

member of Marin Conservation Corps, Environmental Forum, Marin Agricultural Land Trust, and Digital Village to name a few. She has been recognized by induction into the Marin Women's Hall of Fame, received the national Conservation Award from Daughters of the American Revolution, and named the Executive Director of the Year for Excellence in Developing Community Partnerships.

It has been my please and privilege to work with Karin over the last several years on important issues such as protecting wetlands and preserving agriculture and open space. I particularly appreciated her coming to Washington, DC to testify in favor of my bill to expand the Pt. Reyes National Seashore. It's been a pleasure working with such a capable and compassionate person. I continue to be impressed by her dedication and vision. She is a role model for all.

On the occasion of her retirement from Marin Conservation League, and as we celebrate Karin's years of service to this community, I wish to recognize Karin for her commitment to the people of Marin County, and to thank her for her outstanding record of public service. Marin County owes a great deal of gratitude for the tireless efforts of Karin over the years. Time and again she has extended herself on behalf of many people and for many causes.

Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to pay tribute to Karin Urquhart as her many friends and supporters celebrate and toast her at the Marin Rod & Gun Club in San Rafael. I extend my hearty congratulations and best wishes to Karin, and to her husband Don, for continued success now, and in the years to come, and I consider it an honor to be her friend.

MERRY CHRISTMAS, FAA

HON. BOB FRANKS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 22, 1995

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to move the Federal Aviation Administration's [FAA] eastern regional office from Queens, NY, to Union County, NJ.

As my colleagues are aware, after spending \$6 million and taking over 5 years, the FAA will implement next month its long-awaited Solberg mitigation plan. The FAA is proceeding to execute this plan even though it has virtually no support among the citizens of New Jersey or their elected officials.

Judging from the answers given at a recent House Aviation Subcommittee hearing on the expanded east coast plan, a hearing which I requested, the FAA has no plan to resolve New Jersey's aircraft noise problem. In effect, the FAA has decided to wash its hands of my State's legitimate aircraft noise concerns.

It is obvious that the FAA has lost touch with the citizens of New Jersey. This is why it is important that the FAA bureaucrats responsible for the New Jersey aircraft noise debacle work in a State where they can be constantly reminded of their failure. I am confident that after moving to the Garden State, the FAA will be able to clearly hear the aircraft noise problem it created. And after a few months of being in one of the most noise-impacted counties in the Nation, perhaps the FAA will be-

come more amenable to finally solving New Jersey's aircraft noise problem.

Mr. Speaker, the people of New Jersey deserve better than the FAA's footdragging and duplicity on this issue. I plan to attach this legislation to the FAA reform bill, which is ready for consideration by the House. In the interim, I encourage my colleagues to cosponsor this legislation.

TRIBUTE TO SANFORD M. LITVACK

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 22, 1995

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to Sanford M. Litvack, a distinguished attorney who currently serves as the senior executive vice president and chief of corporate operations of the Walt Disney Co.

Mr. Litvack is greatly respected both in the legal community and among the advocates of legal reform and legal services for the poor. He has led the crusade to make the law a field of humane service, and not merely a remunerative profession.

On January 27, 1996, Bet Tzedek Legal Services will honor Sanford M. Litvack for his unstinting work in bringing high-quality legal services to the poor, the elderly, and others in need.

Under Mr. Litvack's vigorous leadership, the goals of Bet Tzedek have been realized even beyond the expectations of the organization's founders and staunchest supporters. He and his colleagues have assembled a well-organized, efficient, humanitarian organization that individuals can turn to for competent legal counsel when all other paths are closed.

Sanford Litvack sets a standard for us all to live up to. He has been able to balance his full family and professional life with energetic and creative contributions to the organization and leadership of Bet Tzedek and other humanitarian and philanthropic efforts.

I ask all of my colleagues to join me in recognizing Sanford Litvack for his important work with Bet Tzedek Legal Services. I wish him every success in all of his future endeavors.

UNITED STATES NEEDS TOUGH ENVIRONMENTAL LEGISLATION TO COMPETE GLOBALLY IN NEXT CENTURY

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 22, 1995

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, one of the many problems with the Republicans' most recent budget proposal is the drastic effect it will have on environmental research and technology. According to the White House, "it would cut environmental research and technology funding by nearly \$1 billion or 20 percent from the President's request for fiscal year 1996." Additionally, the Republican cuts include a 92-percent reduction from the President's request for the Environmental Technology Initiative [ETI], which would thwart ef-

forts to encourage the development of new technologies that reduce pollution and clean up the environment while creating new jobs and economic growth—a market that is expected to boom to \$400 billion by 2000—if American industry does not make sufficient investments in this area today.

The need for environmental technology and services is rapidly growing on a global scale. The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development estimates the market will be worth \$300 billion and that the demand for waste-management products and air-pollution control equipment will grow by over 50 percent in the next 5 years, with water- and effluent-treatment growing by a third by the end of the decade. The U.S. Export-Import Bank already estimates the environmental technology and services market's worldwide value at \$400 billion.

However, developers of environmental technology face a series of hurdles before they can truly tap into this market. First, the market is ill-defined and driven almost entirely by regulation and the level of enforcement in different national and regional markets. According to Financial Times (6/21/95), in the UK the greatest demands by companies in this expanding market are for ever more accurate data and analysis. Of the 116 companies questioned in the first survey of purchases of environmental technology earlier this year, 90 percent said the main driving-force behind the market was legislation.

The second problem facing developers, which is mainly due to weak environmental legislation, is convincing financiers that the technology can generate sufficient returns for investors.

According to the Financial Times (December 1, 1995), international competition is fierce, primarily between the three biggest exporters, the United States, Japan, and Germany. The U.S. Ex-Im Bank started a special program to help its industry find markets abroad. Julie Belaga, a director of the bank, says the main aim is to create United States jobs by financing exports where the private sector is unwilling to do so. Helmut Kohl, the German chancellor, commented in a recent edition of Environment Strategy Europe, a yearbook for legislators and business leaders, that Germany's very tough environmental legislation had enabled the country to take a leading position in the world market for environmental protection goods.

Now is not the time for the United States to cut back on funds for environmental research and technology, nor is it the time to backtrack on advances made in environmental legislation made over the past decade. Now is when the 104th Congress needs to seize this opportunity to create jobs, build new industries, and protect the environment by passing additional legislation, particularly in the area of tax reform, that will ensure that the United States will be a leader in the environmental technology and services industry into the next century.

According to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development in an environmental assessment report of the United States scheduled to be released in January 1996, the United States has been a leader in environmental programs, but needs to eliminate "environmentally unsound Federal subsidies", including those to coal-fired power plants, and examine national consumption patterns. Back

in September, I introduced a bill that would repeal 11 incentives in the corporate Tax Code to produce various polluting energy supplies and consume various nonrenewable minerals. Currently, these polluting tax subsidies cost taxpayers close to \$2.2 billion per year. This figure is expected to total a \$14.5 billion Treasury loss over the next 5 years.

The cost is even greater when we consider that not only do these subsidies encourage waste and environment degradation, but they also discourage investment in new alternatives to existing technology. Some European countries, that is, Germany, Austria, and the Netherlands, are considering a fiscally-neutral Ecological Tax Reform (ETR) which would introduce a CO₂/energy tax and at the same time reduce their income tax. The European Union Commission is considering a similar proposal. I am currently working on a bill along these same lines that would gradually reduce corporate and individual income taxes and gradually increase taxes on pollution, excessive depletion of valuable natural resources, and inefficient production and consumption of energy.

The time is right from both an environmental and an economical view point to press forward with tough environmental legislation which will protect our environment, create jobs, and position the United States as a leader in the environmental technology and services industry, an industry that will be constantly expanding through the next century.

Reprinted below is an article by Jessica Mathews which depicts the ease with which businesses developed substitutes for ozone-depleting chlorofluorocarbons [CFCs] once there was a modest incentive to do so.

CLEAN SWEEPS: TWO SUCCESS STORIES FOR THE ENVIRONMENT

Two extraordinary environmental successes are passing almost unnoticed. They illustrate the cost of ignoring good news—in particular good news about government—in favor of bad. When the success stories are missed so is the opportunity to reframe policy on the basis of what works instead of always focusing on what doesn't.

In less than two weeks the United States will produce its last ozone-destroying chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs), completing a historic international phaseout of a class of chemicals that just a few years ago seemed irreplaceable. Since the original aim of cutting production by half by 2000 was set in 1987, the goal has been tightened to a phase out, the schedule repeatedly accelerated and the class of banned chemicals broadened. The developing countries are now full partners and will cease production in 2015. Each new goal has been reached more quickly and at lower cost—frequently at a profit—than anyone dreamed possible even five years ago.

The ease with which businesses have developed CFC substitutes makes it easy to forget how hard the task looked at the outset. Industries predicted doomsday scenarios. The cuts would cripple the electronics industry, which would be unable to clean its chips, it was said, and would force offices, hospitals and shopping malls deprived of air conditioning to close.

With hindsight it's obvious why the experts were so wrong. CFCs seemed irreplaceable only because there had never been a reason to look for substitutes. CFCs were cheap, easy to handle, environmentally benign outside the stratosphere and useful in an enormous number of applications. Once there was a need to replace them, a modest economic incentive (in this case a tax) and enough time to develop alternatives, innovation bloomed.

The Clean Air Act amendments of 1990, which set the U.S. CFC rules, also established a plan to curb acid rain. In the 10 years it took to pass this law, no provisions were more bitterly fought. The need for controls at all, their appropriate level and their cost sparked trench warfare between environmentalists and industry and among pollution-emitting and pollution-receiving states. Utilities predicted a cost of \$1,000 to \$1,500 for every ton of sulfur dioxide removed. Some said it could not be done even at that exorbitant price.

The debates of the 1980s have been replaced by a benefit/cost ratio almost too lopsided to be believed. The newest estimate of the benefits of controlling acid rain, released by EPA this week, pegs the health benefits at an astonishing \$12 billion to \$40 billion annually. (The high estimate, based on more controversial science, is \$78 billion.) The estimate does not include the considerable benefits to acidified lakes and streams, high-altitude forests, to buildings or to visibility—only health. On the other side, the costs to industry and government when the controls are fully implemented will be \$2 billion to \$3 billion per year.

Acid rain emission allowances are trading for one-tenth what industry predicted—at \$130 per ton. Power plants and industries that do not have to begin cutting back until 2000 have begun to do so by choice. Those required to begin cutbacks this year are, in the new lingo "overcontrolling," cutting a staggering 40 percent more pollution than the law demands. To put it another way: Polluters are today emitting only 60 percent of what was allowed by a standard that, only a few years ago, many considered to be overly stringent and dangerously expensive.

What happened? First, of course, it is a law of human nature that the technical difficulty and economic cost of change—no matter how cloaked in seemingly objective science—will be exaggerated by those most deeply affected. In the case of environmental controls that generally means by the affected industries.

Something more important is at work. Both the CFC and the acid rain program set a goal, a performance standard, and left business free to figure out how best to meet it. Both avoided the traditional route of writing regulations specifying precisely what must be done.

Both programs let the marketplace work. The acid rain emissions trading scheme lets pollution sources buy and sell rights to emit sulfur dioxide or to bank them for later use. Instead of being forced to move by an arbitrary schedule, a company sets whatever schedule works best for it. Rather than requiring a cut of 10 percent or 50 percent from one year to the next, banked allowances allow a smooth transition. An incentive is created to control more pollution than the law requires. Instead of being told what to do by a bureaucrat, businessmen are given the flexibility to do what they're trained to do. Innovation is unleashed.

The sulfur emissions market is only a primitive first step toward an effective environmental marketplace. Newer schemes rely less heavily on government regulators. But EPA's best friends testify that while the agency's leadership has gotten the message, the command and control mentality still grips its troops—as well as too many environmentalists.

It's important these days to know that major societal goals can be achieved and even exceeded, as well as missed. The ozone and acid rain successes mean, too, that we know how to achieve more environmental cleanup at less cost and with more exportable innovation that we are currently using. That's news.

PROBLEMS FOR THE POOR

HON. WILLIAM J. MARTINI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 22, 1995

Mr. MARTINI. Mr. Speaker, 30 years of ever-expanding and growing antipoverty programs have not erased poverty from our midst.

We have spent \$5 trillion trying to address this problem, yet the percentage of children living in poverty is unchanged from what it was in 1965.

Worse, we have seen illegitimate births more than quadruple, and have subsidized the rise of the single parent family in our country.

Today, nearly 30 percent of all births in our Nation are illegitimate.

In 1992, the Federal Government alone spent \$305 billion on 79 overlapping means-tested social welfare programs.

If we had spent just one-third of that in direct transfer payments to the poor, it would have been enough to lift each and every impoverished family over the poverty line.

But our problems still persist.

Some in Congress and the bureaucracy in Washington continue to insist that they know what the poor in our communities need.

For years they have been beholden to the ill-conceived notion that we can only consider ourselves a compassionate nation if Washington prescribes solutions to societal problems.

The resulting system has done worse than fail us.

It has betrayed us.

Something needs to change, but for years this body has been unwilling to address welfare reform.

And I understand why, Mr. Speaker.

Some Democrats in this Chamber have spent their careers constructing the American welfare state.

They have continually told us that more and more government will make it all better.

Now that it is obvious that their policies have failed, pride of authorship prohibits them from making the tough but necessary decisions to dismantle the system.

This is only natural, but it cannot be the excuse not to move this body forward.

Finally, Congress will send to the President that promised to "end welfare as we know it" a real, credible plan to do just that.

No longer will we entice illegal aliens across our borders with easily received welfare benefits.

No longer will the taxpayers pay to support addiction.

An no longer will Washington bureaucrats impose top-down solutions to problems they don't understand.

We will put an end to the big-government compassion that kills, and return a sense of responsibility, a sense of right and wrong, to the American social safety net.

I look forward to supporting the conference report on H.R. 4, and I urge every Member from both sides of the aisle to support it.