Rao has embarked on a bold economic reform program which has made our Nation India's largest trading partner. India's Finance Minister, Manmohan Singh, has worked tirelessly to build economic bridges between the Indian consumers and important American companies. Our diplomatic relationship with India will only succeed, however, if the Indian Embassy successfully conducts its relationships with the Congress, the State Department, and other agencies of our Government. During the past 3 years the Indian Embassy has been an important player in our nearly improved relationship with the world's largest democracy.

Mr. Speaker, Kanwal Sibal has served in Washington with distinction for the past 3 years as the Deputy Chief of Mission. Prior to coming to Washington, Kanwal Sibal served as India's Ambassador to Turkey. Now, with the completion of a successful tour in Washington, Kanwal Sibal is about to become India's Ambassador to Egypt.

Mr. Speaker, I know many of my colleagues join with me in congratulating Kanwal Sibal for the successful completion of his assignment to Washington. I call to the attention of my colleagues an article which appeared in the July 14, 1995, edition of News India-Times regarding Kanwal Sibal's years here in Washington. I know my colleagues will agree with the praise accorded to Ambassador Sibal. Kanwal Sibal will be missed in Washington, but I am certain he will ably represent his nation in Cairo and I request that the attached News India-Times article be printed at this point in the RECORD:

[From the News India-Times, July 14, 1995]

SATISFACTION AT THE END OF A SUCCESSFUL
INNINGS

(By Tania Anand)

WASHINGTON.—“The canvas is huge, the players numerous. No embassy or government can be in control all the time. One has

to be genuinely modest about making any claims or reordering India-US relations.” The man reflecting is Kanwal Sibal, deputy chief of mission at the Indian embassy. Having completed three years as the chief of the IFS battery in Washington, Sibal will make way for Shyamala Cowsik, who takes his place on September 1.

In an extensive interview with News India-Times at the end of an eventful term which saw India move from an inconsequential point outside the US radar screen to a centerpoint as one of the foremost Big Emerging Markets identified by the US government, Sibal was modest about his role in the transition.

“A lot of our progress is thanks to policies back home. My role, as part of the team, has been essentially consolidating on the positive trends that are occurring.” Following are excerpts from the interview, conducted in two sessions in his office last week.

On Indo-US relations when he assumed office in September 1992: There were a lot of uncertainties in our relationship. There was a lack of confidence in US intentions toward India. We were feeling US pressure specially on the nuclear proliferation issue and within a few months on human rights. There were sanctions on ISRO the technology transfer issue culminated in pressure on Russia to cancel the cryogenic engines, there was concern on intellectual property rights. There was pressure from Congress on Kashmir and Punjab and generally on human rights.

The atmosphere in relations between the two countries became even more difficult by statements made on Kashmir which seemed to suggest a reopening of the accession question there was a third party to the Indo-Pak dialogue on Kashmir.

The economic reforms process was not more than a year old and had not begun to register either at the government or at the business level. From the government point of view India was not blinking on the US radar screen. It was very difficult to get the attention of the policy-makers.

On relations today in general: Today on all fronts the scenario is much better. It has obviously been a team effort where everybody has contributed. Yet having said that I will take some credit for the contribution.

Our relationship with the US is highly complex. The US is the world's foremost power, we are not. In many areas, the US holds the strong hand vis-a-vis all countries. This makes the task of dealing with the US a challenging one. The decision making process here is complex. The capability of innumerable agencies to block a decision here has to be understood. These non-governmental agencies are powerful but from our point of view irresponsible. They do not think in a narrow agenda and push it to the maximum. Yet the overall atmosphere has improved vastly.

On nuclear proliferation: We have certainly made significant advance in persuading the American side that India's security dilemmas cannot be adequately dealt with within the India-Pakistan or South Asian framework. The US is no longer persisting with a proposal that would limit the nuclear no-proliferation dialogue to just India and Pakistan. There have been no new pressures on India on the NPT front despite its indefinite extension.

Mode of communication: A significant advance following Strobe Talbott's visit to

• This “bullet” symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

India was to take the dialogue on issues away from the glare of publicity. The US government recognizes today that public pressure on India will not help.

On human rights: There has been a significant change in the US public position on human rights in India and the tone of comments. They publicly recognize the significant work done on this front in India and the National Human Rights Commission has been well received.

On the India-Pakistan issues: We might have wanted the US to be more positive in its support for Indian positions and more willing to take public and official cognizance to Pakistan's continuing support to terrorism in India. The US has acknowledged the fact that India has made serious and genuine efforts at dialogue on Kashmir. They are also willing to acknowledge that elections would be a good route to follow in promoting democratic processes.

They have not supported Pakistani efforts at New York or Geneva to move resolutions against India. The kind of negative statements that were being made by some elements on the US side have not been reiterated—there is a greater sense of measure in comments being made. The joint statement between President Clinton and Prime Minister Rao clearly said all issues between India and Pakistan should be resolved bilaterally.

On transfer of technology: The ISRO sanctions have not been renewed. Yet on the issue of transfer of technology more work needs to be done. Still, we have moved from a position where we were deeply concerned to a dialogue.

On relations with the Congress: We have made a very major advance in our relationship with individual Congressmen and Senators and in the general mood of Congress.

The India caucus which was the first individual country caucus on the Hill is a big asset. It is bipartisan with 61 members and gives us a platform on which to build our relationship with the Congress. The crowning success of the caucus has been the recent defeat of the Burton amendment which was sprung upon the House with no lead time. It was the sustained contact with the Congress and the Indian-American community that helped defeat the move.

