

have but just a few minutes left, and I want to personally thank everyone that has been involved in the special order.

We are going to have special orders on this issue over the next few months, weeks and months, to familiarize the people of this country with what is going on. Now I realize that it is very true that you can save a lot of money to pay the taxes, or you can have insurance, or you can do different types of financial planning. But I want people to consider this one thing:

When you are preparing for death taxes, the average family business or farm spends nearly \$20,000 in legal fees, \$11,900 for accounting fees and \$11,200 for other advisers. The typical small business owner normally makes around \$40,000 a year.

Now I have got one question. Who among us who makes \$40,000 a year can afford to meet the staggering burden of a death tax?

Now to me the clear solution is this: We should eliminate the death tax. It is an unfair tax. It is a tax that puts burdens on people when they do not need any more burden. It also creates an environment where people no longer want to save, they no longer want to work, there is no reason for them to, and we are not giving them an incentive. And we create an environment that hurts our economy, and hurts our small businesses and small farms all around this Nation.

People need to realize the effect it is going to have, and I am looking forward to the liberals in this body coming to the floor, justifying the death tax. I want to see them stand and tell the American people and our colleagues why we should confiscate property, why we should confiscate money from individuals when they die, and spread it around and hurt people for doing what we ask people to do every day, and that is to work hard, to save, to take care of their families, to create jobs, to build their business, to make life better for their fellow man and their community. I want to see people come and defend that, the whole idea of death taxes.

Mr. Speaker, I think when that occurs, we will see the American people understand what position and what side they should be on, and I am looking forward to this debate over and over again until we get total repeal of the death tax.

THE CLEAN AIR ACT AND THE CLEAN AIR ACT AMENDMENTS HAVE BEEN A GREAT SUCCESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KLINK] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KLINK. Mr. Speaker, as with the previous gentleman speaking, when the Government takes action or the Government takes inaction, it has an impact on all of our lives. Sometimes

that impact that the Government has on our lives can be positive, and other times it can be negative.

I would agree with many Republicans and Democrats, with many liberals and conservatives, with many in industry and in labor and in the environmental movement that one of the positive things that the government has done is to provide us with clean air. The Clean Air Act and Clean Air Act amendments have been a great success.

Coming from my region of western Pennsylvania where we had unbelievably dirty air because of the heavy industry and the steel mills, and you go back 30, 40, 50 years ago, our region was once described as hell with the lid off. In midday the sun would be blackened out by the soot that would be coming out of smokestacks that would not allow the sunshine to get down to the people on the earth, and people had tremendous problems breathing. In Donora, PA, people were actually dropping dead in the street many decades ago as they were the victims of a temperature inversion and all of the poisons that were spewed into the air.

We have gotten beyond that, and in fact, I would invite, Mr. Speaker, you or any of my colleagues to come to Pittsburgh, PA, today. It is a beautiful city, it is a clean city. The air is clean, the water is clean, and in all of our three rivers, which we are so famous for, you can now catch fish. But where there were once mill sites there is now level land. Where there were once tens of thousands of manufacturing jobs, there is now in many instances desperation and poverty. We are coming back in many areas; many areas, we are still going down.

That is why I am here today, because I fear that my Federal Government, that Federal Government that I am a part of as an elected Representative of Congress, is about to make a very severe error. I am afraid that we are about to reverse what has been a steady increase toward cleaner air, and in what is a veiled attempt, I think, to try to tighten clean air regulations, my fear is that the EPA and anyone else who goes along with them will, in fact, allow the air to remain dirty longer.

You see, we have definitive dates in place now whereby that soot; it is called particulate matter in scientific language, but all of that smoke stack soot that is going through the air, we are supposed to be reaching certain goals, and have that air cleaned, and we have been doing that. And that ozone, which is technical talk for smog, we have areas including here in Washington, DC, and Baltimore, specific periods in time at which we are to reach the goals and specific goals have been set.

Well, here comes a lawsuit by the American Lung Association, and they are rightfully, I think, pointed out to the EPA that since we last took a look at particulate matter or smog back in 1987, many more than 5 years has

passed, and according to the statute every 5 years the EPA is supposed to take a look at these issues.

And so it was that they went to court and they said to EPA you have to go back and you have to reexamine what you are doing with particulate matter. It does not mean they have to tighten the standards, it does not mean that they have to change the standards. It simply means they have to go back and review those standards.

