

the people who are currently trapped in the welfare state can find jobs, can get off the welfare rolls and get to payrolls and that really ought to be our goal.

In fact, talking about welfare and how this all ties together, I thought it took a lot of courage recently for the New Republic, which is by its own admission a liberal magazine, came out recently and said, we were wrong. When they said that our welfare reform plan would not work, they said they were wrong. Now they have come to the conclusion that 6 out of 10 people that were on welfare a few years ago really should be off welfare.

As we go forward, as the economy grows and as we get more educational opportunities to some of those people, I think we are going to open up the American dream to a much larger group of people, to people who for a generation have thought that the American dream was not for them. So if we really love those people, we have to help them find their way off the welfare rolls and on to payrolls.

Because I have said this, and I really believe it, that a job is more than the way one earns one's living, a job helps to define your very life. I think people who are jobless tend to think of themselves as being valueless. So we need to help those people, we need to give them the encouragement, and sometimes we have to give them a little nudge to get them out on their own and instead of being dependent, becoming independent.

So this is about reinforcing those values of faith, family, work, thrift, and personal responsibility. We do not have all the answers, but as I say, and I think the American people understand, as was reflected in the poll the gentleman mentioned earlier, I think the American people understand that we are now moving in the right direction, that Congress said it is doing what it said it was going to do, and most importantly, it is doing what they have wanted Congress to do for many, many years.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for yielding.

Let me just say that I too am a sponsor of the legislation of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN] to deal with the issue of paying off the debt. His plan I think is a very good plan. Once we start showing some surplus after the budget is balanced, what are we going to do with that money? It is a real legitimate question. What do we do with that money?

There will be people in this body, there will be people in this city, who will want to spend it all. And to take some of that money and use it to pay off the debt early, a \$5 trillion debt, use some of it to provide some more tax relief, and yes, use some of it for targeted important spending like on infrastructure.

We have not been spending the kind of money we need to for roads and highways. We have to keep in mind

that when we pay off that debt sooner, the interest payments get smaller, and suddenly, it is a double benefit because we are spending about \$360 billion paying interest on the debt. If we did not have to make interest payments today, there would be no deficit. We would have a \$100 billion, \$150 billion, \$250 billion surplus that we would be arguing about if the people who preceded us had made the tough decisions and had not run up this kind of a debt.

What a wonderful situation to be in, where we have those kinds of surpluses and we could really talk about putting more money into needy areas in our Nation's infrastructure and needy areas such as more health care, for example, or better health care for Americans, and then to be able to take some of that money and return it back in the form of tax relief.

I know for me and my district, people would like to see more money on the space program. I am proud to be able to represent Kennedy Space Center, the home of our space shuttle program. People in my community always talk about when are we going to go back to the Moon? When are we going to go to Mars?

In those early years in the space program, in the 1960's, when we were making that investment, that critical investment in the Apollo program, in the Mercury, in the Gemini program, entitlement spending was about 7 percent of spending. The debt service was 4 or 5 percent.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Now it is 16 percent.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Now it is 16 percent. So it is incredibly important that we balance the budget, that we pay off the debt, that we provide badly needed family tax relief, that we fix the welfare system as we have.

This is about the future. I am told by teachers, there is nothing that motivates kids more to study math and science than to talk about the space program. It just makes their eyes get big, and if we can relate what they are learning in the classroom to applications in our space program, it just gets them so excited.

I do not think there is anything that the American people are more proud of than the tremendous accomplishments of our astronauts and the people who work in our space programs. But yet we as a nation would never be able to do that if we were not able to have the financial resources to do it. The financial resources only come from managing our resources properly.

This is just simple stewardship. It is the same stewardship that families use back home.

The gentleman was talking about the farmer. I can tell the gentleman that I have met countless families in my district, some of them ranchers, some of them working in the citrus industry, some of them working in the space program who have said to me, why can Congress not just do things the way we do things around the kitchen table? We

realize we cannot do everything every month, so we set some priorities. And that is what this budget proposal, a lot of it is about, and what the Republicans in the 104th Congress and the 105th Congress have been about.

Let me just say it has been a real pleasure to join with the gentleman in this colloquy tonight. I would say to the gentleman that he has been a stalwart activist in getting the job done and delivering on the promises we made to the American people in terms of balancing the budget, preserving Medicare, providing badly needed family tax relief, and finally, fixing welfare.

It has been a pleasure for me to be able to work with the gentleman and the leadership that the gentleman has provided in all of these areas and to join with the gentleman tonight in talking about this. Because this is about the future.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

In closing I would just like to thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. WELDON] for joining me tonight, but I also want to say that this is an important first step. This is not the end of the road, this is an important step. But it is about restoring accountability to Government, it is about encouraging more personal responsibility, and it is about sending more of the authority back to communities, neighborhoods, and to families.

For 40 years, Washington had it wrong. For 40 years they thought Washington knew best and for 40 years, both the bureaucracy and the debt ballooned.

Well, now that is changing. Families are winning, and with their help, we will keep winning this fight.

NEW EPA STANDARDS WILL HALT PROGRESS IN AIR POLLUTION REDUCTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PAPPAS). 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, we come to the floor tonight with a heavy heart because we were hoping that as Democrats and as Republicans, we would be able to talk to the administration and have them reach a commonsense conclusion as it pertained to the progress that we have made in this country in abating air pollution; in the way we have accommodated the growth of industry in this Nation. While making the air cleaner, we have been making progress.

The Clean Air Act itself is a tremendous success. We continue to clean the air, and no one predicts during the coming years that under the current standards for particulate matter and for ozone that we would continue to clean the air. But today, the President of the United States has recommended a tightening of those standards.

In essence, it is changing the finish line as we are about to complete the race. It is saying to the Governors across this Nation and saying to mayors of cities and villages across this Nation and other political local leaders that we in the Federal Government think that we want to change the rules. It is a bad decision, it is a bad decision for the health of this Nation, because what will happen is State implementation plans aimed at cleaning the air are going to come to a grinding halt. They will have to be changed.

