

\$55 million. An independent economic analysis by the Upjohn Institute has resulted in estimated savings of \$4 million.

Mr. Speaker, I support the cost-saving goals of the BRAC Commission. However, if the cost of closing down, hiring and retraining workers is considered in the Battle Creek case, there will be no savings whatsoever. If this proposal, because of dislocation, new hires and retraining, results in as much as a 1 percent loss in the value of military surplus equipment handled by just one of the units at Battle Creek, the move could result in \$29 million added cost to taxpayers.

Not only DOD but the rest of Federal Government must start doing a better job of economic analysis if we are to start reducing the tremendous waste in the Federal bureaucracy.

#### SUPPORT FOR H.R. 1308

SPEECH OF

**HON. BENJAMIN L. CARDIN**

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, May 11, 1993*

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, H.R. 1308.

The Supreme Court's decision in *Employment Division of Oregon versus Smith* seriously weakened the first amendment's guarantee of freedom of religion. In the case, often referred to as the "peyote case," the Supreme Court found that the State of Oregon could deny unemployment compensation benefits to drug rehabilitation counselors who were fired for the sacramental use of peyote in native American religious ceremonies.

Prior to the decision, the test used by the courts for evaluating the constitutionality of a statute that restricted the free exercise of religion was whether the Government could prove it had a compelling interest. In this case, the Supreme Court discarded the strict compelling interest standard in favor of a lesser valid governmental purpose standard.

Under the lesser standard, people's constitutional right to freely exercise their religion was infringed. Here are some examples: Veterans have been denied the right to be buried in some veterans' cemeteries on Saturday and Sunday even if their religious beliefs required it; the Amish have been forced to be required by State law to display fluorescent orange emblems on their horse-drawn carriages even though this violates their religious beliefs; autopsies have been performed on individuals whose religious beliefs prohibit autopsies even though the State was unable to show a compelling reason for performing the autopsy; and on and on.

The Religious Freedom Restoration Act would restore the requirement that the government demonstrate a compelling interest in order to restrict the free exercise of religion. It would also require the government to use the least restrictive means possible to further its compelling interest.

As a long-time cosponsor of the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, I am pleased the bill has received the support of virtually every major religious denomination, the Clinton administration, and, most recently, the unanimous vote of the House Judiciary Committee. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation

that strengthens one of our most fundamental rights—the free exercise of religion.

#### SENIOR CENTERS IN AMERICA 50 YEARS OF SERVICE TO OUR NATION

**HON. NITA M. LOWEY**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 12, 1993*

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in proud recognition of the 50th anniversary of the founding of the first senior center in the United States.

One of the most dramatic changes and profound challenges we face as a nation is the aging of our population. Advances in medicine and in social services have extended the life and improved the health of millions of older Americans. Every segment of our society will be influenced by the needs, resources, expertise, and wisdom of senior citizens.

For the past 50 years, senior centers have played a vital role as service delivery focal points, helping older persons to help themselves and each other through a range of programs, and access to needed community resources.

Senior centers throughout the Nation affirm the dignity, self-worth and independence of older persons by facilitating independent decisionmaking and action, and by utilizing their experiences, skills and knowledge, to provide for continuing contributions to our society.

As you know, the month of May has been proclaimed Older Americans Month. Communities across the Nation have been encouraged to give special recognition to older persons and to the role of senior centers in serving them.

I call upon all Americans to recognize the importance of strengthening the bonds between generations, and I pledge continued support to the special institutions which offer so much to individuals who have given generously of themselves for our benefit.

#### NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL TRADE DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1993 INTRODUCED

**HON. GERRY E. STUDDS**

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 12, 1993*

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure today that I introduce with Representatives FURSE, KENNEDY, OLVER, LAUGHLIN, UNSOELD, MANTON, ESHOO, HUGHES, LANCASTER, and THOMPSON, the National Environmental Trade Development Act of 1993. This bill has two simple purposes—create American jobs and protect the global environment. How can anyone object?

In his Earth Day Address of April 21, 1993, President Clinton called on the Secretary of Commerce, in cooperation with the Secretary of Energy and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, to develop an interagency strategic plan to increase exports of U.S.-made environmental technologies and improve the competitiveness of those technologies. I applaud the leadership of President

Clinton in recognizing that the United States has developed environmental technologies which the world needs and that we have to explore new ways of getting these technologies to the global marketplace. Creating linkages between U.S. know-how and foreign markets in need of this know-how requires a partnership between the Government and the private sector. The National Environmental Trade Development Act establishes this partnership.

What are environmental technologies? Broadly speaking, they are technologies, goods, and services used to prevent, reduce, and clean up air, water, and land pollution. They consist of the actual hardware plus the education, training, and information needed to put these technologies to good use in improving our environmental condition.

The United States is the world leader in the development of environmental technologies needed to comply with our tough environmental standards, but, unfortunately, we are not the dominant trader of these technologies in the global market. Other countries, like Japan and Germany, are expending more of their GNP to help their companies sell their technologies in the global market. We have to do the same if we wish to compete. If we wish to create new jobs for the next century, and if we wish to save this planet from further pollution.

I support the President's initiative to expand our envirotech exports and especially agree with his decision to give lead agency responsibility to the Secretary of Commerce. I know that Secretary Ron Brown understands the importance of this issue to jobs, competitiveness, and environmental protection. The Secretary also understands that the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration within his Department, with its important environmental and scientific assessment responsibilities, has a valuable role to play in making sure that new technologies get from the Government to the private sector.

There is, however, one group that the President failed to mention in his address, namely the private sector. Unless the private sector is included in the strategic planning process, I fear we will not be able to meet the President's goals of improving U.S. competitiveness. For it is the private sector that has developed these technologies, it is the private sector that will sell these technologies in the global market, and it is the private sector that will create the jobs we so badly need in this country.

According to the Office of Technology Assessment, in 1990, the global market for environmental technology, goods and services, was \$200 billion. By conservative estimates, it is expected to grow to \$300 billion, or possibly \$500 billion, by the year 2000. The U.S. share of this market, while substantial, is only a small percentage compared to that of its major trading partners. According to a 1992 report from the Brookings Institution, entitled "Going Global," exports for the 12-nation European Community average more than 30 percent of total GNP. In contrast, U.S. exports were less than 7 percent of GNP. The reason for this difference—the lack of a coherent trade strategy in the United States compared to our European trading partners. If we create a true public-private partnership in the area of environmental technologies, we can capture a greater share of the world market and create more