And so, Mr. Speaker, they have, and they formed a scientific advisory group that has made some recommendations, and we, in the Committee on Commerce, two of our subcommittees, the oversight and investigation subcommittee of which I am the ranking Democrat and the health and environment subcommittee, held a series of hearings, and we heard from some of the scientists, and we heard from other interested people, and we heard from Carol Browner, the administrator of EPA. Over an 8-hour hearing we heard from Miss Browner. My concern is that it appears EPA is moving forward not to just review particulate matter, as they have been told to do, but they have also coupled this with changing the ozone standards. They were not supposed to do that. They were not told to do that. So when dealing with soot, with that particulate matter that we ingest into our lungs which could cause physical problems, that is complex enough. Why are we deciding to tackle two very difficult issues at the same time?

Well, I would say, Mr. Speaker, that after all of the hearings that we have had and after all of the questions that have been asked we still do not know. We have never gotten a straight answer. My fear is it is because that EPA understands that while there may be a stronger case for dealing with that soot that is in the air, there is a much weaker case for dealing with ozone. So they couple the two. They can head in the direction that they feel we need to head.

But what would be the ramifications of that? You might say, well, if we tighten the standards, we are all going to breathe healthier air. But the fact of the matter is that simply is not true, and that is why I have taken to the floor today. That is why many of my colleagues on both the Republican side and the Democratic side have been talking about this issue. That is why mayors and Governors and State legislators and local government officials and labor unions have begun to talk about this, because we fear that by changing the finish line in the middle of the race the race will never be finished. No matter what happens, and Carol Browner, the Administrator of the EPA, told us in the hearings, she has told others, environmentalists agree, I agree, my Republican colleagues agree that if we do nothing, we are still going to continue to clean the air. The air will get cleaner. We all want cleaner air.

But when we tighten those standards, the States that have not implemented their air cleaning plans are going to stop and say wait a minute, you cannot give us a different target. That target that we were working toward right now has been moved.

And so now Federal Government, we have to go back to our industries. We in the States who must reach attainment for our air quality have to go back to our industries, we have to go back to our local government leaders, and we have to figure out how do we get back into attainment for a new standard while we were just beginning to clean the air and make it healthier for children, for elderly, for all of our citizens.

This will cause confusion among industries, industries that have spent tens upon tens of millions of dollars to install scrubbers to install the latest technology so that they have cleaned that air in Pittsburgh, and in Detroit, and in Cleveland, OH, and in New York City, and in Philadelphia, PA, and in my area in Beaver County, and Westmoreland County, in Lawrence County, PA. They have spent all of that money to clean the air, we have seen the dramatic results, and now the EPA is about ready to say, no; we had you driving toward the wrong standard. It is time that we tighten that standard.

Well, needless to say many of these industries are going to certainly say we are finished investing. Until we know what the rules of the game are, until the Federal Government can ensure us that we are working toward something that we know is going to be good science, that we know is going to be a final destination where we will in fact, have agreement, we are not going to do anything. And I have had industries that have told me they are not going to expand any more. I have had other industries that said we are not going to move into western Pennsylvania because we are afraid to make that investment.

Mr. Speaker, why in the world are we going to spend tens of millions of dollars or hundreds of millions of dollars building a manufacturing facility and then have the Federal Government say the rules have changed? With NAFTA we can now build that facility in Mexico, and we can ship all those products right into the United States, have access to the market with no tariffs, or we can build that facility in Canada, and we do not have to deal with a Jeckyll and Hyde EPA that changes their mind as to what the specific rules of the game are going to be.

□ 1700

This is important to me, because as we cleaned the air during the 1960's and 1970's and 1980's, and I admit, we needed to clean the air, people were dying. We had people with severe respiratory problems. But as we cleaned the air there was a price to pay, not only for installing the scrubbers in the smokestacks, there was a price to pay for jobs.

Take a look at the employment in areas like southwestern Pennsylvania prior to the Clean Air Act. Take a look at how many steel mills were operating, and as we spent money to clean up the air, that was money that we did not spend on capital improvements in those manufacturing facilities.

Now, there are many people on the other side of this argument who will argue to me, oh, the EPA has done studies, and their studies have shown that in fact not a single job was lost due to clean air. Well, that is like me asking the fox if the rooster and the hen both died of natural causes. The fox is going to say, oh, yes, they both had heart attacks, and I ate them because, well, they just happened to be dead.

We cannot trust the EPA in this matter. They have a bad credibility problem when it comes to southwestern Pennsylvania. Because you see, they leaned on the State of Pennsylvania just a few years ago to tell us that what we really needed to do to meet our clean air standards, and that is not the new standards that we feel they are going to propose, this is the old standards, the ones that we are moving toward, and they told us that in order to hit that, we had to have a centralized emissions testing program for our automobiles and our trucks.

