

TWO ENDS AGAINST THE MIDDLE

Mr. Holbrooke can shout at every camera he finds that Bosnia is not another Vietnam, Lebanon or Somalia. But the parallel with Lebanon is deadly and exact. We dispatched troops to Lebanon to act as a buffer between two states, and innumerable militias that had not agreed to peace or a peacekeeping force. In Bosnia we have a paper agreement that Mr. Milosevic, anxious to save his skin, purported to sign for his former ally, Dr. Karadzic, whose wild and wavering statements after the agreement have made clear that the Bosnian Serbs will most likely fight any intervention force. And since the world has already been told that the U.S. force will be pulled out before next year's U.S. presidential election, Milosevic, Karadzic and Mladic can wait until November 1996 to try again.

Mr. Speaker, even though I oppose the deployment, I want to state very clearly that I am in full support of the troops, the individual people that are going there, doing their duty as they have been instructed. These men and women are members of the finest military in the world. To put these top combat troops in harm's way doing occupation duty is beyond belief, and I call upon the President to stop this movement into Bosnia while we can still do so.

Finally I will encourage everyone to show their support of our troops by donating to the individual services relief societies. This is the best way to support the children who will be left without a parent at this holiday season. In the gulf war there were so many letters to our troops that families could not communicate with their mothers and fathers. Giving a donation to the relief societies helps the services take care of the children separated from their parents because of the deployment of American forces abroad.

□ 2000

IMPACT OF THE BUDGET AND APPROPRIATION BILL ON THE ENVIRONMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ENSIGN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I do not plan to use the entire time. What I wanted to do tonight and what I will do is to explain the budget and appropriation bills that have been proposed or passed by the Republican majority in this House and how they have a negative impact on the environment.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, we had some previous speakers who gave 5-minute special orders previously: The gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY], the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO], and also the gentleman from New York [Mr. HINCHEY], that outlined some of the concerns that myself and Democrats in general have about the impact on the environment of the budget bill that has been passed by the Congress and which

the President today fortunately vetoed, and also the appropriations bill that funds the Environmental Protection Agency, the VA-HUD and independent agencies, an appropriations bill which has already been sent back to Congress twice but which will come back up again, probably as early as tomorrow.

Throughout this Congress, we have watched the Republican leadership step by step as they work to completely undermine 25 years of environmental progress in order to make it easier for special interests to pollute the environment at the expense of Americans' health and environmental heritage.

Despite what the Republicans may think, the election last year was not a mandate to roll back our most successful environmental laws. In fact, a recent Harris poll found that 76 percent of Americans think that air and water laws as they now stand are not strict enough; not that they should be downgraded, but they are not strict enough.

Despite this, undercover efforts by the new Republican majority to attack environmental protection through budget and appropriation bills is the paramount example of what lengths the leadership will go to fulfill their promises to special interests, despite the potential impacts to Americans' health, environmental heritage, and economic well-being.

Mr. Speaker, I was very pleased tonight, as we were waiting to address the House during the special orders, that we actually received from the President his veto message on the budget bill. One of the things that he stressed, and I would like to just read some sections from his veto message, is that this budget bill impacts the environment in a very negative way and takes away too much money from environmental protection.

If I could just read some excerpts from his veto message to the House of Representatives, he says: "As I have repeatedly stressed, I want to find common ground with the Congress on a balanced budget plan that will best serve the American people, but I have profound differences with the extreme approach that the Republican majority has adopted. It would hurt average Americans and help special interests. My balanced budget plan reflects the values that Americans share"; and among those values that the President mentioned was to protect public health and the environment.

He stressed in his veto message that "the budget proposed by the Republicans would cut too deeply into a number of programs, and specifically hurt the environment." He went on to explain how various programs in title V of the program of the budget bill were specifically geared toward downgrading environmental protection.

What I wanted to do tonight, Mr. Speaker, was to talk about, if I could, some examples of how in fact the budget bill, as well as the appropriation bill that we are likely to consider tomor-

row, will turn back the clock on environmental protection. In fact, one of the previous speakers tonight, I believe it was the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO], specifically said that what the Republicans are doing in these spending and budget bills is turning back the clock on environmental protection. My friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HINCHEY], who spoke previously, talked about how, specifically with the Clean Water Act, we have made so much progress in the last 10 or 15 years.

When I was first elected to the Congress back in 1988, the main reason why I believe that I was elected was because in the summer of 1988, we experienced in my district along the shore in New Jersey, a summer where all kinds of material washed up on the beaches: medical waste, sludge material, plastics. You name it, was on the beach. Most of our beaches were closed for the summer, and we lost billions of dollars to our local economy because of the tourists that did not come.

