

Ortiz-Y.

Utah:

Hansen-Y.
Owens-N.
Orton-Y.

Vermont:

Sanders-N.

Virginia:

Bateman-Y.
Pickett-Y.
Bliley-Y.
Sisisky-Y.
Payne-Y.
Olin-N.
Slaughter-Y.
Moran-N.
Boucher-N.
Wolf-Y.

Washington:

Miller-Y.
Swift-N.
Unsoeld-N.
Morrison-Y.
Foley-N.
Dicks-N.
McDermott-N.
Chandler-Y.

West Virginia:

Mollohan-Y.
Staggers-N.
Wise-N.
Rahall-Y.

Wisconsin:

Aspin-Y.
Klug-Y.
Gunderson-Y.
Klecza-N.
Moody-N.
Petri-Y.
Obey-N.
Roth-Y.
Sensenbrenner-Y.

Wyoming:

Thomas-Y.

ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENT
SUBCOMMITTEE FIELD BRIEFING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield for a second.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Yes; I would.

Mr. DORNAN. I thank my colleague for yielding.

I made reference earlier to your hard-hitting, factual, truthful special order last night with CHRIS COX, and I would like to ask unanimous consent that this not interrupt the flow of this fascinating environmental presentation, but that my question of you and my short statement hear appear at the beginning of your special order so it has a flow from special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORNAN. What I wanted to do was to point out at the end of my special order, because I got caught a little about there, that I have asked unanimous consent they duplicate it to put it in the RECORD at the end of my remarks for any Americans tracking us

through the gallery of visits here, or through the electronic wizardry of C-SPAN I and II, that I am putting into the record the vote.

You were here for that great debate in January 1991, so was the Speaker pro tempore; 180 Democrats voted against doing anything about Saddam Hussein. Some of them even voted against the sanctions, like my pal, ELIOT ENGEL, although he voted for hostile action. But all the leadership: Tom Foley, who was the Speaker, Mr. BONIOR, who was in leadership then, Mr. HOYER, the entire leadership here and the entire leadership that is over there today in the Senate: Mr. DASCHLE, then the majority leader, Mr. Mitchell, they all voted against doing anything. And Admiral Crowe, who had risen to glory under Reagan and Bush, he wrote against any action, and his reward is to be the Ambassador to England in the Court of St. James.

Now we have these same people coming to the floor. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY] at least had the decency to say, well, he voted no because he thought we went into week 2 early and left a few days too late, and I might agree with the analysis, but that is not a reason to vote against going in at all, because he did not know when we were going in.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. If I could reclaim my time for a moment?

Mr. DORNAN. Sure.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Actually, it is worse than what you are presenting. The fact is that we had hundreds of thousands of Americans in the desert in a very vulnerable situation. They were in a hostile environment, even if there were no enemy troops out to kill them; and what happened, what you are talking about, the vast majority of the members of the Democratic Party who were here in this body decided and voted that they should not be permitted to conduct offensive military operations.

What, in essence, that vote was all about was saying our troops, vulnerable in the middle of a hostile desert, facing a well-armed foe would not be able to conduct offensive operations but would have to sit there and fry in the desert and take hits, but were not permitted to take offensive action.

This is Vietnam times 10, if they would have succeeded. Luckily a number, Democrats crossed over to join almost every Republican.

Mr. DORNAN. 240 to 183.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Right. Almost every Republican voted to side with our troops.

You do not put people out in that condition unless you are willing to back them up, and the last thing you want to do is put them out in the middle of the desert as it is going into summertime and make them sit there and make them take the hits for not letting offensive military operations take place.

They voted that way, and then when Schwarzkopf came here, when he came

here to give a speech to this body after the great victory that he led us to, I remember the Schwarzkopf reception because all of those who voted, not all of them, but so many of those who voted to make him a sitting duck elbows everybody else out of the way in order to get their picture with General Schwarzkopf.

