tamination and Superfund sites stemming from used oil.

The third objective of the bill is to remove the lead and other metals from used oil before it can be burned, so as to prevent contamination of our air. Lead has been shown over the years to cause serious physical and mental impairments, mainly in our youth, especially in urban areas. We must no longer allow the learning and development of our children to be limited due to environmental recklessness. I fully agree with the recent declaration by Health and Human Services Secretary Dr. Louis Sullivan that lead is the No. 1 environmental threat to children.

The report titled "The Costs Of Used Oil Management," released on November 13, 1991, by the Natural Resources Defense Council, Sierra Club, Izaak Walton League of America, and Hazardous Waste Treatment Council solidly documents the presence of lead in our air and the primary sources of this lead. The No. 1 source of airborne lead emissions in the United States is the burning of used oil with high lead levels. Annually, about 588,000 pounds of lead are pumped into our air from the unregulated burning of used oil, and amount greater than any other source.

All across the country, Americans must be able to heat homes, schools, and hospitals without compromising our children's ability to learn, grow, and live healthy, prosperous lives. In Chicago, used oil with high lead levels is still used in certain large industrial boilers and processes. Although industry may not rely heavily on used oil as their fuel source, the amount they use propels enough lead into our air to cause our concern and call out for correction. We have a right to demand that our health not be sacrificed by industrial profit margins.

Thus, the bill also calls for the metals and other chemicals found in used oil to be reduced to negligible levels before the oil can be burned. In the case of lead, the current national standard is that there can be no more than 100 parts per million of lead, even though much smaller amounts are still considered dangerous. Even with this loose guideline, enforcement is very spotty, with oil burning often being entirely unregulated. The ORSHA would require that the lead content be decreased to no more than 2 parts per million before used oil could be burned.

Mr. Speaker, the link between the environment and public health cannot be taken lightly. The days are gone when corporate practices could slowly kill us with unseen poisons packing our air, land, and water. In Chicago, like everywhere, residents cannot choose which air to breathe and they don't know the chemical composition of their soil and water. As a matter of public health, we need the reforms of the Oil Recycling and Safe Handling Act of 1991, and I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill.

INTRODUCTION OF MICROLEND FOR THE FUTURE ACT

HON. NANCY PELOSI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 26, 1991

Ms. PELOSI. Mr Speaker, today, I am introducing the Microlend for the Future Act. As we talk about how to get our country's economy back on the upswing, I believe that we must discuss steps to foster economic independence and self-sufficiency in our citizens. These steps are a vital part of increasing our international competitiveness and overall economic well-being. To do this, we must concentrate our energies at home and rebuild our own neighborhoods and communities. A very practical and cost effective means to achieving this is investing in microenterprises or small business concerns being started or expanded by low-income individuals. Microlending is an idea whose time has come.

The Micorlend for the Future Act would establish a 5-year demonstration program to provide loan and grant funds to community-based organizations and financial intermediaries, which in turn would provide loans to low-income individuals starting or expanding a microenterprise. The vital element in this process is that eligible groups would also provide business training and technical assistance throughout the entire loan venture. It is the business training and assistance that will help low-income individuals gain the skills necessary to become and remain self-sufficient.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me as a cosponsor of this important bill. Microlending is an investment in our communities and in the economic future of our Nation. Our action now will help low-income individuals help themselves and move from economic dependency to self-sufficiency.

ESCALANTE CANYONS STUDY ACT

HON. WAYNE OWENS

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 26, 1991

Mr. OWENS of Utah. Mr. Speaker, over 50 years ago, a proposal was made by Harold Ickes, Secretary of the Interior to President Franklin Roosevelt, to establish a national park that would have encompassed much of southern Utah. The centerpiece of this park was to be the Escalante River and its canyons. Since then, parts of this region have been protected in national parks and monuments. But the Escalante River and its tributary canyons, the focus of the original effort, have not been protected by national park status.

Today, I introduce a bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study of the Escalante Canyon region to be used to consider the establishment of a national park in the area. A national park in the Escalante Canyon region would protect unique natural, cultural, and historic resources that are an integral part of Utah's heritage.

I grew up in the shadow of the canyons and cliffs of the Escalante region. As a teenager herding cattle and sheep, I marveled at the canyon's spectacular beauty. It seemed peculiar to me then—and it still does now—that an area of such enormous beauty had not been designated as one of our national parks.