Well, the State of Pennsylvania, under Governor Casey, decided at that time to go out and sign a contract with a company from Arizona called EnviroTest. So we built 86, they were called E test systems where people in many counties across Pennsylvania, we have 67 counties, and many of our counties were going to have to go to the centralized testing facility. There were only a handful of them in each county, maybe one or two or at most four in each county, so it was going to create a problem. They could no longer go to their neighborhood mechanic who could buy a piece of equipment to test the automobiles; they had to go to a specialized central test.

Now, if there was a line, people may have to sit in that line for hours. That means lost work, lost time, and obviously the people of Pennsylvania were not real thrilled about this. So we went to war with the EPA and they said, you really do not have to do this. The problem was, by the time they give us this "whoops, you really do not have to do what the Federal Government was forcing you to do," we already had a contract signed with EnviroTest. We had built 86 E test systems.

EnviroTest was planning on making as much as \$100 million a year in profits out of Pennsylvania. So obviously, they were not going to take this lying down; they were going to file a suit against the State of Pennsylvania because Pennsylvania had done what they felt EPA was forcing them to do.

In the meantime, we got a new governor, Tom Ridge, who was our colleague here in the House. Governor Ridge saw this as a real problem, and

so he sat down with EnviroTest and said, we will reach an out-of-court settlement with you. That out-of-court settlement was \$145 million because EPA gave us that big "whoops."

Now, that is \$145 million, Mr. Speaker, that we are not spending in Pennsylvania to build new highways. It is \$145 million that we are not spending for Medicaid, or to educate our children, or for any of the many other things that the taxpayers that I represent in Pennsylvania would like us to spend that money for. It went to pay off an agreement that we had with an out-of-State firm to do centralized testing because we thought the Environmental Protection Agency was forcing us into that position.

Not one penny of that \$145 million, Mr. Speaker, cleaned up the air. The air did not get any cleaner at all. In fact, I would think the air got dirtier because all of the hot air that we heard from the Federal Government demanding that the State of Pennsylvania do this. Other States have been in a similar position.

The question is, why in the world would we now, while we are cleaning the air, change the target? Why would we force industry that has made investments in cleaning the air, that is moving toward providing more employment, all of a sudden force them to step back and say, I am not sure I want to make an investment in an area like southwestern Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, in our region while we were cleaning up the air we lost 155,000 manufacturing jobs. That is just one section of the State of Pennsylvania. Those are not my numbers, Mr. Speaker. Those numbers come from a white paper done by Carnegie-Mellon University who years later went back and took a look at the impact of the industrial downsizing in the Pittsburgh region.

So when we had a chance several months ago to have a new automobile plant move into western Pennsylvania, we were excited. It was a 1,000-acre site, 2,500 jobs, very good-paying jobs in auto manufacturing, but when the company took a look at the fact that Pennsylvania is located in something called the Northeast Ozone Transport Region, meaning that all of the smog from the West moves toward Pennsylvania and the States from Maine down through Pennsylvania to Northern Virginia are in this ozone transport region, and the rules are different for us because we are in that region, they said, well, we are not going to deal there.

We are not going to build a facility there, because first of all, it would cost us a minimum of \$3 million to buy pollution credits. So, Mr. Speaker, it is not just the fact that one cannot pollute, it is the fact that if one is wealthy enough and if one is prone to want to invest, one can actually buy pollution credits. So one can still pollute if one wants to, if one can find those credits.

Now, here is what happens with the pollution credits. Generally a larger firm would have the money to purchase those credits from a smaller firm. The smaller firm then would go out and find some greenfield site located somewhere else, they would build their facility and they would begin polluting there. So we do need to take a look at what kind of particulate matter, what kind of soot, is causing adverse health affects. We have done many studies on smog, so I think that the science on smog is in.

The problem with what they are doing on smog or ozone is that they want to go from .12 parts per million studied over a 1-hour period to .08 parts per million over an 8-hour period. Now, this group of scientists that was studying this, I do not want to get too complex, but I want to explain to people that this group of scientists said, look, you can do anything from .508 to .08 to .09. They chose the number in the middle. Here is the important point about that.

Had they chosen the higher range the scientists recommended, 400 additional counties across this Nation would not be in noncompliance.

Now, what does that mean, 400 counties in noncompliance? That means if you are located in those counties, immediately when EPA files these new standards, you have to buy the most sophisticated technology for anything that you do. It means that your building permit process becomes much stricter and much tougher, and quite frankly, in those counties you are probably not going to see much industrial expansion and you are going to see almost no new construction, because why would an industry want to move into a county that is already in noncompliance? So there is a stigma that occurs with noncompliance.

