

years without adverse health effects—this “Health Advisory” is much lower than the EPA guideline. Yet, the city of Columbus, OH found that compliance with this regulation could require a new \$80 million water purification plant. For the same amount of money, the city could hire an extra 2,300 teachers at the average State teacher’s salary. We must remember that protecting our environment has real costs and that we cannot squander those resources on minimal threat, extreme cost environmental boondoggles.

Another thing that we, as Americans, cannot tolerate in our environmental trek, is a cumbersome bureaucracy that makes environmental protection difficult to attain. The Endangered Species Act first passed with strong bipartisan support, all of us can agree that we should not be willfully trying to eradicate the creatures important to our ecosystem. However, the two pronged efforts of the act, protection and recovery, have become stymied in bureaucracy and court cases so that many species have become protected, but very few species have been recovered at all. This undermines the real intention of the law.

But as bad as the bureaucracy has been with the Endangered Species Act, the Superfund Program has been worse. This program, which was put into law 16 years ago to clean our Nation’s worst toxic dumps, has been a miserable failure; it is the archetypical government program. Everyone believes this program needs to be reformed. We have spent billions of dollars on this program only to see hazardous waste sites sit uncleaned, with lawyers and bureaucrats drawing ever-increasing paychecks. The American people deserve a much better return on their investment. I have successfully offered an amendment to congressional efforts to reform Superfund that would force greater amounts of the Superfund’s cleanup budget—the money that should be going to “dirt moving” activity, not bureaucrats, desks, and reams of studies—to go to site remediation. The private sector generally spends over 200 percent less on administrative costs in cleanup projects than the Government. The money we save here could be used for tangible environmental improvements and I am hopeful that this important provision can be enacted into public law.

Our country has made significant strides over the last 30 years to make our environment safer, cleaner, and healthier. We should not abdicate the responsibility to protect our air, land, and water that has been established and been successful. However, we should not forget to reform or improve those laws that have actually perpetuated the problems. More of a bad thing does not make it a good thing, it only becomes a bigger bad thing—and delay is worse. This should be our credo in finding environmental problems, as well as in proposing their solutions. Trying something new, or looking at the problem in another way, does not immediately constitute an infringement on environmental protection, we all want a clean environment.

Mr. Speaker, much of the public debate on the environment has been cast in purely partisan tones, yet, I am here to set the record straight that making our natural inheritance better for present and future generations should not be confined to party identification. If we were to keep score from that perspective, as most people do in this town, I would like to remind people that the Republicans

were the first ones to embrace the cause of conservation. Teddy Roosevelt, the first real standard bearer for the National Park System, was a Republican. And, the Environmental Protection Agency was established by Richard Nixon and would have been elevated to Cabinet-level status under President Bush had certain political considerations not come to the fore.

Our environment is too important to become a political football, filled with hot air every election cycle. Emotional pleas and incendiary direct mail pieces only clutter the burgeoning waste stream of environmental perspectives. We need a science-based policy which gives us solid, substantiated information; governing by fearmongering is no way to responsibly lead. Using informed, expert opinion and legitimate data, we can make our natural inheritance better for present and future generations.

I am hopeful that this Earth Day will be an opportunity for us all to consider the environment and how we can make it better. Billions of tax dollars are spent to ensure our public health and safety, they should not fund unreasonable regulations or stifling bureaucracies. We should take a prudent, realistic course, that realizes we are currently able to accomplish a finite set of objectives, as our resources allow. And, we should see that local involvement in priority setting, on top of proven and substantiated research, lead us to environmental quality in which we can all take pride.

THE 26TH ANNUAL CELEBRATION
OF EARTH DAY

HON. KAREN MCCARTHY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1996

Ms. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday marked the 26th Annual celebration of Earth Day. In the time since the first Earth Day, much has been accomplished in to the way of environmental protection. Landmark legislation such as the Clean Water Act, the Clean Air Act, the Endangered Species, Act, and the establishment of the Environmental Protection Agency have resulted from a commitment to protection of our natural resources that is exemplified by Earth Day.

There is no question that today our water is more clean and our air is more breathable than it was 25 years ago. Species that were threatened or endangered 25 years ago, such as the American Bald Eagle, are now thriving. Wetlands are better protected, toxic dump sites are more quickly identified and treated, environmentally sensitive sources of energy are being developed and put into use, and our public lands are more sensitively preserved and maintained.

The job is certainly not complete. Much can be done to strengthen the laws on the books, but much can be done to make compliance with those laws more achievable. Long-term environmental protection can only be accomplished through a partnership between the environmental and business communities. In seeking to expand and improve environmental protection, we must also consider the legitimate concerns raised by those who live with the regulations.

Despite all the positive and popular steps that have been taken to protect the environ-

ment in the past quarter century, and the additional work that needs to be done, the leadership of the 104th Congress has attempted to halt, roll back, and eliminate many of the protections for the environment we hold sacred. Legislation has passed the House during this Congress to dramatically reduce one of the most successful laws on our books, the Clean Water Act. While not perfect, the Clean Water Act has gone a long way towards cleaning up our Nation’s rivers, lakes, and streams; but the bill that passed the House rejects those successes and represents a major step backward in cleanup of polluted waterways.

Another target of this Congress has been the Environmental Protection Agency. In pursuit of a worthy cause—streamlining and making more efficient the environmental regulatory process—legislation has passed the House to establish stringent new requirements for risk assessment and cost benefit analysis of major federal regulations affecting health, safety, or the environment. Should this bill become law, it would hamstring EPA’s ability to promulgate and enforce regulations designed to protect the environment.

In addition, funding for EPA has been slashed by more than 25 percent. The House Leadership’s commitment to reducing environmental protection funding has resulted in fewer hazardous waste cleanups, a reduction in enforcement, and a decrease in needed water infrastructure and treatment programs.

Today, as we celebrate the 26th anniversary of Earth Day, it is important to reflect on the successes that have been achieved in environmental protection over the years, and the work that must continue to be done to ensure our natural resources will be preserved for generations to come. Instead of misguided attempts to roll back protection, we need to develop ways to preserve our environment that are cost-effective, efficient, and responsible.

I participated in the first Earth Day celebration in 1970 by walking to my teaching job rather than driving, and discussing with my students the responsibility each individual has to the environment. I have marked the anniversary of Earth Day each year since, and this year I helped to create a community garden with Americorps volunteers in my district.

All of my life I have worked for sound environment, and I practice conservation and recycling at home and in my offices. As a member of the Transportation Committee’s Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment, and the Science Committee’s Subcommittee on Energy and Environment, I work as an advocate for substantive changes in law and policy that will ensure a quality environment.

Concern about our environment must be reflected in each of our lives daily. From recycling our newspapers, to planting trees, to using public transportation whenever possible, together we can make our environment cleaner and safer. Let us each pledge to make every day, Earth Day.

COMMEMORATION OF THE
OKLAHOMA CITY BOMBING

HON. VIC FAZIO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1996

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the Oklahoma City