Things that are being done by industry, things that are being done across this country that are working, that are cleaning the air, will have to be changed. We know that an additional 400 counties across this Nation will be thrown into noncompliance, and when that happens, there will not be an industrial development in those areas.

Now, the White House has said that well, you will have to work with us. With a wink and a nod, they are saying we are not really going to enforce these new standards right away.

Well, to the administration I would say you cannot have it both ways. You cannot say that we have to live by the letter of the law and we have to tighten these standards, we have to move forward, and that is the excuse they are giving us, and then say, but we are really not going to enforce these regulations.

In an area like my region in southwestern Pennsylvania where we have lost a tremendous number of jobs over several decades, we are beginning to come back. But that progress that we have made and the progress that we think we are going to make over the coming decade will be stymied if the decision that the President has made today is carried forward and the EPA changes these regulations.

We have had hearings in this Congress; we have had hearings in the House of Representatives; we have had hearings in the Senate, various committees, and the science is not there. They want to go to a new standard, Mr. Speaker, which is called PM_{2.5}.

Now, that is a scientific term, and I apologize this late at night for using such a term, but what it amounts to is going from one size of particulate matter, whether that is soot coming out of a smokestack or whether it is dust blowing off of a field somewhere in agricultural country, or whether it is coming off of an automobile. This is particulate matter, something that is thrown off by industry, or it is thrown off by nature. They are going to change the size of the particle that they measure. They are going to go from what they call 10 microns to 2.5 microns, about one-fourth the size.

The only problem is, in this Nation we only have about 50 monitors that measure this, not enough to have accurate data. Until we build those monitors, until we analyze the data from those monitors, another 5 years will pass, and at the end of that time, by

law, by the Clean Air Act itself, we would have to change these standards again.

There is a simpler way to do this: Allow the progress that the States have made to move forward, Mr. President. To you and to Carol Browner I would say, allow us to continue to clean the air. Mr. President, your actions now in fact take State and local officials who have been making progress off the hook, areas like Washington, DC, that have to be in compliance for ozone by the year 1999, so that we save those children that are on the playground that may be asthmatic.

□ 2300

By 1999 we will hit the new standard. Not anymore. If the President gets his way with the new standards, if Carol Browner at EPA carries out these new standards, if we in Congress do not stop them, then we will give that 9- or 10-year-old on the playground in Washington, DC not until 1999 to have cleaner air but until the year 2009, so that child will be away in college somewhere. We are postponing the tough decisions. We are allowing the air to remain dirtier in the shorter term, and we do not know if the science we are pushing forward is accurate science.

I have spoken about this several times over the last 2 weeks because this is important. It reflects whether or not we are going to continue an industrial expansion in the Northeast and in the Midwest, and whether or not we are going to be able to carry out our defense flights in certain areas where in fact the airplanes, whether the commercial and military airplanes, are able to fly or not at certain times of day, depending on what the pollution readings are for particulate matter or for ozone.

It does not deal with the idea of transport, that pollution travels from one State to the other carried by the wind. Indeed, our State of Pennsylvania is impacted tremendously by the pollution that is carried in from the States to our immediate west. And we, Mr. Speaker, in addition to that, have that air passing through Pennsylvania, it comes to the State of New Jersey, it comes to the State of Delaware, and others.

Nothing that the President has proposed today, nothing that Carol Browner has proposed prior to this, really deals with the transport issue. This is not something that is based on good common sense, it is not based on good science, because we do not have the monitors to know the truth.

I will take time now to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from southwestern Pennsylvania Mr. MIKE DOYLE, my colleague who has labored on this issue long and hard, who brings a tremendous amount of knowledge in his role on the Committee on Science, who has analyzed this issue, who sticks up for working men and women, sticks up for businesses, so they are able to expand and create jobs.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania RON KLINK, for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I share with the gentleman great disappointment today about learning of the President's decision to endorse the new national ambient air quality standards. Unfortunately, this is a victory for politics over science.

Earlier today the Committee on Science's Subcommittee on Energy and Environment, of which I am a member, released a detailed report of our findings based upon three hearings we have held on the NAQS. Under the leadership of the chairman, the gentleman from California, Mr. KEN CALVERT, and the ranking member, the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. TIM ROEMER, we conducted an exhaustive examination of the scientific bases for the new standards. I believe that the recommendation of the subcommittee's reports are a more responsible and balanced approach than that of the administration.

The plan outlined by EPA and now backed by the President commits us to standards that will be of great economic cost before we know enough to be sure that they will yield any public health benefit. The existing body of scientific knowledge is clearly lacking, especially for particulate matter. Even the EPA agrees with that assessment.

In its 1997 update to its Office of Research and Development's strategic plan, EPA identified PM as one of its six high priority research topics because of, and I quote, "A high degree of uncertainty about the size and the composition of the particles that may be responsible for adverse health effects."

Mr. Speaker, I think we all agree that there is a great need for more research. In fact, in all the testimony I heard from all the experts in front of the Committee on Science, the only thing they all agreed upon was that we need more research. The Committee on Science has already addressed this issue by authorizing \$50 million more for PM research. This would lead Members to wonder, why should we move forward with a regulatory approach before we know if there is a problem that needs to be regulated?

In the Committee on Science's first hearing on the standards, Dr. Joseph Motterley, the new head of the Clean Air Science Advisory Committee, spoke for many when he stated that going ahead with the new standards was necessary in order to ensure that monitoring and additional research is funded.

Is this any way to operate? A new standard should be science-based, not a tool to promote the installation of PM monitors or to fund more research. This is putting the cart before the horse. First you do adequate monitoring and research, then you draw conclusions, not the other way around.

Mr. Speaker, as we continue with this special order, I will get into greater detail about what the Committee on Science found.