Now, in a rush to get Members on both sides of the aisle to not believe that this was the case, EPA Administrator Browner, we believe, has been making some assurances to Members of Congress and to officials at the State, county and local level, that they are really going to kind of look the other way as far as enforcement goes.

Now, the fact of the matter is, whether they look the other way or not, the day those regulations are in the books, things change, because as Ms. Browner testified before our committee, it is up to the States and the local government to come into compliance with the standards set by the Federal Government. If they do not do it, then the Federal Government comes in and can then insist that they do it one way or another. If they have been out of compliance, they have not taken steps, the Federal Government would at that point step in.

We understand one Member of Congress from northeastern Ohio was assured that an automobile manufacturing plant and an automobile casting plant in his district would not have to put on additional controls, even if

those plants were located in counties that were found to be in noncompliance based on the new standards.

My question to EPA is how do you do that? How do you say, these are the regulations, but a wink and a nod, you do not have to listen to them? And if that is the case, well, Ms. Browner is the administrator, what happens if she is no longer the administrator? Does EPA do something different? Is this an assurance only for this Member of Congress that is receiving that assurance?

So the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] and myself have written to Administrator Browner, and we have asked how they can make these assurances. We also would applaud what appears to be recognition by EPA that there are problems these proposals will create for industry and for local governments, and for State governments. So we also would like them to talk to us about how those problems are going to be dealt with.

The assertions that the administrator seems to be making to these Members of Congress and to other elected officials have raised really three fundamental questions. Number one, who is receiving these assurances? Are only certain Members of Congress being told that their industries will get a bye on this, or will all of our districts get a bye on obeying these new regulations? And what were those assurances? Exactly, specifically, what are you assuring us that EPA will do or will not do?

Number three, how much value would those assurances have, given the fact in the face of contradictory statutory provisions and the expansion of citizens' rights found in the Clean Air Act? Because any citizen has the ability, under the Clean Air Act, to bring a suit and say, you are not adhering to this act. So once the EPA said, forget about these standards that were working, forget about these standards that we were reaching, that the States were developing State implementation plans to achieve that were causing the air to get cleaner, forget about those, we now have new standards.

The citizen says, wait a second, you are not doing what you should be doing in these areas. That citizen can bring a suit, and we need to know what impact a possible citizen suit would have. I do not think that the assurances that the administrator is giving is worth the breath with which they are uttered, and if they are written on paper, I would like to see the paper, and I do not think that they are worth the paper that they are being written on.

I think, Mr. Speaker, you are aware and most of my colleagues are aware that title I of the Clean Air Act amendments sets out the steps that the EPA and the States have to take once we have a new ambient air quality standard that is established pursuant to section 107. The EPA is then to promulgate area designations based on the new standards, and they are supposed to do it directly from the act. The

quote is, "as expeditiously as practicable, but in no case later than two years from the date of promulgation of the new or revised national ambient air quality standards."

So how can they say to my friend from Ohio, or any other Member of Congress or to anyone else, do not worry about the new standards, you are all right, trust us. We are the Federal Government. We are here to help you.

I also have questions. Within three years after the promulgation of the national air ambient standards, the States have to submit an implementation plan which has to include numerous planning and control requirements, as well as an enforceable schedule, the timetable that the sources within that region that is out of compliance that is going to comply, and we want to know, given all of this, how can we give assurances to anyone that these timetables will not be adhered to?

Now, let me go from the general discussion for a moment just to talk about smog, or ozone, as it is known. Here in the Washington, D.C. area, and in Baltimore, I mentioned a little bit earlier that by 1999, I think it is, they have to reach their standards. Here is where this actually ends up, I believe, making the air dirtier longer. As soon as we have new standards going from the .12 for 1 hour to .08 for 8 hours, these regions can say, wait a minute, time out.

□ 1715

You have just changed the end zone. As a result of that, here is what I am going to do. I need my 10 or 12 years additional time to meet the new timetables. So they can stop all the things they are doing to implement clean air standards.

If you have a child who is 8 or 9 years old who has asthma and you are concerned, and you say, boy, this is a good thing, we are only 2 years, this is 1997, in 2 years in the Washington, D.C.-Baltimore area they are going to take action. They are going to have the air cleaned as regards to smog to this standard.

All of a sudden, EPA comes in, changes the standard, and the local people and the State people and the District people say, wait a second, we want our 10 or 12 years. So now that child will be 20 years old, will in fact be in college and perhaps move out of the area or be employed before the new standard has to be reached. So you are not protecting that child, who is now 8 or 9 or 10 years old. We are putting it off for another decade or more.