At that time, if you remember, right after we voted to give them the right to conduct offensive military operations, and it became clear that our forces were going to win a magnificent victory, the Democrats who controlled this body at the time, if you remember, BOB, called us back, immediately called us back in order to have a vote which was nothing but a face-saving vote for them at massive expense to the taxpayers to get everybody back here for just a face-saving vote for—

Mr. DORNAN. To support the men and women.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. That is right.

Mr. DORNAN. Two quick final thoughts:

You are right. Boy, was I understating it. Those of us who were raised in California and in New York, a few other big cities, find words like arrogance, gall, the effrontery of it all. They are not strong enough.

We must turn to Yiddish, one of the world's most powerfully expressive and emotional languages. The word with great accent "chutzpah" comes to mind, that they would ask us, without even being consulted, let alone a fulsome debate, as President Bush and Dick Cheney gave us, that we should sign off on some feel-good thing from the other Chamber without being consulted about the air war that may be beginning any second over there of hostilities again affronting our Constitution.

□ 1430

A final thought. I leave you now to go to the West Front, Ronald Reagan the first President ever sworn in out there, where bishops, cardinals of the Catholic Church, bishops of the Mormon Church, prolife ministers and pastors, great evangelical leaders and prolife rabbis are gathering to ask the U.S. Senate, six hardened hearts, to turn around and support the overwhelming majority of the House and Senate to override Clinton's veto on partial birth infanticide of 80-percent-delivered babies held in the mother's birth canal under great distress to the mother, heck with the distress on the baby, because the abortionist is about to stab it in the back of its head and remove its brains by suction. I am going out there now to that.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I have always believed that there is an honest disagreement on the issue of pro-life and pro-choice and the abortion issue. I personally, until I came to the conclusion that life begins at conception, I was ambivalent about this whole issue. But once you come to a conclusion, once

you say to yourself, I honestly believe that we are talking about a baby, once you actually say to yourself this is the conclusion I have come to, and looking at all the facts, then that is it. There is no more decision. If you believe life begins at conception, you cannot permit the killings of babies.

Many of our colleagues have an honest disagreement. They have not come to that. Their eyes have not been opened to that. I did not believe that all the time, either. But as soon as I did, then my decisionmaking was past. No moral person could permit a baby to be killed.

But a partial birth abortion, even those people who do not believe that life begins at conception, as I now have come to believe, even those people who do not believe that know that a partial birth abortion is a baby that is well along the way.

Mr. DORNAN. You see the arms and legs moving.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. This really is tragic that the other side, who is so opposed to any restrictions on abortion, have been able to blind themselves about what this is. There should be no question about this.

Mr. DORNAN. Senator DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN is changing his vote. At least one has let his conscience kick in. He wrote a speech titled "Too Close to Infanticide." Great cardinals and bishops and Protestant leaders have said it is infanticide, and that is what I say. Eighty percent of the infant is there. You are holding the mother in distress while you take its brains out and kill it right in front of your eyes. That is infanticide.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Let us just hope, I happen to believe that we should try to explain in a very heartfelt way, those of us whose eyes have been opened, that honestly, there is no other, once you conclude that life begins at conception you cannot have any other belief. Even the most strident person who is pro-choice that I know, if they believed that it was a baby that we were talking about, they would not believe that there should be an abortion.

Mr. DORNAN. Beautifully put. You have actually picked up the theme of the cardinals, to try and win by persuasion. But when you are a fighter pilot, that is hard. Your dad is a fighter pilot. Ask your dad how hard it is to be loving and kind and try to open people's eyes when they keep trying to funnel Federal dollars into what is obviously the infanticide of a living child, 80 percent born. I am going to take your advice and speak with love out there on the West Front today.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I think we should.

Mr. Speaker, I asked for this time to report to the House on a field briefing and site visit that was held on August 8, a hearing and field briefing that was hosted by the Energy and Environmental Subcommittee which I chair. Joining me at that field briefing were

four other members of the Committee on Science: Mr. SCHIFF, the distinguished chairman of the Basic Research Subcommittee, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. FOLEY, and Mr. STOCKMAN. The field briefing could well have been called: Free Enterprise Works. Each of the sites that we visited gave us a first-hand look and a better understanding of the private sector's response to environmental challenges. We found that in southern California new technologies are emerging to clean and purify the environment and to make a profit, to boot.