On the economic relationship: Certainly, India has begun to blink on the U.S. radar here. Five high-level visits in one year is unprecedented—four Cabinet level visits plus the visit of Mrs. Hillary Clinton. It has led to others wondering what this signifies in Indo-US relations.

We have been working closely with the India Interest Group to give it a certain profile, getting incoming visitors from India to meet them as a group and also getting them high-level appointments when they visit India. We have also been trying to forge a close working relationship between the India Interest Group and the India Caucus to make them mutually reinforcing.

On defense ties: It has been our effort to build a closer relationship with the Pentagon because during the Cold War the fact that the Pentagon was neglected has not helped our overall relationship. It has been our conscious effort to develop greater links with Pentagon and there has been a substantial improvement in our dialogue with them on various issues.

On India's lobbyist: It has been both a process of learning and achievement. It was a new experience, starting from scratch, and has resulted in a multiplier effect of our own efforts.

On relations with Indian-American community: We have vastly improved the mechanics of interaction with the Indian-American community for grassroots campaign. We

have developed a list of important Indian-Americans who have credible political links and supply them regularly with information on developments in India and Indo-U.S. relations. Over the last three years we have taken several steps to transform what was earlier a disorganized and unfocused effort into a highly systemized and focused effort.

TITLE X OF H.R. 2127

HON. KAREN MCCARTHY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1995

Ms. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, today I walk with my head held high and with great pride as a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives. Last night Members from both sides of the aisle stood together and said to families across this Nation that their Government does support title X funding. Title X is part of the Public Health Service Act, sponsored by then-Congressman George Bush, and signed into law by President Nixon in 1970. I am proud to be a part of a majority in the U.S. House of Representatives with the common sense to set family planning funding as a priority.

The title X program has been reauthorized six times since 1970 and has always received broad bipartisan support. The 104th Congress has put aside partisan politics and restored adequate funding for family planning and health care services. In my district, title X means women can afford preventive health services like pap smears and gynecological exams. In my district, title X means women can afford vital pre- and neo-natal health care to prevent problems with pregnancies. In my district, title X means women can afford contraceptive health services to prevent unwanted pregnancies. In my district, title X means men can afford screening tests for prostate cancer. In my district, title X means that a woman's income level will not control her health or that of her family.

Mr. Speaker, at the end of this week, when I return to my district for the August work period, I can tell the women of Jackson County MO, that the House is committed to their family planning and health care needs. I can now go back to my district with pride for the work this body has done to preserve a 25-year commitment to the families of this Nation.

It is unfortunate, however, Mr. Speaker, that I will be unable to tell my constituents that I voted for the overall Labor-HHS-Education Appropriations bill of which title X is a part. The measure contains extreme and unfair cuts to valuable, proven programs that educate children, invest in working people, and protect our Nation's health and safety. We must invest in our country's future by supporting education and training to promote long-term economic growth and higher living standards. We must continue to invest in programs like Cradles and Crayons that benefit our children. I regret that this bill does not represent the priorities Jackson Countians want.

OSTEOPOROSIS

HON. CONSTANCE A. MORELLA

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1995

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, osteoporosis is a major public health problem affecting 25 million Americans, 20 million of whom are women. The disease causes 1.5 million fractures at a cost of \$10 billion annually in direct medical expenses. One in two women and one in eight men over the age of 50 will fracture a bone due to osteoporosis. A woman's risk of osteoporosis is equal to her combined risk of contracting breast, uterine and ovarian cancer.

Osteoporosis is largely preventable and thousands of fractures could be avoided if low bone mass was detected early and treated. However, identification of risk factors alone cannot predict how much bone a person has and how strong or weak bone is. Experts estimate that without bone density tests, up to 40 percent of women with low bone mass could be missed—an unacceptable diagnostic error rate.

Unfortunately, Medicare's coverage of bone density tests is inconsistent. The program covers several types of tests such as single photon absorptiometry, measurement of the wrist and radiographic absorptiometry, hand; however, it leaves the decision to the Medicare carriers whether to cover quantitative computed tomography, spine, and dual energy x-ray absorptiometry or DXA—spine, hip, and total body—one of the most common methods used by scientists. The Food and Drug Administration has approved all of these methods except the radiographic absorptiometry.

Medicare covers DXA in 42 States, while parts of four additional States are covered. This leaves four States and the District of Columbia without coverage. A national average allowable charge of \$124 was established for DXA by the Health Care Financing Administration this year, yet a national coverage decision does not exist.

Inconsistency of coverage policy is confusing and unfair to beneficiaries. If a Medicare beneficiary lives in Florida, DXA is covered; if she lives in New Jersey, it is not covered. If she lives in Baltimore County in Maryland, it is covered; if she lives in Montgomery County, MD, it is not covered.

Today, I am introducing a bill, together with Congresswomen NITA LOWEY and EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, as well as 10 other original co-sponsors, to standardize Medicare's inconsistent coverage of bone density tests—the only sure method to determine bone mass and avoid some of the 1.5 million fractures caused annually by osteoporosis. The bill would also clarify that Medicare will cover other scientifically proven techniques to detect bone loss, such as biochemical markers. These inexpensive lab tests can be important adjuncts to bone mass measurement in the effort to detect and treat individuals who are at risk of osteoporosis. Considering that bone density tests are already covered by a large majority of the Medicare carriers, this bill will not add significantly to the costs of the Medicare program.

I urge my colleagues to join us in introducing this bill to help women and men prevent fractures caused by osteoporosis.