

democracy. They can only further isolate China and close off avenues for greater Western influence.

The growth of Western businesses in China, however, would dilute the power of China's communist rulers. As commercial networks develop, Chinese businesspeople are able to travel more freely, and Chinese believers have more disposable income with which to support evangelistic endeavors.

No one understands this better than evangelical missionaries currently working in China. Mr. Bauer's passionate campaign has elicited pleas from many of them for Congress not to cut off trade. Such an action would endanger their status there, and possibly lead China to revoke their visas. It would severely limit opportunities to bring in Bibles and other religious materials. These missionaries understand that commercial relations are a wonderfully liberating force that allow not only mutually beneficial trade but also cultural and religious exchanges. Why doesn't Mr. Bauer listen to those who know far more about China than Washington think tanks and labor unions do? "They may be too close to the situation," he answers, somewhat flippantly.

Until recently, trade warriors have cited the case of the U.S. Catholic bishops, who have opposed renewing normal trade status with China. At the same time, however, Hong Kong's official Catholic newspaper, the Sunday Examiner, reports new contacts between Beijing and Hong Kong's Catholic hierarchy. These contacts are a major step toward an official recognition of the Catholic Church on the mainland.

#### TO THE GOOD

This would all be to the good. Diplomacy and international trade strengthen people's loyalties to each other and weaken government power. Beijing has shown itself to be supremely interested in fostering prosperity at home. Christians must take advantage of this impulse, rather than recklessly treating China as a monster that must be slain.

This need not be an issue that divides social conservatives from economic conservatives. Economic prosperity through free trade is the most effective distributor of wealth and power, and trade with China is the surest way to break the gap of centralized political power. Religious conservatives should broaden their focus beyond purely social and cultural issues. Mr. Bauer and his supporters are right to decry the immoral treatment of believers in China. But allowing themselves to be used by protectionist and labor lobbies is an imprudent approach. Just as religious freedom offers the best hope for Christian social influence, economic freedom is the best hope for spreading that influence around the world.

#### MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF FREELY ELECTED HEADS OF GOVERNMENT

**HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, June 20, 1997*

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased recently to participate in this year's meeting of the Council of Freely Elected Heads of Government in Atlanta, GA. This meeting dealt with a number of important issues facing the Western Hemisphere, but I would like to focus the attention of my colleagues on one issue the conference addressed: The importance of freedom of the press.

Freedom of speech and of the press is a basic American value. It is enshrined in the first amendment to our Constitution. As countries around the world struggle to achieve a transition to democracy, we must never forget the importance of this freedom. We must strive to protect and foster the rights of expression of peoples everywhere.

It was in this spirit that the council endorsed a declaration on press freedom that was adopted on March 11, 1994, at the Hemisphere Conference on Free Speech held at Chapultepec Castle in Mexico City.

Known as the Declaration of Chapultepec, it has been endorsed by news organizations and prominent leaders throughout the Western Hemisphere, including President Clinton.

The Declaration describes the importance of a free press in a free society, and lays down 10 principles for ensuring the continuance of press freedom. It is only when individuals take responsibility for protecting their liberties that we can all be assured of the continuation of the freedoms that we cherish.

I commend the Declaration to my colleagues and ask that it be printed in the RECORD at this point:

No people or society can be free without freedom of expression and of the press. The exercise of this freedom is not something authorities grant, it is an inalienable right of the people.

Every person has the right to seek and receive information, express opinions and disseminate them freely. No one may restrict or deny these rights.

The authorities must be compelled by law to make available in a timely and reasonable manner the information generated by the public sector. No journalist may be forced to reveal his or her sources of information.

Freedom of expression and of the press are severely limited by murder, terrorism, kidnapping, intimidation, the unjust imprisonment of journalists, the destruction of facilities, violence of any kind and impunity for perpetrators. Such acts must be investigated promptly and punished harshly.

Prior censorship, restrictions on the circulation of the media or dissemination of their reports, arbitrary management of information, the imposition of obstacles to the flow of news, and restrictions on the activities and movements of journalists directly contradict freedom of the press.

The media and journalists should neither be discriminated against nor favored because of what they write or say.

Tariff and exchange policies, licenses for the importation of paper or news-gathering equipment, the assigning of radio and television frequencies and the granting or withdrawal of government advertising may not be used to reward or punish the media or individual journalists.

The membership of journalists in guilds, their affiliation to professional and trade associations and the affiliation of the media with business groups must be strictly voluntary.

The credibility of the press is linked to its commitment to truth, to the pursuit of accuracy, fairness and objectivity and to the clear distinction between news and advertising. The attainment of these goals and the respect for ethical and professional values may not be imposed. These are the exclusive responsibility of journalists and the media. In a free society, it is public opinion that rewards or punishes.

No news medium nor journalist may be punished for publishing the truth or criticizing or denouncing the government.