Mr. KLINK. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague and my neighbor in Pennsylvania, Mr. MIKE DOYLE, for coming forward with me tonight. I know that it takes a tremendous amount of dedication to stay this late in the day, when we really finished nearly 5 hours ago with our votes. I really appreciate the fact that the gentleman has dedicated so much effort to this issue.

I want to say to my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, that we are not standing idly by. We are not waiting and just reacting and hanging our heads, although the President now has agreed with Carol Browner, as though we are defeated. We are not defeated. We are going to move forward in a bipartisan fashion. We will develop a game plan.

We have a bill, H.R. 1984, which says and would prohibit EPA from changing these standards for 5 years. The Republicans and the Democrats are standing together on this issue, saying what we will do is exactly what Mr. DOYLE suggested. We are willing to spend \$75 million a year to build the monitors, to do the monitoring, collect the data, make sure the science is good, make sure that what we are doing is not a rush to judgment, make sure that there is a health benefit.

So in this era when Congress has been beat upon for being so partisan, on this issue it is common sense, so we can actually see good science used in an effective way to make sure that we are moving forward, keeping the air clean at the same time that we are promoting the growth of our industries and jobs for people in America.

We have said, as Republicans and Democrats, let us make sure we are doing this right. Even Carol Browner, the administrator of EPA, and others in the administration agree with us when we say that, regardless of what you do, the air will be cleaner 5 years from now than it is today. So if we are making progress, why stop that progress?

What the President has done today, Mr. Speaker, first of all is stick a finger in the eye of all of us on the Democratic side, in particular, who have written to him, who have called the administration over the many past months and said, Mr. President, sit down with us. You want to have a dialogue on race relations, you want to have a dialogue about this problem, you want to have a dialogue about that problem. We want to have a dialogue with you about clean air. It is important.

We do not want asthmatic kids to get sick and die. We do not want the elderly to be forced inside their houses different days of the year because of the weather and the air conditions. We come from Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, where we know a little bit about dirty air.

We know what happened in Donora, Pennsylvania, decades ago when people

were dropping dead in the street. In my previous life as a news reporter I interviewed the doctor who was down there running around as people were actually falling dead in the streets of Donora, Pennsylvania.

We have cleaned the air. We have moved forward. The Clean Air Act is working. As we said to the President, you called upon us when you wanted to pass your budget. You called upon us when you wanted to talk about other things that were important to your administration. This is life and death to the economy of our region. Before you make a decision, have your people or you sit down with us and let us have a dialogue.

Not only did we not have that dialogue before the President made his announcement today, he did not even acknowledge our letter. What does that say to the 600,000 people that live in each one of the 40 districts of the Members of Congress from his own party who said to the President, sit down with us. Parley with us, talk to us about the impact that this decision on changing the ambient air quality standards would have on our region, on our businesses, on the children and the elderly in our districts, on the health care facilities in our districts, which, unfortunately, more and more are becoming the largest industries, because we do not make anything anymore. Now you are going to chase away the economic expansion that is out there.

Mr. Speaker, the Conference of Mayors said in an overwhelming fashion yesterday to the President, Mr. President, you are going the wrong way. If you pursue this line of changing the air quality standards now, it is the wrong thing to do. Do not do it. The President has ignored them.

Governors across this Nation, and the President likes to remind us that he was a Governor, Governors across this Nation have said to the President, it is the wrong thing to do. He has ignored them. State legislators across this region, other elected officials, union officials, have said, Mr. President, it is the wrong thing to do. He has ignored them, deciding only to listen to one person and that is Carol Browner, the administrator at EPA.

Mr. Speaker, it is a mistake. It is an absolute mistake. The President has received bad advice. He has not sat down to talk to those of us, to even say later on to the gentlemen from Pennsylvania, Mr. KLINK and Mr. DOYLE, to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], I think you are wrong.

At least have the discussion. Do us the honor for the people that we represent, people who you asked to vote for you, Mr. President, to sit down and have this conversation with us, have a dialogue with us. But you cannot do that. In fact, we found out from the news media today that you made your announcement. Is this the way we work together? Is this the politics of inclusion? What will be the impact on the businesses that are growing in our region?

Mr. DOYLE commented a few moments ago about Jim Motterley, the current head of CASAC, who also said, I will paraphrase, I do not have his exact words in front of me, that perhaps the money we would be spending to set new standards would be better spent to bring areas that are currently not in attainment into attainment.

We have counties across this Nation, regions across this Nation, that are out of the current attainment standards, but they are making progress. They are implementing standards to get there. This takes them off the hook. They no longer have to do that, because we have now said that the standard you have been striving to reach that you are still not in attainment with is not there anymore. We have created a new standard, so the air can be dirtier for a longer period of time.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues understand that. We need Members of Congress to rally around, Democrats and Republicans in the House, in the Senate, to come onto our bill, H.R. 1984, so we can say to EPA that it is the will of Congress that we not change these standards while they are working, while we are cleaning up the air, while we are creating a healthier atmosphere in this Nation. Instead, let us do the right thing. Let us build those monitors for PM2.5. Let us deploy them. Let us collect the data, and 5 years down the road let us make a decision based on sound science.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DOYLE].

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I want the gentleman to know all of us in the western Pennsylvania delegation have appreciated the gentleman's leadership on this issue. I was just thinking back when the gentleman was talking. I grew up in Swissvale, Pennsylvania. I have spent all 44 years of my life in the community of Swissvale. My father was a steel worker and worked on an Edgar Thompson steel mill in Braddock. He spent all of his life in that same town, as did my mother.

When our grandparents came over from Ireland and Italy, that is the town we settled in. That is not unlike many families in western Pennsylvania, who have spent a lifetime in this community. We remember what the air was like. We remember the days when there were orange specks on the car when we would come out in the morning, because the mills had let out, before there were stricter air controls. Nobody wants to return to those days. I know the gentleman has two children, I have been blessed with four. We care about our children. We want them to breathe clean air.