I do not believe we should be doing that. We have worked so hard to clean up the air. We have given up so much for the sake of clean air. To now change the final stopping place in the middle of the race, as we are so close to reaching those standards, does not make any sense.

The other problem with this is that there is a problem with transport. We have this in Pennsylvania. Our friends

to the west of us, States like Ohio and Michigan and Indiana and Illinois and Minnesota and on and on, send us their dirty air. We in turn send our dirty air to Delaware and New York and New Jersey. It is called transport. It is a problem we all have.

There is a group now that is called OTAG, a group which is a task force that is supposed to study this problem of transport of smog, how do we deal with it. They are, as we are speaking now, supposed to file their final report.

These new regulations do not make it—there are no new tools to deal with the problem of the air that is transported into our regions. Yet, it is going to stop this OTAG process, their ability to issue final recommendations, which in fact could cause the air to get cleaner because we would deal with the transport of pollution from one State to another.

There is a reluctance of States to take action against each other. As I mentioned, my State of Pennsylvania would be reluctant to seek action against States to our west because we do not want the States to our east to come after us, so there is kind of a Mexican standoff that is taking place. We are all looking forward to the day when we can sit down through this OTAG report and say, this is how we are going to deal with the transport problem.

I am particularly interested because my district happens to be right on the border with West Virginia and Ohio. So a business could locate in those States and not have the same stringent ozone requirements they would have in my district, because we are in that area designated the northeast ozone regional transport region. So we are getting that dirty air in from our west, we have the Allegheny mountains that act as a backstop, and we are done.

In fact, if we were to evacuate southwestern Pennsylvania, take out all of the industry, take all of the people out of their homes, take all of the vehicles out of southwestern Pennsylvania, shut it down, give it back to the birds and the wildlife, under the new proposed standards there would be several days a year that we would still be in excess of the standard allowed for smog.

We cannot meet the new standard. It is impossible until we deal with the transport issue of that dirty air that our friends and neighbors to the west are sending us. I think that Pennsylvania is not the only region that is having this problem. There are many other areas across the country that are having a problem with transport.

Let me just mention that I am not asking Members to believe me just because I happen to be a Member of Congress, or because I happen to sit in on some of these hearings. I think that the scientists and the scientific evidence would point out that what I am saying is correct.

The CASAC group that gave the recommendations to EPA is chaired currently by Dr. Joe Mauderly. He has

been the Chair this year and on into the future, we hope. When talking about the issue of the ozone or smog, he said: "While I support the proposed change as logical from a scientific viewpoint, I would point out that it should also be considered that an equal or greater overall health benefit might be derived by using the Nation's resources to achieve compliance with the present standard in presently non-compliant regions, than by enforcing nationwide compliance with a more restrictive standard."

What is he saying? The same thing I have been saying for the last half an hour. That is, we are better to try to meet the current standard, a standard that is allowing us to clean up the air, a standard that local government has been working toward, State government has been working toward, industry has been investing money to work toward, rather than changing the target. If we use our resources in that manner, to bring the areas that are still out of compliance into compliance, we will have more healthier kids, we will have a healthier industry.

He also says, and my friends out in the west, Mr. Speaker, I would hope would listen to this, this is Joe Mauderly, this is not the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RON KLINK], this is someone who has knowledge of these matters because he has studied it and looked at it, and he is designated as the chairman of this group that is supposed to be advising EPA.

He says: "I am concerned that New Mexico and other arid regions with alkaline soils, the substantial portion of soil-derived PM that can exist as PM_{2.5}," and we call it soot but it also could be agricultural dust, so you understand, if you have alkaline type soils, that that loose soil blowing in the wind from agricultural activities could cause the new PM_{2.5}, 2.5 microns, to be out there in the air.

Now we have a problem. What is this? What we are talking about with particulate matter, or as I said, it is that soot, we refer to it in the northeast as coming out of an industrial site, but obviously it can come out of an airplane exhaust, it can come out of a power plant smoke stack. Particulate matters are the dusts and soils that are blowing in the air, so it can come from different things. What they are talking about doing is going from PM₁₀, 10 microns, to PM_{2.5}. It is smaller. They are saying it is smaller, so when it is ingested into the lungs it is more dangerous, harder to get out.

The question is, is all 2.5 microns the same? Meaning if it is of a certain size, is there not a different toxicity to it? Are some things not more toxic than others? Are they more dense than others? How about when you use different kinds of particulate matter in conjunction with each other? We do not know all the answers to this, because in this whole Nation there are only 50 monitors that measure particulate matter in the 2.5 micron range. We do not have the data. We do not know.