We began the day by attending a ground-breaking for C-launch. This is an innovative project of the Boeing Corporation which will launch commercial satellites from platforms based at sea. I am particularly pleased that Boeing has chosen the site of the now closed Long Beach Naval Station for its home port, bringing much-needed jobs to the area.

We next visited the Long Beach headquarters of Gridcore. Gridcore is a company that has commercialized technology originally developed at the Department of Agriculture research lab in Wisconsin. They are a proud example of a public-private partnership.

The result of this cooperation is a remarkable product. They are panels with the strength of plywood at half the weight made from 100 percent recycled material, primarily fiber from old corrugated cardboard containers. It is keeping our landfills from overflowing while at the same time producing a building substitute for trees.

Even more, this technology allows the production of Gridcore products without the use of toxic resins or binders. Not only is Gridcore made from recycled materials, but the product itself is also recyclable.

So what we have here, a product of a basically public-private partnership, is the development of an environmental technology that will keep our landfills from overflowing, but at the same time save trees, and at the same time, of course, make a profit for those who are engaged in the enterprise.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to enter Gridcore's specification sheet at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARTON of Texas). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The specification sheet referred to is as follows:

GRIDCORE®
SPECIFICATION SHEET

Product description

Gridcore® is an engineered molded fiber stressed skin panel. Proprietary technology facilitates the pressure forming of recycled resources into three dimensional geometric ribs molded to smooth faces. When laminated together, they form a honeycomb panel with high strength-to-weight features and impressive design, fabrication and application flexibility.

Size

4' x 10' x 23/32" (Internally Tested)

Thickness Tolerance: ±1/64"
(Equivalent to A/C plywood specifications)

Weight

1.0-1.25 pounds per square foot (nominal 3/4" basis) (Internally Tested)

Density

20 pounds per cubic foot (nominal 3/4" basis) (Internally Tested)

Bending Strength

ASTM D 1037 @ 50% RH
Modulus of Rupture: 1,000-1,300 PSI (Timber Products Inspection Lab)

Modulus of Elasticity: 150,000-200,000 PSI
(Equivalent to low density particleboard specifications)

Flat Crush

ASTM C 365 @ 50% RH: 50-60 PSI (Internally Tested)

Screw Withdrawal

ANSI A208.1 @ 50% RH:
Hollow Core: 76 pounds (Timber Products Inspection Lab)

Epoxy Filled Core: 254 pounds

Linear Expansion

50%-90% RH: 0.15%-0.20% (Fiber Research International)

Flame Spread

ASTM E-84: Class C (United States Testing Company)

Flame Spread Index: 115 Test performed on Gridcore®

Smoke Density: <450 Gridboard assembly.

Environmental Features

Current Gridcore® products are made from 100% recycled resources, primarily kraft fiber from old corrugated containers. Gridcore® is free of formaldehyde's and urea reins. Non-toxic PVA (white) glue is used to laminate sub-panels. The manufacturing process generates no toxic off-gasses. The water utilized in the forming & pressing cycles is recycled back into the system. Wide-spread adoption of Gridcore® can slow deforestation and provide sustainable building solutions for the growing needs of Twenty-First Century development.

NOTE.—Changes in raw material content can affect the structural characteristics of the panels. If surfaced with coatings, veneers or laminates, Gridcore® should be balanced with similar treatments on both faces to prevent warping.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, as part of its commercialization agreement with the Government, Gridcore is paying royalties on its profits. As a result, the taxpayers will get more back in terms of what Gridcore is giving them through royalties than it costs us in the original investment.

Well, I have been somewhat skeptical of developing a partnership-type relationship between government and private companies. In this case it has obviously worked, and certainly these royalty arrangements by which private companies commercialize government-developed technologies, certainly this should be encouraged, and in this case, Gridcore has developed a product which is a win for the taxpayers, a win for the consumers, and a win for the environment.