After 1988, in the Congress, and it was on a bipartisan basis, laws were passed that prohibited ocean dumping, that tried to protect against the disposal of medical wastes into the waters of the New York and New Jersey harbors. And, lo and behold, after two or three years, the beaches started to come back, the water quality improved, we did not have the washups that we had during the summer of 1988. So this year, this summer, in 1995, we had probably one of our best beach seasons ever, and people constantly remarked about the improvement in water quality.

But the gentleman from New York, [Mr. HINCHEY] pointed out that if you look at these appropriation bills and if you look at the budget, you are seeing significant cutbacks in the amount of money that is available under the Clean Water Act. Loans that the Federal Government provides to municipalities and counties throughout the country to upgrade their sewage treatment plants are severely cut, so that makes it more difficult for the communities to actually get sufficient funds to upgrade their sewage treatment plants. Specifically in New Jersey, in the part of New Jersey that I represent, we are very concerned about what we call combined sewer overflow. In many of the municipalities in north Jersey, as well as New York City and outlying areas of New York City, in the metropolitan area, there are sewage systems which are combined with stormwater systems, which means that essentially when it rains, the sewage and the stormwater get combined and there is an overflow, and raw sewage goes out into the New York harbor, and of course, makes its way down to the Jersey shore.

What we need are Federal dollars which have now been available and continue to be available over the last few years to try to either separate those sewer and stormwater systems,

or at least prevent the overflow that occurs during the storm. If we do not provide funding on the Federal level for loans or grants to upgrade sewage treatment plants or to separate combined sewer systems, sewer overflow problems, then what we are going to have is an increase, once again, in the sewage and the pollution that goes into our harbor areas and ultimately down to the Atlantic Ocean. That is what the gentleman from New York was talking about.

Mr. Speaker, the amazing thing about clean water and the efforts for clean water, and this was something that my predecessor, Congressman Howard often remarked to me before I was elected to Congress, was that this was one of the few environmental areas where money makes a difference. You could take a small amount of money in the overall terms of the Federal budget and use it to actually upgrade your sewage treatment and improve your water quality. The technology exists, with a relatively small amount of money, to do that. So why cut the funding that is coming from the Federal Government in order to clean and upgrade our water? It makes no sense from a health point of view, it makes no sense from any kind of environmental point of view, whether it is to upgrade sewage treatment plants or to provide for some of the other things that improve our water quality.

The gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] talked about the Superfund program. The Superfund program, she stressed, works. A lot of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle act like the Superfund program does not work. It may be that all the Superfund sites have not been cleaned up, but a lot of them have. She specifically mentioned the Raymark site in Stratford, CT as a model for the Superfund program.

What is happening with the Republican budget and with the Republican appropriations bill with regard to the Superfund program? We find that the Superfund program in the VA-HUD appropriations bill, the EPA appropriations bill, is cut by 19 percent. There is a rider in it that says that no new Superfund sites can in fact be designated. The bottom line is that that means that the Superfund program will be downgraded, that a lot of sites that need to be put on the national priority list will not be, and that sites like Raymark in Stratford, CT, which serve as models for the Superfund program, will not get additional funds necessary, or other sites will not get additional funds necessary to continue the cleanup of hazardous waste sites.

That is not what the American people want. Over and over again they indicate, through polling or through contact with us, that clean water and the cleanup of hazardous waste sites are very important to them. Let us not turn our back on the Superfund program the way that is being proposed with this budget and also with the ap-

propriations bill that deals with the EPA.

The President specifically mentioned in his budget message tonight a number of provisions that were actually placed in the budget bill. This is the example of the undercover efforts that I mentioned by the new majority, that if they cannot get a bill passed through the normal course of things, they put language into the appropriations or into the budget bill to try to get environmental programs, or to try to despoil the environment.

One of the things that the President mentioned in his veto message tonight is he specifically says, and I quote: "Title V of the budget would open the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge," ANWAR, as it is called, "to oil and gas drilling, threatening a unique pristine ecosystem in hopes of generating \$1.3 billion in Federal revenues, a revenue estimate based on wishful thinking and outdated analysis."

This is one of the major points that was raised by the President in vetoing the budget, and rightly so. We know that the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge is a very pristine area, a very delicate ecosystem where oil and gas drilling could effectively destroy the whole nature of the refuge area. Yet, in the budget bill we have language that not only says that we are going to drill for oil and natural gas, but that we have to start within the next year, and specifically eliminates any environmental safeguards or any environmental impact statements that have to be done before that drilling were to take place.