I get a little bit disturbed when the people who have been trying to frame this debate and those of us who have been questioning the science of these new clean air standards somehow do not want clean air for the community. The fact of the matter is the air in Pittsburgh is as clean as it has ever been.

In fact, in the past 5 years a study has shown that the air in Pittsburgh, just in the past 5 years, is 64 percent cleaner since when the old standards were implemented in 1990. We have already made tremendous progress. I think it is interesting to note, and a lot of people may not have realized, the American Lung Association of Western Pennsylvania has taken a position contrary to the national American Lung Association.

Mr. KLINK. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding, and correct me if I am wrong, Mr. DOYLE, but it is my understanding that in 1996 and thus far in 1997 our Pittsburgh region has not been out of attainment.

Mr. DOYLE. Not a single exceedance in those 2 years, and only an average of four exceedances a year during the years 1991 to 1995, representing a 64 percent improvement in our air quality.

I think it is interesting. This is a letter from the American Lung Association of Western Pennsylvania. In the letter they start by saying, "We would like to thank you for the support of the work of our organization, and we want to share with you our grave concerns over the position on particulate matter taken by the American Lung Association."

"In its broad brush extremist overview of what it deems to be a widespread problem, the national American Lung Association is ignoring our stunning progress in cleaning up our local environment, and the overwhelmingly good to moderate air quality we enjoy, as well as the potentially devastating effect that this legislation could have on our region's economy."

This is from the American Lung Association of Western Pennsylvania.

□ 2315

Mr. KLINK. Reclaiming my time, they realize the progress that has been made in southwestern Pennsylvania, they understand the good things that have been done with the air. And the gentleman brings up a fine point. This whole issue came to light when the National American Lung Association brought suit against the EPA, saying that back in 1987 when they went from total suspended particles to PM10, 10-micron size particles, since then, every 5 years they are supposed to revisit the issue.

They have not done that. So it is time to revisit. It does not say they have to delay. It does not say they have to make it more stringent. It simply says they have to deal with PM, or as we say, soot or dust in the air.

So here comes CASAC and they give the recommendation that we go from a 10 micron down to 2.5, but there are a lot of other things that they do not make recommendations about. We do not know, again, because we do not have the monitors, how bad the situation is.

So where did this ozone thing come from? Legally, and the gentleman I know would agree, we do not have to

deal with ozone right now, particularly at a time when the transport issue of ozone from one State to another is just being dealt with by the transport group that has been studying it.

Mr. DOYLE. I think it is important for the public to understand these issues like transport zones. When we think of Pennsylvania and what has been happening, particularly in our region, as we lost jobs and factories in western Pennsylvania to States like Ohio and States west of us, yet western Pennsylvania is literally the victim of pollution that is blowing from the west over to the east.

If we cleaned up each source of pollution, every source of pollution in western Pennsylvania that was being caused in western Pennsylvania, we would still be out of attainment because of the pollution that blows across our borders from western States.

Mr. KLINK. Reclaiming my time, under the new standards. Under the old standards, we are fine. But under the new standards, the gentleman is right.

Mr. DOYLE. What is our State supposed to do? We said jokingly, maybe we need to set these giant fans up along the border and blow it back to Ohio. But the sad result of the situation is our young people are leaving western Pennsylvania because there is no opportunity there. And part of the reason there is no opportunity there is the factories are not locating in an area that is nonattainment because of the cost of compliance, and we are losing them to States like Ohio, who are sending their pollution over to western Pennsylvania.

I just want to take a second to read the summary. We just had this report released this afternoon. This is the report from the House Committee on Science, of which I am a member, and I want to read the summary because I think it is important for people to understand this:

"We have had regulations on large particulate matter, which is known as total suspended particles, that have been in place since 1971. Particles of 10 microns or less, PM10, have been regulated since 1987."

Now to give my colleagues an idea of what we are talking about here, a human hair is 75 microns. So we are talking about PM10, 10 microns, versus 75 microns, the size of a human hair.

And this issue is a very narrow one, "whether there is sufficient scientific evidence to impose an exact standard for particles below 2.5 microns at this time. Although much of the research EPA has compiled is suggestive, there are too many uncertainties in the data and the interpretation of that data to form an adequate basis for moving ahead with a strict PM2.5 standard at this time. The weaknesses of the epidemiological evidence discussed above are of particular concern. Our subcommittee has received testimony that, except for PM, EPA has never set a standard for criteria air pollution

without clinical, animal, toxicological, and other studies supporting the epidemiological results. Yet studies such as this that do exist are inconsistent, and do not resolve but rather add to the uncertainties about the effects of PM2.5. Moreover, this committee has received testimony on many of the basic questions that still need to be addressed before we have a clear understanding of the impacts of PM2.5."

Chairman SENSENBRENNER I think said it right: "The citizens of this country have a right to expect that the new air quality standards be science-based. However, in this case, EPA has put the regulatory cart before the scientific horse."

Mr. KLINK. Reclaiming my time, the gentleman again makes good sense. To boil all of that down, the gentleman is right, when we talk about the width of a human hair being 75 microns and we have been measuring PM10, or 10 microns, that is about one-seventh the width of a human hair.

Now they are talking about going to one-fourth of one-seventh the size of a human hair. That tells us how crazy this is. They are talking about size alone. There are different kinds of particulate matter floating around. Some of it, as I said, is found in nature. We heard testimony in the Committee on Commerce, where they said if you live in an area like New Mexico where you have high alkaline soil that is blowing in the wind, you could have problems.

What about if some of these particulate matters that are being ingested into the lungs are more toxic than others? This is not addressed at all in these new ambient air quality standards suggested by Ms. Browner at EPA and now endorsed by the President.

What about a blend of different kinds of PM2.5? Does that cause more of a toxicological problem? We do not know because, as my distinguished colleague just pointed out, we do not have the studies. We do not have enough epidemiological studies, toxicological studies. All kinds of studies need to be done, and we do not have that data yet.