From Gridcore, our field briefing went on and we visit the headquarters of Simple Green in Huntington Beach. Simple Green began in the family workshop of Bruce Fabrizio and his father, Joseph. They successfully developed an alternative to toxic cleaners

used to remove tannic acid that results from coffee roasting. Twenty years later they have developed an all-purpose cleaner that degreases products marketed around the world, and these products are nontoxic nonflammable, nonabrasive, and even biodegradable.

One of the greatest obstacles to this success, to the development of an environmentally friendly product, a cleaner that went well beyond anything that was on the market at that time, one of the greatest obstacles they had to overcome was the high taxes, high interest rates and double-digit inflation during the 1970's.

This was the time during the late 1970's when, as entrepreneurs, they struggled to establish their new company to offer this environmentally sound alternative to the cleaning products that were already on the market. But with high interest rates and a killer inflation they were almost kept off of the market simply by the general economic conditions.

So let us never forget that when we are talking about cleaning the environment or any other very laudable goal that we must insure that the fundamental economic factors that are at play in our society are conducive to entrepreneurs developing new products and creating jobs and basically bringing about the progress that will make this a better world.

Well, once they were successful, Simple Green did not stop at just making a good product and making a profit. In fact, the product itself, of course, is beneficial in that it is more environmentally safe than the other cleaners that are on the market, but they did not stop at just making a profit at doing that. They went on to establish the Egbar Foundation which stands for: everything is going to be all right, which is, of course, in stark contrast to some of the pessimism that we hear from other people who claim to be interested in the environment but basically are so pessimistic and are making such outlandish claims that the world is going to end and that we all are going to be consumed in our own waste that it actually decreases the amount of activity, of human activity, that is aimed at solving the problems because they are so pessimistic.

Well, the Simple Green people established this foundation, everything is going to be all right, in order to stimulate new ideas and to get people active and personally mobilized to try to make this a better planet environmentally. Using 1 percent of the company's annual sales, the foundation sponsors an environmental education program which involves over 200,000 California students.

While onsite we learned that Simple Green has recently begun research on using its technologies to improve bioremediation techniques. They now have developed a method to reclaim land despoiled by oil and other toxics in a more effective and more efficient way than the currently alternatives.

Again they are making money by building a better more effective product that will be better for the environment as the product is being used.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to place a statement from Simple Green, on its bioremediation research, into the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARTON of Texas). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The statement referred to is as follows:

SIMPLE GREEN—THE KEY TO ENVIRONMENTAL TECHNOLOGY

For more than 20 years, Simple Green has been helping make our planet a much cleaner place. Unlike hazardous solvents and harsh detergents, Simple Green's unique formula is non-toxic, non-flammable and biodegradable.

Now marketed throughout the world as an environmentally sensitive cleaner and degreaser, Simple Green's reputation continues to grow.

Simple Green is versatile, safe and effective. We're still discovering brand-new applications for its use. At home, industry, and, now even in the land, as an integral part of promising new techniques for bioremediation.

Bioremediation is proving to be an attractive alternative for waste disposal. The United States Environmental Protection Agency defines bioremediation as "a process whereby naturally occurring microbes, typically bacteria or fungi, degrade harmful chemicals into less toxic or non-toxic compounds."

One of the most difficult problems in bioremediation is that the pollutant is often not readily available to the microbial community. Material that disperse organic pollutants prove to be a very important part of an effective bioremediation process. Even at relatively low levels compared to the pollutant concentration.

Simple Green has proven to be outstanding for this kind of intermediary function. Simple Green's chelating capacity decreases metal toxicity problems and its formulation significantly increases the bioavailability of many types of pollutants.

Bacterial viability is a critical consideration for any additive proposed for use in a bioremediation effort. Simple Green has properties that will increase the effectiveness of bioremediation, and could be used safely with no deleterious effect on the indigenous bacteria.

According to Celia Bonaventura, Co-Director, Marine Biomedical Center Duke University Marine Laboratory, "The part that Simple Green plays in this process is facilitating the hydrocarbon bacterial juxtaposition. Hydrocarbons tend to stay in oily pockets and bacteria likes to live in watery places and Simple Green works well to help these come together."