The establishment of a national park in the Escalante Canyon area is a good idea whose time has finally come. With good baseline information and planning, a strategy for tourism, and protected land that serves as a principal upon which we gain interest, we can enhance the State and local economies and protect our unique lands. As more and more land is developed in other parts of this Nation, future generations will look toward Utah and areas like Escalante to find vestiges of natural lands and their associated values. There is no boom and bust cycle associated with the public's appreciation of their natural and cultural heritage—the lure and the beauty of Utah country will remain, and continue to increase in importance with the passage of time. In this year of the 75th anniversary of our National Park Service, I believe it is time to consider a national park in the Escalante Canyon country of Utah.

DEATH IN THE FOREST

HON. HELEN DELICH BENTLEY

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 26, 1991

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago, the National Geographic Society's Explorer program devoted important segments to the illegal poaching of black bears. Sickening indeed were the scenes of black bear corpses lying on the forest floor, with their gall bladders removed and paws chopped off.

Most people are unaware of the fact that our forests are silently being emptied in order to satisfy the heavy demand for bear body parts from customers in Korea, Japan, and Taiwan. In this business, Asian herbal dealers in these United States purchase bear gall bladders from poachers, after which they are shipped overseas where they are prized for ancient curative properties. Often, the gall bladder is dried, pulverized, and sold in capsule form to those who believe that it will cure blood disorders, cancer, and even hemorrhoids.

According to law enforcement officials, the trade in bear gall bladders has become so frenzied, that counterfeiters will often substitute pig and cow gall bladders for the real article. This, in turn, has led some dealers to request a videotape of the removal of the gall bladder as a macabre "certificate of authenticity." Mr. Speaker, this is an outrage and one that I plan to address in the form of legislation when the Congress reconvenes in 1992.

SUPPORT RELIGIOUS FREEDOM WITHOUT JEOPARDIZING THE UNBORN

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 26, 1991

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Religious Freedom Act of 1991. It is intended to overcome the adverse impact on religious freedom in this country caused by the U.S. Supreme Court's decision last year in Employment Division versus Smith.

The practical result of the Smith case is that individuals or organizations whose religious practices are burdened by a particular law, regulation, or administrative action are placed at a great procedural disadvantage when pursuing relief from these sometimes capricious

governmental intrusions. Under the Smith approach, almost any reason advanced by Government will justify restraining religious practices so long as the particular governmental action does not single out religion for adverse treatment.

From the founding of our Nation, religion has enjoyed a special position. The Smith decision places that special status in jeopardy. The ability of individuals and organizations to practice their religion without unnecessary governmental interference is guaranteed by the first amendment. Governments should be held to strict standards before they are allowed to interfere with or burden the practice of religion. That is what the Religious Freedom Act of 1991 would do. Where applicable, it would require governments to demonstrate that a policy or practice that burdens religious practice is essential to further a compelling governmental interest of the highest order and is the least restrictive means of furthering that compelling interest.

Earlier this year, my good friend STEVE SOLARZ introduced H.R. 2797, the Religious Freedom Restoration Act. While I believe this legislation was introduced with the best of intentions, some very notable legal scholars, religious organizations, and prolife groups have expressed serious reservations about its potential impact in the area of abortion policy. Some have also voiced concerns about H.R. 2797's possible effect on the tax-exempt status of religious organizations and their capacity to participate in Government-sponsored social service programs.

The bill I am introducing has a specific provision that makes it clear that the legislation cannot be used to secure a right to abortion or abortion funding. It also explicitly protects the tax status of religious organizations.

The Nation's preeminent free exercise litigator, William Bentley Ball, who litigated the famous Yoder free exercise case, has stated that, "We need legislation for the overriding" of the Supreme Court's Smith decision. However, he has told Congressman HENRY HYDE that he is totally opposed to a Religious Freedom Restoration Act [RFRA] that does not contain an exclusion for religiously based challenges to abortion-restrictive statutes.

The National Right to Life Committee, U.S. Catholic Conference, Americans United for Life, and Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod have all made it clear that a legislative remedy to Smith must include an abortion neutral amendment.

Free exercise of religion claims are currently being used by groups such as the ACLU and the Religious Coalition for Abortion Rights [RCAR] to attack pro-life laws in Utah, Guam, Louisiana, Michigan, and New York. Under current law and Supreme Court precedent, those attacks will undoubtedly fail. If H.R. 2797 is enacted, such attacks would be based on the new statute, and they would very likely succeed.

Marc Stern of the American Jewish Congress is a member of the drafting committee that developed H.R. 2797. In a May 9, 1991, memo which he transmitted on behalf of the committee, Mr. Stern proposed that the following language be inserted in the congressional committee report on the Solarz bill:

RFRA could not be invoked to challenge the bare existence of restrictive or permissive abortion laws, but it could be invoked by persons who for religious reasons wish to obtain, or not participate in, abortion where a law imposed contrary restrictions or obligations.