We also find ourselves in another particularly bad position. I do not like the fact that we are here on the floor tonight, I say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DOYLE], and Mr. Speaker, having this public disagreement with our own President.

I stood up in 1993 and gave this President a very, very difficult vote when he had a budget that he said the future of his presidency depended on, and I still bear the scars politically of that very tough vote. It was the right thing to do, because since 1993 the stock market has more than doubled, unemployment has gone down, we created employment, the deficit has plunged; and we, the Democrats that took that hard vote, need to have that credit, and the President needs to have the credit for putting that plan together.

So I have stood with this President when it was unpopular to stand with him. At other times when we disagreed,

we have just agreed to disagree. One of those issues was on trade, it was on NAFTA, with a starkly different opinion of what this country's trade policy should be.

But I fear that what has been set up with a double whammy of the passage of NAFTA and now these proposed ambient air quality standards being tightened is the companies in our districts or that are looking at coming to our districts will say, "Congressman DOYLE, Congressman KLINK," and in fact some of them have already said this to us, this is not something we are pulling out of a hat, it has happened, "we would be crazy to expand a plant or build a new plant in southwestern Pennsylvania when we could go to Mexico or to Canada, bring other products in because of NAFTA, with no tariff, and we do not have to play by the same environmental rules. We do not have to install the same scrubbers. We do not have to have the expensive pollution equipment." And so we find ourselves the victims of a double whammy.

How can the economy of this Nation continue to grow? That is the problem that the workers or potential workers, the kids that are in school, that are looking for jobs in our region, are going to have. We will not have the growth of jobs. They get caught in this double witching thing that is going on.

The fact of the matter is that when these new regulations go into effect, and with the ozone issue, the day that this happens, 400 counties across this Nation go out of attainment. In those counties, no one is going to come in if they are already out of attainment in the new standard and say, "I am going to build a factory. I am going to expand a factory here. I am going to create employment."

They are not going to build there. It is that simple. First of all, they may not be able to build because that day the local government probably cannot issue them a building permit. That happens immediately.

Now the EPA will say, "Wait a minute, Congressman KLINK, we do not say that you cannot have a building permit." Well, of course not. The EPA does not issue building permits. But they force the government leaders to make that kind of a decision. They force the kind of decision where the local government leaders might say, "You have to go to reformulating gasoline. You have to go to no further building construction in this region. You have to go to certain days that you are carpooling," or whatever it is that they have to do to reach at that attainment figure. The local government leaders are the ones that are stuck at the bottom.

It is this administration now and the EPA that is forcing the local leaders to make those decisions. That is why the Conference of Mayors says, "No, Mr. President do not do this." That is why the governors and the State legislators are saying to the Federal Government,

"Do not force this upon us. The current system is working. You are going to put us into a situation where we cannot win, where we cannot expand the wealth of this Nation, where we cannot create new opportunities."

Mr. DOYLE. My colleague is so much on the point. It is not only new jobs, it is existing jobs too. I think right in the Monongahela Valley, the Clairton Coke Works. When we talk about the proud heritage that Pittsburgh had in the steel industry, as we all know, anyone that has lived in western Pennsylvania, we understand what has happened in the steel industry when the downsizing took place, when many hard-working western Pennsylvanians found themselves without work because of the collapse of the steel industry.

But we still have some plants up and operating. Edgar Thompson Steel Mill in Braddock, the steel mill that dad worked at; and the Clairton Coke Works, supplying coke all over the country, it is in production and it is at peak capacity.

Right now, if these new standards are implemented, a place like the Clairton Coke Works are going to be shut down. We have got five communities around Clairton, Glassport, Liberty, Lincoln borough, towns like that, where the major importer of those five communities is Clairton Coke Works.

And that is a situation where U.S. Steel is going to have to make a financial decision that they can no longer operate that plant because the cost of complying with these new regulations would exceed the profit margin. It just would not become economically feasible to do that any longer.

Mr. KLINK. The gentleman is on a very good point. I do not know how much USX has invested in Clairton. I have been by the Coke Works many times, dozens, hundreds of times probably. But I know that they have spent tens of millions of dollars modernizing and cleaning the air of that facility.

I have got small specialty steel companies and small chemical manufacturers in my district that have spent anywhere from \$40 million since 1990, since the Clean Air Act amendments, to 160, 170 million per plant to clean the air. So the gentleman is right, that is what the President and EPA are doing right now. They are saying, "After you spent these tens of millions of dollars or hundreds of millions of dollars cleaning the air, it is working, forget about it. Now we are changing the rules. We are changing the standards." And do we have the science? No. Have we done the toxicological studies? No. Have we done all the other studies? Do we know what we are really doing? No.

I would say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DOYLE], we in Pennsylvania, as I mentioned on the floor before, we went through it with EPA where they were forcing us to go to centralized emission testing for the cars. And the Federal Government EPA cost the State of Pennsylvania a \$145 million court settlement that came out

of the pockets of the taxpayers of Pennsylvania and did not clean up one speck of air.

Mr. DOYLE. The gentleman is right. And when we talk about the President and EPA saying, "Work with us, you have got 10 years to make this compliance," what type of investments do you think U.S. Steel is going to make in the Clairton Coke Works knowing that this clock is ticking right now?

Let us talk about another subject that is very near and dear to both of us and to the very survival of the Monongahela Valley, and that is the Mon-Fayette Expressway. What is going to happen to projects like the Mon-Fayette Expressway when construction projects of that magnitude are going to have to be put on hold, too, because of these new standards?

I think it is an insult to the intelligence of the people in western Pennsylvania to believe, and as my colleague said it before, that we will put these new standards in because we have to follow the letter of the law, but now we are supposed to believe all of a sudden EPA is going to throw the rule book out and they are just going to arbitrarily on the enforcement side of things say, "Do not get nervous about this. You have got 10 years to do this. We are going to be very flexible with you. We are going to work with you on this."

