

problem, particularly within the garment industry. Even my Republican colleagues on the Committee on Education and the Workforce, the Gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. GOODLING, and the Gentleman from Michigan, Mr. HOEKSTRA, have noted the re-emergence of sweatshops.

The re-emergence of sweatshops has impoverished workers and their families and has driven reputable contractors out of otherwise profitable businesses. It represents a problem that cannot and should not be tolerated.

The "Stop Sweatshops Act" establishes joint liability on the part of manufacturers in the garment industry who contract with sweatshop operators for violations of the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA). This legislation strengthens the ability of the Department of Labor to enforce the law and improves the ability of garment workers to obtain redress where violations occur. As importantly, by encouraging manufacturers in the garment industry to deal with reputable contractors, this legislation acts to balance market pressures that have encouraged the re-emergence of sweatshops.

One hundred of my colleagues joined me last Congress as cosponsors of this legislation. I urge those of my colleagues who have supported this legislation in the past to do so again. And, I urge those who have not previously cosponsored this legislation to do so now. We cannot continue to allow unscrupulous employers to drive responsible employers out of business. Nor should we continue to tolerate working conditions that undermine rather than promote the well being of workers. As we near the end of the 20th Century, we must eliminate this vestige of 19th Century exploitation.

THE CHILDREN'S ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION ACT

HON. JAMES P. MORAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation to protect the health of America's children, the Children's Environmental Protection Act.

In 1996, Congress unanimously passed the Food Quality Protection Act (FQPA) which requires the Environmental Protection Agency to consider children's exposure to pesticides in food limit pesticide exposure to children. While the FQPA focused on protecting children by ensuring that the food they eat does not contain harmful levels of pesticides, this bill establishes guidelines to help reduce and eliminate exposure of children to environmental pollutants in areas reasonably accessible to children. The bill also requires the collection of toxicity data by the EPA Administrator, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Secretary of Health and Human Services so that we can begin to understand, with some level of accuracy, the long-term health effects and toxicity of pesticides and other environmental pollutants on children.

For too long risk assessments have been performed using the average, robust 170 pound male as a model. As a result, we really have no idea how these chemicals impact a child's system. This leaves our children at risk

because their physiology, play habits, and patterns of exposure make them more vulnerable to toxic harm. For example, children breathe in more of an air pollutant per pound of body weight. They eat more fresh fruit by body weight and drink proportionally more tap water, juice, and milk.

This bill addresses that problem by requiring that all EPA standards for environmental pollutants be set at levels that protect children. In addition, the Act requires EPA to publish a "Safe for Children" list of products, in addition to providing parents and the public with advice on how to minimize a child's exposure to harmful pollutants.

This bill also helps families educate themselves about potential threats to their children's health through the creation of a family right-to-know information kit. The kit will include a summary of helpful information and guidance to families and practical suggestions on how parents can reduce their children's exposure to environmental pollutants.

This bill will begin to provide the essential information we need to quantify and evaluate the impact of environmental pollutants in children. The more we know about potential risks and the less toxic burden we put on the environment the healthier our children will be. This legislation has been endorsed by Administrator Browner and by several environmental and health organizations. I urge your support and co-sponsorship of this important legislation.

ARLINGTON NATIONAL CEMETERY BURIAL ELIGIBILITY ACT

HON. BOB STUMP

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the "Arlington National Cemetery Burial Eligibility Act." I invite members to join me as a cosponsor of this important legislation. It is my expectation that the VA Committee will take prompt actions so that the House may consider this legislation early in the Congress.

This bill is almost identical to the legislation passed by the House during the 105th Congress by a vote of 412-0. The VA Committee learned as a result of its investigative efforts that the practice of allowing burial of persons who did not meet Army regulations prescribing eligibility for burial at Arlington National Cemetery (ANC) had become the subject of serious controversy. Further, the practice of allowing burial of persons without military service at ANC has caused considerable anguish on the part of members of military and veterans organizations. As a result, the VA Committee recommended this legislation to codify existing burial regulations for ANC with two significant changes. First, there would not be authority to grant exceptions, or "waivers," under the proposed legislation. No one—not the Superintendent of ANC, the Secretary of the Army, or the President of the United States—could authorize the burial of a person who is not eligible under the proposed legislation. However, Congress could enact subsequent legislation on behalf of an individual whose accomplishments are deemed worthy of the honor of being buried at Arlington National Cemetery.

Second, this bill eliminates the "politically well-connected" category of eligibility now

found in existing Army Regulations. Under existing Army regulations, veterans who do not meet the military criteria for burial at ANC are nevertheless eligible if they served as a member of the House or Senate, as a Federal judge, a diplomat, or a high-ranking cabinet officer. This legislation eliminates future eligibility of such persons so that Arlington will once more be the final resting place for those with distinguished military service.

As indicated, this bill passed the House by an overwhelming margin and had the active support of all the major veterans service and military organizations. Unfortunately, the other body did not debate the issue during the 105th Congress. By introducing this bill and planning for its early consideration by the House VA Committee, we hope to give the Senate ample opportunity to consider it and reach agreement on what the nation's policy should be on this issue of abiding importance to veterans and their families.

EXTENDING COVERAGE OF THE FMLA

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to expand the protections afforded by the Family and Medical Leave Act. The bill I am introducing is identical to legislation I introduced in the 105th Congress, H.R. 109.

The Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 (FMLA) grants employees the right to take unpaid leave in the event of a family or medical emergency without jeopardizing their jobs. As a former Chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor-Management Relations of the Committee on Education and Labor, I was privileged to work closely with the Hon. MARGE ROUKEMA, Senator DODD, Senator BOND, our former colleagues the Hon. Pat Schroeder and the Hon. William D. Ford, and many others to bring about the enactment of this important law. Necessarily, however, many compromises were made to bring about this precedent setting legislation.

Among the most important of those compromises was one that limited the applicability of the law to employers of 50 or more employees. My original intention had been to extend the law to employers of 25 or more employees. However, because of uncertainty regarding the impact of the law on employers and in order to increase support for the legislation, I agreed to accept the 50 employee threshold.

The effect of this compromise was to leave tens of millions of employees and their families outside of the protections afforded by the FMLA. In fact, only 57% of the workforce is protected by the FMLA. The fact that an employee may work for an employer of 40 rather than 50 people does not immunize that employee from the vicissitudes of life nor diminish that employee's need of the protections afforded by the FMLA. For my part, this was a very difficult and reluctantly entered compromise. However, it was my hope at that time that experience under the law would prove that the law does not unduly or unreasonably disrupt employer operations.

The FMLA was signed into law on February 5, 1993. Experience has shown that the law