How long will it take to get the data? Mr. Speaker, it is going to take at least 2 years to manufacture and deploy enough particulate matter sensors so we can get that information. Then, according to the law, and we are here about the law, you have to monitor that data for at least 3 years. That is 2 years to manufacture and get them deployed, 3 years to study, on a minimum.

At the end of that, that is 5 years, it is time for the EPA to reanalyze particulate matter. So why are we going to spend billions of dollars going to a new, more stringent standard that industry will not be able to comply with, that State and local facilities and governments will not be able to comply with, only to know that by the time we actually have that data 5 years down the road there will be another lawsuit forcing EPA to look at it again?

It does not make any sense, Mr. Speaker. It absolutely does not make any sense. We need to do the studies first. On this issue, Democrats and Republicans alike agree. We are willing in this House to fund the studies. It is better for us to spend tens of millions of dollars making sure that we are headed toward good science and a good health impact for our citizens, rather than spending billions of dollars, only to find out that again, EPA has gone "whoops," 5 years from now, and told us that back in 1997 we made a bad decision.

Remember, they did that in Pennsylvania with centralized emissions testing. Do not make the same mistake in all 50 States, shutting down industries, stopping industrial growth, cutting down on the number of jobs, meaning the number of people who have paychecks and the number of people who have medical benefits at their jobs. There is an adverse health effect to not moving forward and having industry grow in this country.

Why am I here on the floor today? It is because when we had the loss of 155,000 manufacturing jobs, and I was at that time a journalist who was documenting it, I am not willing to stand here in the halls of Congress and watch the Federal Government make the same mistake that will cost people their jobs, cost them the quality of their lives, and then have the EPA and someone else years from now say, whoops, it was a mistake.

Show me that it is good science. Justify to me and the rest of this Congress that this is a good decision. Make sure that we are headed in the right direction, and you cannot do it with only 50 monitors in this country. You cannot force every industry to go to a new standard when they are already cleaning up the air, when State implementation plans are still being implemented, and you are putting the air quality of this country at risk.

About 40-some Members of Congress from our side of the aisle have tried for many weeks, Mr. Speaker, and I think many of our colleagues on the Republican side know this, we have tried to

sit down with the President. We want to talk to the administration about this before his EPA administrator makes what we think is going to be, we think she is going to do it, a bad decision to change the finish line in the middle of this race.

We have sent a letter. We have not even received back a note that said, we got your mail, we are thinking about it. That is bothersome. I want the President to sit down with us. Let us try to figure out how we can resolve this. Let us figure out how we, and those of us in Congress on both sides of the aisle, we want clean air. We want it to be a good decision. We want it to be a decision that is based on science that we are all comfortable with.

With the Clean Air Act, the Clean Air Act amendments, every major step that we have made toward cleaning up the environment, we have done it with a broad, bipartisan consensus. There is no broad, bipartisan consensus for implementing these new standards.

There is no reason why the EPA is doing smog at the same time they are doing soot, or particulate matter and ozone, if you want to be scientific. There is no reason they are doing both of those things together. I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that other Members who may be watching me talk back in their offices would step forward and would help us to get the attention of the administration, to try to stop what I think really would be bad policy, bad policy for this country.

Just in case the administration does not heed us, just in case we are too late, tomorrow, I would hope, we are prepared to introduce a piece of legislation, myself, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BOUCHER], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. UPTON], so it is a bipartisan bill. We hope many of our colleagues will join us.

The purpose of this bill is not to open the Clean Air Act. I want to make that straight to my friends. We think that is a Pandora's box. The Clean Air Act is working. We are happy with the progress we have made. That is why we are here. We like the progress. We like the progress we are still going to make.

We agree with Carol Browning, no matter what happens, the air is going to get cleaner. We do not want to stop that. But we do want to put a 5-year moratorium on the establishment of these new standards. Let us continue with industry, with the labor unions, with the support of local government and State governments, to move toward bringing those areas that are still out of compliance into compliance. Let us deal with the issue of transport, of pollution across State lines.

So we are going to ask for a 5-year moratorium on the establishment of new ozone and fine particulate matter standards under the Clean Air Act. We really think that this is the direction that we want to go. We believe that most of the programs under the Clean Air Act and the amendments of 1990 are continuing or have yet to be imple-

mented. We want to see them implemented. We want to see the results.

We believe that this country has made tremendous progress on reducing atmospheric levels of ozone and particulate matter since the passage of the amendments back in 1990. We think that that progress is going to continue.