I have not seen flexibility in the EPA in all the years that I have had to deal with them, and I do not believe for one second there is going to be flexibility once these new regs are implemented. And the losses that we are going to see will be not only to existing industries, but the fact that we are not going to see new industries make investments in this region and we are not going to see existing industries do any upgrading when we know what has happened.

□ 2330

We have a 400-county blacklist that is going to take place when these new standards are implemented. There are literally going to be 400 counties whose names are going to be "don't do business here, don't put a new factory here, don't make any upgrades or investment in your existing plant here, because pretty soon the bar is going to go from here up to here and it is going to cost you a fortune to comply with that."

What are we asking the President and EPA to do? Are we asking them to stop all efforts to clean the air? That is not what we are asking at all. There are plans in place as we speak. There is a SIP in place, a State Implementation Plan as we speak in western Pennsylvania, in the State of Pennsylvania, making the air cleaner in western Pennsylvania every day that we are here.

What were the recommendations which we made to the President? We said, postpone the standards. EPA should postpone the new standard until there is sufficient scientific data collected and analyzed. That is the first

thing we asked. Secondly, we said further research is necessary, and we will give you the money to do the research. On the Committee on Science we authorized an additional \$50 million. In the bill of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KLINK], we are going to authorize an additional \$75 million a year for 5 years to do research so that we can start to collect 2.5 and analyze it. We are doing that in this bill. We said we need a monitoring system to fund it and deploy it. The gentleman addressed that in his bill. Then we say EPA should make these data sets available. There are data sets that were in the Pope study, the Harvard six-city study that have yet to be released for independent review and analysis.

Here we are asking the EPA, asking President Clinton, the administration, not to stop cleaning the air, not to roll back any regulations that are in place. This is not going back to the old days. We are simply saying to them, let us continue to clean the air in western Pennsylvania and across the United States and while we are doing that, let us do some more research. Let us collect the data. Let us be certain that the hundreds of millions of dollars that are going to be spent on these new regulations are at least addressing a problem that is real and that when we get that new science and research, that once we have identified the cause of the problem, they do not know what it is about the particle.

The studies on 2.5 and 10 in one study both showed the same health effect. A lot of people were suggesting maybe it is not the size of the particle that is the culprit. Maybe it is not 2.5 we should be regulating. It may be something else within the particulate matter. All we are asking for is some more research, more science, more common sense as we continue to make the air cleaner in western Pennsylvania and across the country. I do not think that is a radical position. I think that is the common sense position that we have taken with this administration.

Mr. KLINK. Reclaiming my time from the gentleman, the gentleman makes a good point. Let me just switch it back over to ozone, which of course as we said was not addressed in the lawsuit, is not something that needs to be addressed right now. And what the administration and what Ms. Browner in fact has said is we are going to go from .12 parts per million over a 1-hour period to .08 parts per million over an 8-hour period. The people at CASAC said that you go .07, .08, .09. These sound like very small differences in numbers, but it is in fact going from .09 down to .08 that throw those 400 additional counties out of attainment. All of the scientists who came to us, everyone, said there is no bright line where the public health greatly improves from one level to another. So why are we throwing 400 counties out of attainment and not having a bright line that benefits people?

Mr. DOYLE. If the gentleman will yield on that, I think it is important

for the public to understand, we use terms like CASAC and bright line, CASAC meaning the Clean Air Scientific Advisory Committee, but let us talk a little bit about this bright line thing too because I think it is important for people to understand. What the scientists were telling us is whether you set that standard where it is now or whether you lower it, there is no measurable difference in the health effect on individuals. They could not see any clear level to say, "Look, if you set it below this particular level, then it will be a great increase in health. This will greatly decrease the adverse health effects." They could not find where the line was on ozone to set where it would make any difference in the health.

The gentleman brings up a good point. Why would we want to shut down industry? Why would we want to displace jobs, put people out of work to set a line that we are not even certain that the line we are setting has any measurable health effect or any benefit?

Mr. KLINK. Following up on what the gentleman said, he mentioned that all of us, and this by the way I will mention just because both of us are from southwestern Pennsylvania, this is not a Pennsylvania issue, this is a New Mexico issue, it is a California issue, it is a Michigan, Ohio, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, New York, all the States across this Nation will be impacted. We just both happen to be here at this late hour, both of us coming from southwestern Pennsylvania. Our region is not the only one that is going to be impacted. Our whole Nation is going to be impacted. The health of our whole Nation is going to be impacted by this decision. Indeed, the adverse effect to the wealth and the growth of industry of our Nation is going to be adversely impacted. This is not just a Pennsylvania issue.

But as the gentleman mentioned earlier, we grew up in southwestern Pennsylvania when people used to go out and brush the dust off their lawn, when there were certain days, and we kind of laugh about it now, but you would hang your laundry out, then you would kind of shake the dust off the laundry at the end of the day because of course the particulate matter would come floating down over your laundry as it hung outside. The air was dirty. People got sick. But as we have cleaned the air in southwestern Pennsylvania and other places across this Nation, in fact, they had the same experience in London back in the 1950s, the incidence of asthma has increased. Why is that? We do not know. There are many areas of speculation. But the point in fact is we do not know why in some instances when the air gets cleaner, asthma increases. Are there other factors?

Many people believe that outside air quality has very little to do with asthma, that it is an inside air problem. Some people recently have suggested this could have to do, and particularly

in areas where there is poverty, where people are living in squalor, that there could be a protein or enzyme thrown off the waste products of cockroaches and other insects that are in homes. Is that part of the problem? We do not know. But if my colleagues would support me with H.R. 1984, we would have 5 years to do the study, we would have 5 years to continue on the track that we are on now to continually clean up the air, to improve the health of this Nation, to know where industry is going, while we spent \$375 million doing this thing right, building the monitors, collecting the data, making sure that we are headed in the right direction for the health benefits of everyone.