Simple Green's cutting edge formulation and superior results is something chemists call Micro-Particulate-Fractionalization, or MPF.

Simple Green uses special "surface active" agents to break down large globs of oil, grease and fat to create much smaller microscopic droplets called "micelles."

Unlike ordinary industrial cleaners and dispersants, Simple Green's special MPF properties continue breaking down these microscopic droplets even further.

These droplets are made increasingly smaller and more numerous by Simple Green's MPF process, which provide increas-

ingly greater surface area for Simple Green and water to attack. The end result of the MPF process is the pollutant is much more available to the microbial community.

Simple Green has invested millions of dollars in independent testing and research to thoroughly evaluate the products, the efficacy and safety.

According to Dr. John Todhunter, President, Science Regulatory Services, International, and former head of toxicology for the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, "Simple Green's unprecedented MPF process is a scientifically advanced method of achieving effective cleaning."

In the past, surfactants have been used in bioremediation with minimal success. What makes Simple Green different? Simple Green's combination of surfactants has been found to actually encourage bacterial activity. While surfactants alone such as Tergitol can actually inhibit bacteria growth due to toxicity.

H & H Eco Systems of North Bonneville, WA, founded by Terry Horn, has established itself on the leading edge of biological systems.

Terry Horn, President of H & H Eco Systems and with 20 years of experience in the field, realized that no one single bioremediation approach would work. Bioremediation needs to be individually assessed for every site.

Because of heterogeneity in the distribution of pollutants, indigenous micro-organisms and soil components, bioremediation methods in a given project vary from site to site.

The approach developed by H & H Eco Systems, Inc. is unlike any other. It's called "the bio-triangle" approach.

The "attack" on contaminants involves a combination of Simple Green, biological and mechanical components. Simple Green chemically acts to alter the physical composition of the contaminant while H & H Nutrients provide a balanced biological diet, and the System 614 Turbo-rator serves as the mechanical component to enhance this process.

Simple Green is also an extremely effective vapor suppressant able to keep vapors below state and Federal levels. Its deodorizing properties, even at diluted levels, help overcome tough odor problems, particularly a concern when doing sites in residential areas.

Celia Bonaventura states "as a cleaner Simple Green makes a good dispersion between the hydrocarbon or oily material and water. As the material is held in that contact it's tendency to vaporize will be much less. Thus there is a very nice complimentary between the cleaning properties of Simple Green and it's ability to act as a vapor suppression."

Today, we are working on sites and showing that we have improved the efficiency of the biological systems and that our approach works.

"We've looked at the growth rates of these bacteria under different conditions in laboratory settings where we would control the temperature and everything in the environment of the bacteria and we're able to see how Simple Green is one of these facilitators which actually enhance the growth of the bacteria in ways that promoted degradation of the hydrocarbon."

The results produced by this collaboration between Simple Green and H & H Eco Systems are both encouraging and impressive.

BREMERTON, WASHINGTON—CONTAMINATE:
HEATING OIL (B-2)

Date and levels: 12/03/93, 2,400 ppm; 02/08/93, 53 ppm; Outside Ambient Temperature, 20° F; Cell Temperature, 70° F.

CLEELUM, WASHINGTON—CONTAMINATE: PENTACHLOROPHENOL (PCP)
Date and levels: 06/18/93, 87 ppm; 06/25/93, 9.5 ppm.

CLEELUM, WASHINGTON—CONTAMINATE: CREOSOTE
Date and levels: 06/18/98, 1000 ppm; 06/25/93, 9 ppm.

CLEELUM, WASHINGTON—CONTAMINATE: DIESEL
Date and levels: 06/18/03, 530 ppm; 06/25/93, 20 ppm.

SAUVIN FORD, OREGON—CONTAMINATE: USED MOTOR OIL
Date and TPH level: 11/14/92, 35,000 ppm; 12/16/92, 13,000 ppm; 01/21/03, 850 ppm.

OLYMPIA, WASHINGTON—CONTAMINATE: GASOLINE AND KEROSENE
Date and levels: 06/14/93, 3000-6000 ppm; 06/23/93, 32 ppm.