□ 1730

And by changing the current national ambient air quality standards for ozone, which we just do not think makes a great deal of sense, we also think that really both the Environmental Protection Agency and this CASAC group, the scientists that I talked about, it stands for Clean Air Scientific Advisory Committee, both of them have recommended that additional research should be conducted to determine the additional health effects of these finer particles and that this should include taking a look at biological mechanisms, how bad and to what extent combining different kinds of particles has an adverse health effect.

Here is the EPA and here are these scientists, this Clean Air Scientific Advisory Committee, all saying we need further research but we think we are going to go to the new standards anyway. It does not make any sense.

So given that fact and the fact that there really is a lack of atmospheric data because we only have about 50 of these 2.5 monitors in this country, it makes sense to do the studies first. It makes sense to go out and measure across this Nation what kind of 2.5 particles do we have, at what level, at what density, what are the health impacts, and are we sure that if we clean them up to this level that there is going to be a health benefit from that.

You say, why would you say that? Would there not be a health benefit? We do not know.

Let me tell my colleagues what happened in London, England back in the 1950s, and it is happening in southwestern Pennsylvania and it is happening across this country now. In London back in 1950s, they had all this black soot in the air. They had problems with respiratory illnesses, bronchial infections. They cleaned the air up. The incidences of asthma increased. Why? They do not know. They still do not know.

That has happened in southwestern Pennsylvania and it is happening across this country. There are all kind of ideas, but the whole point is, why, when we clean up the air, is asthma increasing, not only in the number of cases, the percentage of people that are getting it, but also the violent aspect of it is also getting worse. What is going on here?

There are different ideas. We need time to find out what are the answers to those questions. Setting the new standard right now does not change anything except it stops the progress that we have been making. It stops the benefits that we have been seeing for quite some time.

We have watched the air slowly, slowly getting better, getting more clean. I can remember, and I will make an admission, Mr. Speaker, back in my early days in the television business, I was a television weather forecaster and in the Pittsburgh region, as a matter of fact. And we had to, back in the 1970s, every day, along with the temperature and the barometric pressure, the direction the winds were going, tell the people what days they could go outside and exercise and when they could not and when you kept your children in and when you keep the elderly people in. And we had to tell them what aspect of the air was bad, if it was particulate matter, if it was ozone, if it was whatever.

Still, when I get home, I watch my friends who are still doing the weather forecasting. They do not do that anymore. The air has gotten that much cleaner. But the other aspect of that is the air has gotten cleaner. As I drive into Pittsburgh on the parkway east, where once there was a giant steel mill, there is now a high tech center. We are happy to have those jobs, but the steel industry is not there anymore. When you go to the town of Aliquippa, where once there was a 7-mile-long steel mill, there is now a big flat spot along the Ohio River. So we have paid not only with our tax dollars, we have paid with corporate investments. We have paid with jobs.

Do not make us pay for something that we are unsure of what the benefit will be. Do not make us pay for something that may in fact be more detrimental to our health and at the same time cause this Nation's wealth to go into a downward spiral where companies will not be investing in these regions, where jobs will not be created in these regions. That is what I fear is going to happen.

We have heard from governors across this Nation who are in favor of the wait and see position that I have espoused here today. We have heard from many State legislatures, both houses of representatives of the States and the senates. We have heard from local governments. I have a list here of many pages, I will not read through them, Mr. Speaker, but we have heard from industry. We have heard from labor unions that are in favor.

I would say to my friends who work with the labor unions, the IBEW opposes these standards. The IUOE opposes these standards. The boiler-makers union opposes these standards. The bakery, tobacco and confectionery union opposes these standards. The labor unions oppose these standards. United Mine Workers union opposes these standards. All of those have sent letters to the White House or to the EPA.

Other internationals who oppose but have not yet written letters, we hope that they will, include the Teamsters, the Oil, Chemical and Atomic Energy Organization, carpenters, pipe fitters, we understand many other labor unions are getting on board.

The only labor union that we know that is in favor of these standards, and I cannot figure out for the life of me, the steel workers. I met with the steel workers this week in an effort to try to understand this, because my local steel workers back in Pittsburgh are not for this. The regional directors, who have watched the steel industry move offshore, are not for this.

The Washington lobbyists for the steel workers are for this. I do not know if someday they want to be Secretary of Labor under somebody's administration. I do not know that. It is only conjecture by a cynical television reporter who now is standing here in Congress. I do not know what the reason is.

But the point of it is this, I have been almost all of my adult life a union member, still carry my AFL-CIO card. In acting on behalf of the working people of my region, which is what I was sent here to do, I cannot go along with these proposed new standards. They make no sense. It is bad news environmentally. It is bad news from a health perspective. It is bad news certainly from a wealth perspective from the continuing prosperity of this country moving forward.