Again, why? Special interests. Obviously, the oil companies want to be able to drill. They suggest that somehow there is a significant amount of revenue that is going to be made available. Yet those involved in Alaska oil know that the reality is very different. It is seriously questionable whether the Federal Government will ever get any of the revenue from the drilling.

In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, no effort really has been made by this majority in this Congress to try to deal with our energy dependence. Some of the advocates for drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge say, "This is good. We can drill for more oil domestically. We will not have to depend so much on foreign oil." But they do not do anything or they do not do anything significantly to increase mass transit, they do not look into alternative fuel vehicles, they do not look into what I call renewable resources, as opposed to nonrenewable resources, that will make us less energy-dependent. Instead, they just want to go ahead and drill.

I suggest that the President was right. I commend him not only for vetoing the budget bill, but for specifically mentioning the ANWAR or the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge as one of the reasons why he decided to veto the bill.

Mr. Speaker, let me give a few more examples of how this whole process of

legislating through the appropriations bills is taking place. Traditionally in this Congress and in this House, if you want to legislate as opposed to appropriate or spend money, you go to the authorizing committees. For example, with the Arctic National Wildlife, you go to the Committee on Resources, you would have a hearing, you would vote out a bill that allows drilling for oil and natural gas, for example. It would come to the floor, it would be passed here after open debate. The same thing would happen in the Senate. It would go to conference before it went to the President.

All that is being bypassed with these appropriation and budget bills. These provisions are being put into the spending bills, if you will, without all those initial processes taking place. That is not the way to proceed, and we are seeing it happen over and over again. It happened today. I was on the floor today and it happened today with regard to what we call deep ocean disposal, a form of ocean dumping.

Those of my constituents at the Jersey shore know that ever since 1988 we have had the Ocean Dumping Act passed, which specifically prohibits offshore dumping of sewage sludge as well as a number of other things that were contaminating our coastal environment. Just yesterday I was informed that an ocean dumping provision was sneaked into the appropriation conference report for Commerce, Justice, State, and the Judiciary, which we voted on today, just a few hours ago. This provision, which was not in either the House or Senate version of the appropriations bill, authorizes NOAA, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, to study deep ocean waste and isolation technologies, and basically to start a research program that has unlimited possibilities to dump sewage sludge and other kinds of contaminated material in the deep ocean off the coast of New Jersey or wherever; again, an effort to sneak in this kind of anti-environment legislation into the appropriations bill.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, the VA-HUD and Independent Agencies appropriations bill, the one that covers the EPA, which we will probably take up as early as tomorrow, had 17 riders like this when it originally came to the floor of the House of Representatives, 17 anti-environmental provisions that were simply thrown into the bill that had absolutely nothing really to do with spending money or with the appropriations process.

Twice on the floor of this House we had to vote by majority vote, bipartisan, we had to vote to take those riders out. Even though we voted twice to take the riders out, the conference report came back just last week and still had some of the riders in it. It had riders in it that bar the EPA's role in wetlands permitting, in the wetlands permit process.

Right now the EPA basically has the ability to veto development in wetlands if they think it has a terribly

damaging impact on the environment. That is taken out in a legislative rider that is still in the bill, even though the House voted twice to take it out. It also has the provision which I mentioned before, which says the EPA cannot add new Superfund sites to the national priority list without some additional approval. So again, that is in the bill, even though we voted twice to take it out.

In fact, if you look at the VA-HUD appropriations conference report, which will come again to the floor tomorrow, it actually cuts the EPA by 21 percent. It cuts funding for the Environmental Protection Agency by 21 percent and it cuts enforcement of our environmental laws by the Environmental Protection Agency by 25 percent.

□ 2015

So not only are they cutting the overall agency's budget, but they are also cutting enforcement even more severely. Why? Because essentially, in many cases, they want the laws to not be enforced. They would rather that the polluters get away with not having to pay the fine, not getting caught.

The EPA and environmental protection are cut more than other agency in this whole Federal budget, in this whole appropriations process, more than any other agency in the Government, and that shows again the Republican leadership and the bias against environmental protection in an effort to try to undercut all efforts, or most major efforts, to protect the environment.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to give a few more examples, if I could, of how efforts were made in this budget process to put antienvironmental provisions in. One example, again, that we voted on, on the House floor, was H.R. 260, the National Park System Reform Act, which after being defeated on the floor of this House under suspension of the rules, mysteriously appeared in the budget reconciliation bill.