Terry Hom states, "This was a really high clay soil and now it's a real mealy soil, very fine texture able to be used in agriculture, in lawns and gardens. Compared to what we started with, it was nothing but a slab of silt and clay. Silt and clay level on this was 87 percent fines which means you could squeeze it together and play baseball with the hunks. We've ended up with a soil that now will grow anything. Before it sat for 2½ years without any growth on it at all, now we have stuff coming out of it within two weeks."

At Simple Green, the research and development we fund, the products we make, and the soil bioremediation techniques we're helping to pioneer, all share a common goal: To help make the world a cleaner and better place.

But perhaps Bruce FaBrizio, Founder and CEO of Simple Green, describes the company's philosophy best:

"The world is a finite piece of ground, the environment is finite and not infinite, and if we don't do something aggressive now it won't be there for our grandchildren and yet there is plenty of time to make it a better place for our grandchildren if we just start doing things that are in our ability today."

Our atmosphere, attitude and actions haven't been concocted to achieve a certain appearance. They stem from a natural dedication to excellence and improving the environment—something that's been with us from the very beginning.

It's a dedication all of us at Simple Green invite you to share.

While at Simple Green, we also visited with representatives of Microbics, which is a company based in Carlsbad, CA. They demonstrated a biological toxicity test the company has developed with private funds. They believe that this test is faster, less expensive, and more precise than test methods currently approved in the United States. So they showed us a test that would demonstrate biological toxicity in a way that we then, we have used that knowledge to try to clean the environment and know the threats around us.

Although approved in Canada and in eight European countries, our EPA has yet to see the value of this very effective, low-cost test for toxicity. Thus, it has been hampering its commercial use in the United States. This reconfirms the hesitation many of us have about increasing government's role in most endeavors. While in Gridcore there was an example, of course, where working together and getting the Government involved actually did help that company produce a similar, a new product that will help the environment; but in this particular case with this company down from Carlsbad, the Microbics, we found that the Government's power that it has through the EPA has been used to actually thwart innovation and progress.

So that is one of the drawbacks. Government can be helpful on one hand and you strengthen it, but you have to remember you are also strengthening the Government's hand to be an obstructionist in the game of human progress.

Our final stop at the field briefing was at a site of a former leaking underground storage tank behind the Fountain Valley City Hall. That is Fountain Valley, CA, city hall. There the Regen-

esis Co., and it is based in San Juan Capistrano, demonstrated a bioremediation technique known as oxygen release compound. By inserting the compound into a well, naturally occurring micro-organisms flourish and use the petroleum hydrocarbons as a food source. What has developed then is a product that protects our valuable water resources and cost-effectively reclaims that water that has already been contaminated.

Mr. Speaker, I include the Regensis project results for the RECORD.

The information referred to is as follows.

ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE & ENGINEERING, INC.,

Fountain Valley, CA, September 4, 1996.

MR. CRAIG SANDEFUR, Regeosis Bioremediation Products, San Juan Capistrano, CA.

DEAR MR. SANDEFUR: Environmental Science & Engineering, Inc. (ESE) is pleased to submit this report of current activities at the subject site. A figure, tables and appendices of current and historical data are attached.

On August 6, 1996, ESE installed oxygen release compound (ORC) in Well MW-9. ESE is evaluating the effects of the ORC at 2-week intervals by collecting a grab sample (non-purge) and monitoring the concentrations of petroleum hydrocarbons in the well. As the rate of biodegradation of petroleum hydrocarbons is controlled partly by the availability of dissolved oxygen (DO), ESE believes that by monitoring the amount of DO, you can better evaluate the effectiveness of the ORC. The historical monitoring data is presented on the next page.

The results of this groundwater monitoring event shows that petroleum hydrocarbons decreased several orders of magnitude in 2 weeks time. The concentrations in this well had remained high for approximately 5.5 years prior to the application of ORC. The levels of petroleum hydrocarbons increased at the 4 week sampling. ESE will conduct groundwater monitoring in the future to track the fluctuations in these levels.