We have loved it during the past 5 years as we have watched the stock market go up and industrial investments going up. It is coming into our area; we are starting to see growth and development. I am afraid that the brakes are going to go on.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my friends in this Congress, I would ask that we have as many Members as can sign onto the bill that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BOUCHER], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. UPTON] and I will be dropping tomorrow, because we think there should be a 5-year moratorium on any action by the EPA.

We think there should be a moratorium until these monitors can be put in place, the study can be done, the material from that study can be fully analyzed and that we will know 5 years from now what we are doing. What is the cost of doing that? We are going to have to fund each year the study. We are going to have to fund the building of those monitors. That will cost far less than what it will cost if the EPA implements these new standards and they are wrong.

We are willing in a bipartisan fashion to fund that study. We have talked about it. We think it is the right thing to do. I would urge my friends to join me.

THE VA'S BEST KEPT SECRET: VETERAN'S ON-THE-JOB TRAINING

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. CHRISTENSEN]. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. QUINN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today for a short period of time here, 4 or 5 minutes, to inform my colleagues in

the House about a veterans' congressional jobs program that has come to my attention and we have initiated in my district office.

This is information for our colleagues here in Congress and for their staff members, and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Benefits of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs here in the House.

Back in January and February, Mr. Speaker, I had an opportunity to meet with staff over at the VA and talk about the existing programs. We talked about financing and the budget that is coming up. I also know that most of us as Federal Representatives here in the Congress are committed to improving veterans' employment opportunities, and I think that the Members here will be very interested that the VA is offering a jobs program for service-connected disabled veterans.

This is an existing program that I believe is a win-win-win situation, Mr. Speaker. I think it is one of the VA's best kept secrets, not purposefully; but I think that, if Members know about it and if they are informed about it, they are going to be very excited about it for the district offices and serving our constituents and helping the employment picture for veterans back home in their districts.

That is why it was important for me to come to the floor today and to speak to our colleagues and our Members. This program is referred to as the Chapter 31 Program. The purpose of the VA's vocational rehabilitation program is to assist service-disabled veterans find and maintain suitable employment. The trainee receives a stipend from the VA. In other words, there is no additional cost to us in our district offices.

I mentioned before that I think it is a win-win-win situation because it has helped the effectiveness of my office. It has helped us with our constituent service. It is also a win then for the individual veteran who has an opportunity to experience this on-the-job training, and I believe it is a win for the community at large.

The VA has done an excellent job in finding a candidate to work in my congressional office back in our district. We selected a trainee, Mr. Mark Dunford, who has a bachelor's degree in history, and he is completing his prelaw work at Canisius College in Buffalo. He has agreed to take on all our constituent work relating to veterans.

When we have constituents call our offices that want some help with either hospital veterans benefits or problems with some benefits they are receiving for a previously expired husband or wife, this is the kind of individual that will take that constituent work and get it done.

He is doing an outstanding job, Mr. Dunford is. His experience and skills acquired in the military are an asset to our office. But when he is assisting in constituent work, when he is monitoring the needs that people in my district

and all of our districts have with regard to veterans affairs, he is one of those take-charge people who gets it done.

This on-the-job training program is an excellent way for disabled veterans to gain the work experience that they need.

I think, finally, that it is an opportunity for those of us who are Members of Congress here to lead by example. It is an opportunity to take this congressional job training experience another step and allow our veterans to have that experience so they can get meaningful employment either in our offices or in other places around the community.

In a time of limited resources, Mr. Speaker, it is also an opportunity for us to provide this job at no additional costs to our congressional payrolls. I think it is a win-win-win situation, as I said, for everybody involved.

I came to the floor today to make our Members aware of this program. As I mentioned, it is called the Chapter 31 Program. Later this week I will be sending a dear colleague letter to all of our Members here in the House suggesting that they look into the program. They can very easily give my staff a call in my office so we can put them in touch with the right people in the VA who, to tell you the truth, handle everything for us.

It is a great program. It is one that our constituents should know about. It is one that will help us run our offices more effectively and more efficiently. Finally, it is the right thing to do for some veterans back in our districts.

I would suggest that with the dear colleague letter that goes out from our office later this week, if anybody needs any attention from us or any help, we stand ready to do that, as does the VA.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the time this afternoon to make my office available.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 43 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 0045

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DREIER) at 12 o'clock and 45 minutes a.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1119, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1998 AND 1999

Mr. MCINNIS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report