The pro-life movement has labored long and hard to overturn the infamous Roe versus Wade and Doe versus Bolton Supreme Court decisions. The Court's 1989 Webster decision signaled that such a reversal might be imminent. It would be tragic if a new foundation for permissive abortion policies was created just as we were on the verge of a great victory for the unborn.

During my 11 years in Congress, I have spent a great deal of time fighting for religious freedom. I believe that this cause and the protection of innocent human life are entirely compatible. Therefore, I am proud to introduce the Religious Freedom Act today along with my colleagues HENRY HYDE, ALAN MOLLOHAN, HAROLD VOLKMER, BARBARA VUCANOVICH, BOB DORNAN, DUNCAN HUNTER, CLYDE HOLLOWAY, JOHN BOEHNER, BILL EMERSON, TOM DELAY, BILL DANNEMEYER, JIM BUNNING.

RELATIONS WITH THE COMMUNIST GOVERNMENT OF VIETNAM

HON. TOM CAMPBELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 26, 1991

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss United States relations with the Communist government of Vietnam. Now that the Cambodian peace plan has been signed, it appears that the United States is moving toward normalizing relations with Vietnam. While I welcome the Vietnamese decision to support the U.N. Comprehensive Settlement for Cambodia, they must continue to implement this agreement.

We should proceed with caution as we work toward a full normalization of relations with Vietnam. There are many issues that remain unresolved—humanitarian issues in particular—that should not go unnoticed, or unchanged. Most importantly, we must still receive a comprehensive, final accounting of the Americans missing in action.

Currently, 2,273 of our heroes are reported as missing. If we offer diplomatic recognition before resolving these cases, there will be little incentive for Hanoi to resolve them. No public official in this country should tell 2,300 American families that we intend to extend our friendship to a government that has failed to completely cooperate with our efforts to determine the fates of their loved ones. And I would fear for the safety of any of these MIA's if we recognize Vietnam prematurely; God forbid that we give any incentive to the Vietnamese Government to destroy evidence of MIA's by eliminating whomever might remain. Certainly their recent actions to prevent our chief of the POW/MIA Investigative Office in Hanoi from resuming his duties underscores this fear.

Vietnam's great need for Western assistance will never exceed America's need to resolve these human tragedies. The United States should take every opportunity to make clear to Hanoi that the resolution of these cases is, and will remain, a paramount concern of the United States.

LONG-TERM CARE INSURANCE

HON. CARDISS COLLINS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 26, 1991

Mrs. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, long-term care insurance is a very tricky, relatively new product that has come under scrutiny for certain practices which appear to be characteristic of the industry.

The policies and benefits which are being offered are still evolving and are experiencing growing pains. This explains some of the shortcomings of this market, and I anticipate that these kinks will be worked out over time.

But additionally, there are other problems which stem from insurers and regulators not taking steps which they already recognize would satisfy important needs of consumers. Still other problems stem from deliberate disregard for consumer interests and needs.

The subcommittee on Commerce, Consumer Protection, and Competitiveness, which I chair, held a hearing on Thursday, October 24, 1991, on long-term care insurance standards. The hearing focused on industry and agent practices and the current paltry efforts to regulate them. The subcommittee also had the advantage of comparing the status quo of regulation to the proposals embodied in three bills: H.R. 2378, introduced by Congressman BRUCE; H.R. 1916, introduced by Congressman WYDEN; and H.R. 1205, introduced by Congressman ROWLAND.

The hearing illustrated numerous problem areas, some of which occur with alarming frequency. While at this time, it is difficult to precisely identify all of the reforms which must be established in the immediate future, it is clear that action cannot be delayed. Every day that long-term care insurance is sold in absence of necessary reforms, more groundwork is laid which is likely to fester into full blown problems in the years to come. Many insurers and agents are entirely scrupulous, but there also are ones who are not. Unless we can put an end to abuses, the whole long-term care insurance field will suffer.

At the October 24 hearing, Ms. Betty Tyler testified that her father bought a long-term care insurance policy at age 82 and fully disclosed at the time that he was already suffering from high blood pressure, diabetes, and Parkinson's disease. The policy's premiums were $702 per year, which, considering his age and physical condition, were abnormally low. In fact, it was so low that it prompted a colleague on the subcommittee to observe that, "It would sound to me like they didn't expect to pay any claims."

Unfortunately, that appears to be the case. The claims which were first filed by Ms. Tyler on her father's behalf 3½ years ago still have never been paid.

I fear that Ms. Tyler's father is not alone in his continued quest to receive benefits under these policies. He is in a same sova. If not for Ms. Tyler or someone else's tenaciously pursue the claim, the insurer would be able to