This is a bill that would set up a commission, and as one of its purposes, choose national parks and recreation areas that would possibly be closed. I took it to heart because within my own district at Sandy Hook, Sandy Hook is a unit of Gateway National Recreation Area, the sponsor of the legislation actually mentioned Sandy Hook as one of the national park units that he thought possibly should be closed or suggested should be closed by this commission.

However, even though we worked hard to defeat that bill on the floor of the House so that this commission to close the parks would not be set up, all of a sudden it came up in the budget reconciliation bill that was about to come to the floor of this House. We managed again, through a coalition of Democrats and some Republicans who were concerned about the environment, to make sure that that provision was ultimately not in the conference re-

port; and it fortunately was not in the conference report, but there were a lot of other things that were.

Another item that the President mentioned in his veto message was the transfer of Federal land for a low-level radioactive waste site in California without public safeguards. This is an interesting provision that was put into the conference bill. In fact, what happened is that in the State of California, there was an effort to set up a low-level radioactive waste site to take waste not only from California, but from a number of other States.

The Secretary of the Interior said about a year ago that he would agree to this transfer subject to certain conditions being met to protect the environment. In other words, Secretary Babbitt wanted to go through a process whereby there were hearings, there was an opportunity for the public to be heard, and certain limitations would be put on the types of radioactive waste or the amount of radioactive waste that could be put into this site before the land transfer would be approved. This is Federal land in California, not very far from Los Angeles, that essentially now is under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management.

This budget bill would transfer the land for the purpose of setting up a low-level radioactive waste site for the State of California and other States without any safeguards. In other words, the conditions that Secretary Babbitt had articulated were simply eliminated and not mentioned in the budget bill. Instead, the budget bill said that it was not necessary to meet environmental safeguards; it was not necessary to do the public process with the hearings, and we would just transfer the land, and the State of California and the other States could do whatever they want and use it for a low-level radioactive waste site.

Again, a bill was introduced by a California Member to do this; it was put into my subcommittee, the Subcommittee on Energy and Power which had jurisdiction over it. We never had a hearing, the bill never came up, we never reviewed the bill. All of a sudden it is in the budget bill. But thankfully, now the President has indicated that this is another one of the antienvironmental measures, if you will, that is in the budget bill that he is not going to accept, and that he is going to insist be taken out in whatever negotiations are going to occur.

Mr. Speaker, I mention these items not because I think that there are not a lot of areas where we need to improve environmental protection, not because I think that we need to spend money endlessly on environmental protection, but because I believe very strongly that the normal process is being evaded and that the American public is really not being made aware of what is happening with regard to this budget, this Republican budget, and the appropriations process and environmental protection.

I want to stress before I conclude this evening that we, myself and the other Democrats who feel strongly about environmental protection, will not allow the Republican leadership to try to pull the wool over the eyes of the American people with regard to cuts in environmental protection so that the essential interests can get away with environmental delinquency. The budget and appropriations bills are not to be used as a vehicle for environmental destruction. The President has promised to veto several of these bills, as he did this evening, based on the hateful environmental provisions that are contained therein. I and my colleagues on the Democratic side, along with some Republicans, fully support him and commend him for his strong environmental stance.

As this budget negotiation continues over the next few weeks, and we hopefully come to an agreement on the budget bill that balances the budget and at the same time protects the environment, I think we need to be very vigilant to make sure that whatever is finally negotiated does not give away the store, if you will, to the polluters and strengthens environmental laws and strengthens enforcement, rather than weakening it and turning the clock back over the last 10 or 20 years on what this House and what the Senate have done to try to protect the environment in this country.

BALANCING THE BUDGET AND TROOPS IN BOSNIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I want to first yield to the gentleman from the great State of Pennsylvania, the Keystone State [Mr. FOX]. We want to talk a little bit tonight about the budget, and then perhaps about the other big issue that I think Americans are concerned with, the issue of Bosnia.

So I welcome Representative FOX, and maybe we can talk a little bit about how we got to where we are now and a little bit about the Balanced Budget Act.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the leadership the gentleman has taken here in the 104th Congress in focusing our attention on balancing the budget. Mr. Speaker, this is probably the most important issue we have before us, to make sure that we can reduce the cost of government, eliminate the waste, the fraud, and the abuse, and get down to the services that the Federal Government should be taking care of.

The fact that we have not balanced the budget since 1969 has given us approximately a \$5 trillion debt, and we are paying for that every day, every man, woman, and child in the United States. It has been told to us by no less