I gave up a very good job to come to Congress. I am here because it is a wonderful honor to serve this Nation. I want to make the life of the people in my region and of this Nation better. That is why I am here. I also came here as I know the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DOYLE] did because we want to improve the economy of southwestern Pennsylvania, an area where 155,000 manufacturing jobs have been lost over a two-decade period, because we are selfish in a way. We want our children, his 4 children and my 2, to be able to grow up in southwestern Pennsylvania. I will be darned if I want them breathing air that I think is going to kill them or eventually kill or injure my grandchildren. This is not some excuse for industry. This is about what we feel is good science, what we feel is a prudent way of going about making decisions that impact the health and the wealth and productivity of this Nation.

Mr. DOYLE. That is really what it is all about. It is about the future and it is about our kids. The politically expedient thing to do would be to just go along with this. Both the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KLINK] and myself have been taken to task by the local Pittsburgh newspaper, by environmental groups that somehow we do not want the air to be as clean as they do. We know this is nonsense. This is not only about clean air for our kids, it is about a future for our kids in western Pennsylvania. That is what I think it is all about. The gentleman brought up a good point. I was reading an article just a couple of days ago that was suggesting that maybe one of the key contributing problems to these respiratory illnesses and asthma may not be so much the outside air but these hermetically-sealed office buildings that so many people are living in and as we have these new energy-efficient windows and people have got the air conditioning on and they have got all the windows shut and the air is not getting circulated through the house, that it may well be what we are breathing indoors can be much more damaging to us than what we are breathing outdoors, and people spend about 75 percent of their time indoors instead of outdoors. Particularly the

reason a bill like H.R. 1984 makes so much sense. What we are saying is we need to find out about these things, we need to learn what is it that is causing these problems.

Mr. KLINK. Is there anything that the gentleman has read in the standards proposed by Administrator Browner and now endorsed by the President which would address this sick building syndrome that the gentleman has described?

Mr. DOYLE. I see nothing in the standards that would address it. This is a prime example of why more research is necessary. What we see in today's standards is not going to do anything. Administrator Browner when we had her before the committee, too, never wanted to discuss economic impacts, because she said, "I've got to make this decision based solely on a health decision and not on economic benefits."

I am sorry, but I have to look at the economic impacts to this legislation because we have got real people out there living in western Pennsylvania and all across this country that are going to suffer severe impacts as a result of these standards. I want to just read a study that has come out. There is some ongoing research by environmental economists such as Dr. Vernon Henderson, Brown University; Fred Reuter from Consat Research Corporation and the EPA's own draft regulatory impact analysis for PM. And the following economic impacts could well result from the proposed NAAQs which have just been okayed today by President Clinton. What are some of these consequences? Increased business operating costs, job losses, reductions in worker compensation, decreases in industrial output, and increased expenditures on road cleaning and air quality monitoring by local governments. They go on to say the areas experiencing these effects will be those that do not and in many cases literally cannot comply with the proposed PM-2.5 standard. Several hundred counties and as many as nearly 90 metropolitan areas will be in nonattainment when the full implementation period begins. As local, regional and controls yet to be developed are applied, these numbers will ultimately be substantially reduced, though 30 to 40 areas are likely to remain in nonattainment for many, many years and consequently much economic pain and damage will result lasting many, many years.

They say initially 20 to 25 percent of the entire U.S. population and labor force will reside in these nonattainment areas. Approximately 4 percent of the jobs in these areas will be lost if the proposed NAAQ's for PM-2.5 are adopted. These job losses will occur in nearly every sector of the economy and will be most substantial in the service industries. Workers who continue to be employed in these sectors in nonattainment areas will likely experience stress and uncertainty regarding their futures and their compensation. Small

businesses will be disproportionately impacted and the capital cost in current dollars will exceed \$100 billion. Those are real numbers affecting real people, not only in western Pennsylvania but across this whole United States.

Mr. KLINK. The gentleman is right and I am glad the direction that he is going with that. Because as he mentioned, Administrator Browner kept saying she has to base this not on economics but strictly on what is best for the health of the people. There are a lot of different things that create good or bad health conditions. When industry was crashing down around our ears in the Northeast and in the Midwestern United States people suffered a loss of jobs, a loss of health care benefits, there was increased domestic violence, higher crime rates in our community, higher suicide rates as people's lives fell apart, the social fabric of our community fell apart. If you do not have money in your pocket because you did not have a job and you did not have health care benefits, then your wife if she were pregnant could not go see a doctor for prenatal examination, your young children could not go see a doctor. Many times other people who were dependent on you, you yourself did not get to see a doctor. What was the adverse health impact? That will be seen again if we have the kind of loss of job production that we think we are going to see from this and all evidence we are going to have from this. But beyond that, the administrator says the air will still get cleaner. The Clean Air Act is working. People's health will continue to improve. So you cannot have it both ways.

□ 2345

And that is exactly what they are attempting to do with this issue, and it is why, and I understand that our colleagues, many of them, have come up and thanked us for our leadership on this; many of them are signing on to H.R. 1984, particularly today. I got even calls today from Republicans and Democrats in the other body who are now interested in our efforts and want to coordinate their efforts with us.

We have been busy on both sides of the aisle dealing with reconciliation, trying to make this balanced budget program work for our constituents, and so many Members of the House and the other body have been focusing in on other issues. We have flagged this issue because it is so important, so vitally important to our region.

But I think that what the President did for us today, as he took what I think was not a very good step in a very poor direction by recommending these new ambient air quality standards, I think he has woken up. He has awakened the giant within this institution, and now I think that our Members on both sides of the aisle are going to focus on this, and we are going to move forward.

We have a couple of different legislative directions that we can go. We are

thinking about them, but we are going to sit down with friends on both sides of the aisle, and we are going to try to figure out to protect both the health and wealth of this Nation.