#### MORATORIUM ON THE EPA'S PROPOSED NEW AIR QUALITY STANDARDS

**HON. FRED UPTON**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, June 20, 1997*

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues RON KLING and RICK BOUCHER in introducing legislation that will place a 4-year moratorium on the Administrator of Environmental Protection Agency's [EPA] authority to promulgate new or revised ambient air quality standards for ozone or fine particulate matter. We are introducing this legislation because the Administrator of the EPA appears determined to finalize the highly controversial new standards she proposed in November—in spite of widespread disagreement within the scientific community that they will produce any measurable improvement in human health and widespread certainty among State and local government officials across the Nation and even within other agencies of the Federal Government that the proposed new standard will wreak economic and social havoc.

Consider, for example, these excerpts from an November 20, 1996, letter from the Assistant Secretary of Transportation to Sally Katzen, Director of the Office of Management and Budget [OMB] office responsible for reviewing and signing off on the EPA's regulatory impact analysis of the proposed new standards. The letter calls into question not only the EPA's estimate of the cost of these new standards, but also its determination of the standards' positive impact on public health and the environment:

The social and economic disruption that the proposed changes will cause are not understood. The costs associated with the standards changes, both in terms of cost of compliance as well as economic impacts, will likely be large. . . . [It] is critical that the Administration understand the implications associated with such costs up front.

The impacts of the Clean Air Act sanctions on highway funding, as well as on stationary sources, could affect much larger areas, going well beyond those envisioned when the 1990 Amendments were passed. The enforcement consequences of these mandates would thus likely be profound. Better estimates of the impacts on transportation programs and the economy in general are necessary before the Administration commits to far more stringent standards.

There are substantial uncertainties and numerous subjective judgments required about the health effects and levels and form of the proposed standards. . . .

Control measures needed to meet the standards could have significant economic impacts on industry, including previously unregulated businesses, and require lifestyle changes by a significant part of the U.S. population.

Or consider these excerpts from an November 18, 1996 letter from the Small Business Administration to the Administrator of the EPA:

[Regarding the EPA's conclusion that the proposed rules will not have a significant economic impact on small entities] Considering the large economic impacts suggested by the EPA's own analysis that will unquestionably fall on tens of thousands, if not hundreds of thousands of small businesses, this would be a startling proposition to the small business community.

. . . EPA's own draft November 3 analysis (admittedly very approximate) reveals

shockingly high impacts . . . Furthermore, these costs are in addition to the costs required by the current standards. Thus, this regulation is certainly one of the most expensive regulations, if not the most expensive regulation faced by small business in ten or more years. (emphasis in original)

The grave concerns these and other Federal agencies, offices, and advisory councils—such as the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, and Defense, the Office of Science and Technology Policy, and the Council of Economic Advisors—have expressed about the proposed new standards underscore the concerns felt by communities across my district, my State, and this Nation. For example, Michigan currently has six ozone nonattainment counties. According to information provided by the Michigan Department of Environmental Quality, under the EPA's proposal, an additional 11 counties would violate the standard, based on data from the 1994–96 ozone monitoring seasons. When all associated urbanized areas and adjacent counties are included, most of lower Michigan would be thrust into nonattainment status, seriously undermining and perhaps reversing the progress

we have made in recent years to diversify and develop our economy and produce good jobs.

The proposed new standard pose a particular problem for western Michigan, which is overwhelmingly affected by transient ozone from Gary, Chicago, and Milwaukee. No matter how many costly restrictions and regulations might be imposed on many western Michigan communities to reduce local emissions, they would still not meet the proposed new standards. Take Muskegon County, for example. We could close down every factory, turn off every car, douse every backyard grill, and remove every occupant and the county would still fail to meet the standards because of transient ozone from the other side of Lake Michigan. The proposed regulations do not appear to provide any regulatory relief for such areas victimized by transient ozone, in spite of the fact that the 1990 Clean Air Act amendments gave the Administrator the authority to take such situations into account in promulgating regulations.

Instead of imposing stringent new air quality standards that will thrust many communities now in attainment back into nonattainment and that will be impossible for areas impacted by

transient air pollution from heavily polluted cities to meet, no matter how stringent their pollution reduction restrictions, the EPA ought to be focusing its efforts on the nearly 50 percent of cities that have not yet come into compliance with the current standards for ozone and particulate matter. That is only common sense.

I am also concerned that imposing new standards when many areas have yet to come into compliance with the current standards could actually slow progress toward cleaner air. The promulgation of new standards will require the development and implementation of new State implementation plans and will reset the compliance clock.

The Administrator of the EPA is rushing to judgment, imposing new standards which will wreak havoc on economic growth, jobs, and even personal lifestyles without solid evidence that these sacrifices will be worth it in improved health. That is why the legislation my colleagues and I are introducing today is vital to the future of my State and the nation. I encourage you to join us in cosponsoring this bill.