ANALYTICAL RESULTS FOR GROUNDWATER SAMPLES COLLECTED OVER TIME

Well ID and Sample date	EPA Method (µg/L)					Dissolved oxygen (mg/L)
	8015M	8020				
	TPH	B	T	E	X	
MW-9:						
08/17/90	3,400	470	810	84	850	NA
04/03/92	26,000	700	1,000	500	2,000	NA
10/20/92	94,000	11,000	18,000	24,000	5,000	NA
10/10/93	39,000	2,900	5,600	1,400	8,400	NA
01/06/94	10,000	1,900	2,000	630	2,900	NA
04/27/94	9,600	810	700	720	2,100	NA
04/07/95	1,700	42	14	130	280	NA
10/31/95	8,100	1,000	440	330	990	*2.3
03/25/96	10,000	660	540	440	860	<1
08/06/96	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	<1
08/20/96	ND<100	0.84	ND<0.3	0.55	4.0	1.6
09/03/96	15,000	ND<12.5	320	ND<12.5	3,800	2.6

Notes.—EPA—U.S. Environmental Protection Agency; TPH—total petroleum hydrocarbons as gasoline; M—modified for volatile hydrocarbons; BTEX—benzene, toluene, ethylbenzenes and total xylenes; NA—not analyzed; µg/L—micrograms per liter; mg/L—milligrams per liter; ND—not detected; *—readings taken after purging.

If you have any questions regarding this report, please call me at (714) 964-8722.
Sincerely,

DAVID A. FERREIRA,
Senior Project Hydrogeologist.

Mr. Speaker, I believe my colleagues on the Committee on Science, as I did, found these site visits to be enlightening and informative. The environment is too important simply to be relegated to a Federal bureaucratic program, and

it is too important to just simply rely on the dictates of government employees to meet the environmental challenges facing America.

Instead of Federal restrictions and mandates, new technology and the profit motive can and must be the primary forces at work in this effort. We can clean the environment and make a profit in doing so. That is what we learned at our field briefing. It is a les-

son that we must keep in mind while making policy for this country.

Many of our environmental problems have been and will continue to be solved not by reducing our standard of living, not by increasing the cost of government and hiring government employees to look over our shoulder and control our lives, but, instead, through innovative technology and commercialization developed in the

private sector, and motivated, motivated by the profit motive.

Unfortunately, far too many people in government think that the profit motive is a dirty phrase.

Instead, the profit motive can give people the incentive to do good things, rather than the alternative method, which is having government order people to do that which they think is a good thing.

What we have seen throughout this competition between the Soviet Union and the United States is that societies that are based on incentives, societies which give their people a profit motive to produce and to do good things and to increase the standard of living and produce more wealth and to clean the environment, that those societies are the progressive societies. Those societies that rely on hiring more government bureaucrats or hiring more government employees and empowering them to give orders to other people in order to accomplish those ends have not succeeded. That is why when the Berlin Wall went down, people started rushing from the East to the West, and not in the other direction.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to go back to Simple Green's motto: EGBAR, everything is going to be alright. This is not the blather of some unrealistic optimist. The EGBAR concept, everything is going to be all right, is in stark contrast to what is basically being presented to especially young people in this country in terms of the environment.

I know that young people who visit from California come to visit me in my office, and I in fact have a policy that says any people from my district who want to see me, I am their Congressman, and they come all the way to Washington, DC, I spend time with them, especially the young people, especially students who come here as a group.

It never ceases to amaze me, when I am talking to the young people and I ask them about air pollution. In southern California, we know all about air pollution. But what has happened is that the young people are being told that air pollution today is the worst it has ever been, and that their lives are being shortened, and they are frightened out of their wits.

But I always take this poll and say to the young people visiting from southern California, "Is the air cleaner today, or is it worse today than when I went to high school back in southern California 30 years ago?" And it happens every time. Almost every student raises their hands and says, the air is much dirtier now than it was when you were in high school back in southern California 30 years ago. It is terrible, because now it is going to destroy our health, we are going to live worse lives, and it is terrible how the big companies are trying to hurt us so much. You have these young people telling you that.

In fact, in southern California, the air is cleaner today than it has ever

been in my lifetime. When I was in high school, and I tell these kids, when I was in high school, about every third day when you wanted to go out for a gym class they would say, there will be no exercise today because we are having a smog alert, a health alert, and young people cannot go out and exercise and breathe in that air because it is unhealthy. Of course, there have only been about 20 such days like that in southern California per year for the last few years.

Mr. Speaker, what we have is a pessimism, talking about global warming, global cooling. We are talking about factors that are going to destroy all of mankind that immobilize us, when, instead, we should be giving incentives for people to develop new technologies that will make it a better place and encourage people to be active, rather than to give up. Mr. Speaker, this is a Republican message of hope, but it is also an American theme.

EDUCATION CUTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARTON of Texas). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week while out on the campaign trail Republican Presidential candidate Bob Dole claimed that if he were elected President, he would make education the cornerstone of his administration policy. I want to warn the American people to beware—the Republicans, led by the dormant Presidential campaign of Bob Dole, are once again trying to convince the American people that their agenda to reduce funding for Federal education programs and restrict access to higher education is the way to strengthen the country's educational system.

One need only to look at the Republican's record on education in the 104th Congress to come to the conclusion that their objective is exactly the opposite of what Bob Dole says it is. In short, it is abundantly clear that Republicans who run Congress are determined to destroy the quality of education in America.

During last year's budget negotiations, the Republicans tried to blackmail the Nation into accepting their extremist budgetary agenda by forcing repeated Government shutdowns. Two times they succeeded in shutting the Government down, and both times Democrats in the Congress and President Clinton stood firm, telling the Republicans we would not allow them to gut education.

The Republicans, however, have not given up. With just a few weeks left before Congress adjourns for the remainder of the year, the Republicans, with Bob Dole's blessing, are yet again pushing an education agenda that would restrict access to higher education in this country by gutting student assistance programs. It's the same old story:

Republicans are protecting the ability of the wealthy to send their children to college at the same time they limit the ability average American parents to send their children to college.

The latest Republican plan resumes attack on the most important student assistance programs for middle- and low-income families. The House's bill allows for a mere 1.2-percent increase in the maximum Pell grant award as compared to the President's budget request. This lack of funding would serve 191,000 fewer students next year and 2.7 million fewer between 1997 and 2002.

The Republican plan also eliminates the Federal contribution to the fund for Perkins Loans thereby denying low-interest loans to 96,000 students in the coming school year. The House's education bill also effectively realizes a long-time Republican objective of decimating the Direct Loan Program by capping the number of direct loans through a reduction in funds to administer the program. In addition, Republicans are also proposing to eliminate the AmeriCorps Program, which allows individuals to earn rewards for higher education in exchange for community service.

On the other hand, Democrats in Congress and President Clinton have truly been promoting a plan to expand educational opportunity throughout the 104th Congress. The administration and White House have joined together to fashion the Families First agenda—a plan that will not only increase the minimum level of education obtained by the average citizen, but assist them in obtaining it. The Democrats want to provide American families with a \$10,000 tax deduction for college and job training—under this plan families will be able to deduct up to \$10,000 from their taxes for tuition at college graduate school or job training programs.

Democrats are also proposing to provide a \$1,500 tax credit for the first 2 years of college for students who are prepared to work hard, keep a B average, and stay off drugs. This proposal will, moreover, help strengthen our education system by providing assistance to students to help them obtain at least 2 years of postsecondary education or through the assistance could also be used to get a good start on tuition at a 4-year college.

In short, Democrats have not only proposed expanding traditional student assistance programs as opposed to the Republicans, who have voted time and again to cut these programs; we have also developed new educational plans to ensure that the dream of a college education does not reside exclusively in the domain of America's wealthiest citizens. So when Bob Dole promises to make education the centerpiece of his administration, I would say watch out, because that means the budget ax is coming and access will be diminished.

Mr. Speaker, we can only hope that at some point the extremist Republican forces in Congress will realize that the American people will reject