Mr. DOYLE. I think it is so important that we get people on H.R. 1984, and I think it is important, too. What I fear is that because it is going to be a number of years before we start to see some of these effects because there is going to be a period of installing monitors and collecting data and things like this that, we are not going to see this immediate impact. I mean I think we are going to see businesses saying, well, if they were thinking to come to western Pennsylvania, that is going to be out, and we are not going to see investments in existing plans.

But I fear the public is going to be lulled into some complacency because they do not realize what we are talking about 10 years down the road. It is not going to immediately hit them, and when it does they are going to say what happened to us and where was everybody when this was taking place?

This is not a partisan issue. Here we both stand, Democrats, talking about our own administration, our own President, our own EPA administrator, and at some political risk saying we have got to come together, Democrats and Republicans from all regions of the country, and we are seeing cosponsors now on this bill from all regions of the country and from both parties.

This is not a partisan issue.

Mr. KLINK. On that point I want to repeat again, and I do not think I can say it enough, there is no pride with which we come here and talk about the fact that our President, the party, the President of our party, has made what we think is the wrong decision because he was given bad advice and he heeded that bad advice. We do not like to do that.

There is a political risk that is involved with that. This is not something—we tried as Members; I called the White House, I talked to the legislative liaison people at the White House time and time again, firing shots across their bow, letting them know that from a western Pennsylvania perspective, from a Midwest perspective, from a northeastern United States perspective that we have no choice but to go to war on this issue and begging this administration to sit down with us and talk to us, have a dialogue with us; do not force us to come to this point.

This is a battle which was thrust upon us, a battle which we must fight for our constituents, for the working blue collar men and women, for the small businesses, for the local elect officials, for the Governors, for the people who would have to implement these new standards at great risk and no certainty that we are headed down the right road. In fact the evidence is against it.

We cannot tell you how much it is that we are distressed by having to come to the floor over the last couple

of weeks and being here again tonight to in fact have a family struggle within our own party in a very public way. This is not the fight that we desire. We hoped that we could sit down as statesmen, as men and women talking with the White House, talking with our friends on the other side of the aisle and coming to some kind of a conclusion as to what was best for this country.

All of our requests, including written letters to the President, have gone unanswered, and so it is that we have been forced to come to the floor of the House, Mr. Speaker, to seek the redress here in this institution where the people of our districts have elected us to come here to protect their interests, and it is to protect that interest that we rise tonight to make a plea to you, Mr. Speaker, and to other Members of this great Chamber to join us to make sure that this country is acting based on good science, that we are acting based on what is indeed the best interests of the working people and the businesses of this Nation.

I yield to the gentleman to close.

Mr. DOYLE. I would just close by saying that in 1994, when I came to this Congress, I promised the people of western Pennsylvania, who I am so privileged to represent, that I would put their interests ahead of the interests of my party and my President, and I also say to my wife Susan and my 4 kids, if they are watching this tonight, Michael, David, Kevin, Alexandra, that I am here for you, too, and for other families in western Pennsylvania.

This is important. This is about our future. This is why we stand here tonight opposing our President and our party on a decision that is going to be so wrong for the future of our country.

I would urge Members in both parties, Republicans and Democrats, to join the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KLINK] and I myself in sponsoring H.R. 1984. Together let us turn these rules back, let us give our children a future in this country.

Mr. KLINK. Let me also just say in reclaiming my time that I think we need to give credit to two of our friends who are original cosponsors of H.R. 1994, the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. FRED UPTON, Republican, and the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. BOUCHER. They could not be here with us tonight, but this is a bipartisan effort. I am pleased to be one of the leads on this, glad to have my colleague from southwestern Pennsylvania and so many on board.

I think that we are very close to getting half of the Democrats in this House on our side on this issue. I think we have a tremendous number of Republicans.

It has to be veto proof. The President has sent us a clear message, whatever we do, whatever the legislative answer is, we have got to make it veto proof.

I think we have got some good numbers up, about 63 Members in the Senate that are hard numbers, so I think

that we are headed in the right direction.

Again, we did not want to have to battle it this way; it has been thrust upon us.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PAPPAS). The Chair would remind all Members to direct their remarks to the chair and not to the television viewing audience.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) until 1 p.m. today, on account of medical reasons.

Mr. COX of California (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today, on account of medical reasons.

Mr. YATES (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today, on account of personal reasons.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CAPPS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BONIOR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GEJDENSON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ALLEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WATERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. BROWN of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. CLAYTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. OWENS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PAYNE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SNYDER, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. TAYLOR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STOKES, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. OLVER, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. INGLIS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. EHRLICH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PAPPAS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. NEUMANN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, on June 26.

Mr. DUNCAN, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CAPPS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin.

Ms. LOFGREN.

Mr. ENGEL.

Mr. SHERMAN.

Mr. VENTO.

Mr. BLAGOJEVICH.

Mr. POSHARD.

Mr. HAMILTON.

Mr. FORD.

Mr. ORTIZ.

Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut.

Mr. SANDERS.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

Mr. PASCRELL.

Mr. SKELTON.

Mr. MALEONEY of Connecticut.

Mr. GORDON.

Mrs. LOWEY.

Mr. CAPPS.

Mr. FALDOMAVAEGA.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. INGLIS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. OXLEY.

Mr. MANZULLO.

Mr. HOEKSTRA.

Mr. BILIRAKIS.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

Mr. MCDADE.

Mr. SAXTON.

Mr. DOOLITTLE.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KLINK) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. RILEY, in two instances.

Mr. FALDOMAVAEGA.

Mr. FARR of California.

Mr. OWENS.

Mr. BONIOR.

Mr. MATSUI.

Mr. DEUTSCH.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House oversight, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1306. An act to amend Federal law to clarify the applicability of host State laws to any branch in such State of an out-of-State bank, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1902. An act to immunize donations made in the form of charitable gift annuities and charitable remainder trusts from the antitrust laws and State laws similar to the antitrust laws

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KLINK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 53 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, June 26, 1997, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows: