

United States Senate, 364 Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC 20510-6150.

For further information, please contact Jim O'Toole of the Subcommittee staff at (202) 224-5161.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet on Thursday, October 9, 1997 at 9:30 a.m. on the tobacco agreement public health analysis.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, October 9, 1997, at 2:00 p.m. to hold a hearing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent on behalf of the Governmental Affairs Committee Special Investigation to meet on Thursday, October 9, at 10:00 a.m. for a hearing on campaign financing issues.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to hold an executive business meeting during the session of the Senate on Thursday, October 9, 1997, at 10:00 a.m., in room 226 of the Senate Dirksen Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC POLICY, EXPORT AND TRADE PROMOTION

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on International Economic Policy, Export and Trade Promotion be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, October 9, 1997, at 9:30 a.m. to hold a hearing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS, HISTORIC PRESERVATION, AND RECREATION

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on National Parks, Historic Preservation, and Recreation of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be granted permission to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, October 9, for purposes of conducting a subcommittee hearing which is scheduled to begin at 2:00 p.m. The purpose of this oversight hearing is to receive testimony on the feasibility of using bonding techniques to finance large-scale capital projects in the National Park System.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Com-

mittee on Labor and Human Resources Subcommittee on Public Health and Safety be authorized to meet for a Hearing on NIH Clinical Research during the session of the Senate on Thursday, October 9, 1997, at 9:30 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SECURITIES

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Securities of the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, October 9, 1997, to conduct an oversight hearing on the financial accounting standards board and its proposed derivatives accounting standard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

PROTECTING THIS NATION'S AIR

• Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, late last month, the Subcommittee on Manufacturing and Competitiveness held a hearing to examine the impact of EPA's new air quality standards on American manufacturing, especially small manufacturers.

On July 18 of this year, the Environmental Protection Agency announced new air quality standards that call for more severe restrictions on ground-level ozone and microscopic dust particles called particulate matter. These new standards are the most far-reaching—and potentially the most costly—regulatory mandates implemented in U.S. history.

Despite the administration's having promulgated these regulations, I believe a number of questions remain unanswered. To begin with, are these standards necessary? It seems clear that the scientific community is not of one mind on the EPA's new standards. Indeed, from the reading I have done it seems clear that a substantial amount of scientific evidence exists to the effect that the new rules will have negligible positive impact whatsoever on the public health. Not even the EPA's own Science Advisory Committee could conclude that public health would be substantially improved by adopting new standards more stringent than those already in effect. Moreover, Kay Jones, President Jimmy Carter's top air quality adviser, says there are serious flaws in the studies cited by the EPA to justify these new regulatory mandates.

Nevertheless, the EPA wants Americans to incur substantial costs in implementing their new standards. By the EPA's own estimate, implementing the new standards will cost Americans almost \$50 billion. And that estimate is very low if we are to believe some of the estimates made by other organizations. The highly regarded Reason Foundation, as an example, has determined that the costs of the new clean air rules should be conservatively

pegged at \$122 billion. If this figure is correct, then the economic cost of EPA's new regulations will wipe out the entire economic benefit of the tax relief that we just enacted for America. In my judgment, this would not bode well for our Nation's financial health, or for the economic well-being of our working families.

We must also keep in mind that there are alternative means by which we can save lives. Taking the EPA's own estimates, the new standards will save the equivalent of 1,100 lives, at a cost of \$2,400,000 per life year saved. Meanwhile, universal influenza vaccination would save 7,100,000 equivalent lives at a cost of only \$140 per life year saved. And mammography for women over 50, an issue which many Members of this Senate have been personally involved with, would save 1,500,000 equivalent lives at a cost of \$810 per life year saved. This is according to an article in the journal "Risk Analysis" by a group of researchers led by Dr. Tengs. These discrepancies in lives saved and programs' bang for the buck if you will, should not be ignored.

Furthermore, if the Reason Foundation cost estimate is correct, 70,000 Michiganites could lose their jobs under these new regulations. Many of those jobs—well-paying, blue-collar jobs—would be in my State's crucial manufacturing sector. That is one reason the president of Flint's United Auto Workers Local 599, Arthur McGee, testified in opposition to the new standards. UAW Local 599 notes that workers at the Buick complex in that city already are fighting for their jobs.

In a full page advertisement taken out in the Wall Street Journal, Local 599 proclaims that by working carefully, quickly, and efficiently, these workers have earned for themselves and their families a "healthy way of life for their families and their community." Good pay, good health care benefits, and safe neighborhoods, all of which promote healthy children, would be lost if the new EPA standards forced plant closings in Flint. After evaluating the new standards and their potential impact, UAW Local 599 has concluded, "Poverty is more dangerous to our children than the current low levels of air pollution."

However, perhaps most surprising, some of the latest studies actually show that many more jobs would be lost in the service than in the manufacturing sector. Dry cleaning establishments, hair salons, and other small businesses will not be able to absorb the increased costs imposed by these regulations. According to Decision Focus, leading environmental policy consultants, compliance with the new ozone and particulate levels will cost 200,000 jobs nationwide, with the bulk of the loss occurring in small service and retail businesses. This kind of job loss would cause a particular problem for this Nation's larger urban areas.

I worry when I hear Harry Alford, president of the National Black Chamber of Commerce, say that "EPA's new rules will create such an air of economic uncertainty that they might well be the last straw for inner-city investments." In my view, Mr. Alford's warning should lead us to proceed very cautiously. It seems to me that the burden of proof is on the EPA to demonstrate conclusively that the costs to be borne, in particular by our job creating enterprises, can be borne without significant damage to those businesses and to our workers. It also seems to me that this burden, in the case of these regulations, is considerable.

The effects of the clean air standards, however, will not be limited to America's cities. There are a number of reports that the new regulations may bar farmers from plowing during the dry summer months for fear of stirring up dust, that is, particulate matter. The EPA has signaled farmers that they need not worry about complying with the rules, but it is the States, not EPA, that will have the burden of controlling emissions and targeting their sources. And this begs a separate question: Who will bear the costs if the EPA, in order to quell likely opposition, keeps telling various groups that they needn't worry about complying with the new rules?

Many within the agriculture community fear that much of these likely costs—increased energy and fuel expenses—will be borne by them. As one witness, a member of the Kansas Farm Bureau, testified, many U.S. commodity prices are tied to world markets, so farmers will not be able to pass these costs on to consumers and could be forced to concede some crop production to foreign competitors.

Meanwhile, the manufacturing sector fears that small businessowners will lack the resources to pay the cost of expensive pollution reduction equipment and will be unwilling or unable to comply with still more regulations. Most experts acknowledge that heavy industries will likely face significant additional regulatory controls to reduce NO_x and other particulates. Small business owners, however, maintain they will shoulder a similarly heavy load because they typically lack the technical expertise and the financial and human resources to consistently engage with State officials to shape the outcome of emissions control plans. During the hearing, two different small businessowners testified that the new standards could result in a dramatic reduction in business expansion—or stop it altogether—in many U.S. cities. These owners admitted that they were unlikely to go out of business as a result of the NAAQS, but they noted that their increased costs could be reflected in reduced hiring and the reduction, or elimination, of some employee benefits.

We are all concerned with making our country a more healthy place for our children and grandchildren to live. The key is striking a responsible balance. Not only should our children have clean air, clean water, and safe food in their future, they must also

have good jobs, high wages, and good benefits, and a robust economy waiting for them when they grow up, enter the work force, and start their own families.

The new air quality standards have been the subject of intense scrutiny and often acrimonious debate over the course of this year. In the face of such uncertainty, I believe it is incumbent upon the administration to consider again its plans for enacting these regulations. The current implementation process seeks to give the Nation ample time to adjust to the new standards. I applaud the President for this approach: It is a step in the right direction. However, I believe EPA's implementation plan will last only as long as the first lawsuit and result in the immediate enforcement of the new standards.

If, as the President says, these new standards are not intended to harm this Nation's economy then I urge the President to support the legislation offered in both the House and the Senate to codify a 5-year delay of the regulations. This postponement will allow for continued research into the cause and effects of pollution and allow the 1990 amendments to the Clean Air Act to continue to clean the air and make the effects of any future new standards less drastic. I hope that other Members will join in urging the administration to consider this approach.

These are my concerns. I am worried about my children's health and want to make sure we are doing everything we can to protect it. But I am also concerned whether the new rules represent the best means by which we can protect that health.

WORLD FOOD DAY AND RUSSELL ULREY

• Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I rise today to celebrate World Food Day. World Food Day takes place on October 16 and in the words of Catherine Bertini, executive Director of the U.N. World Food Program, is an opportunity to "not only rededicate ourselves to the battle against hunger and poverty but also acknowledge that millions of people have been saved from the scourge of famine because of the commitment of the United States and other members of the international community." I would also like to honor the many humanitarian relief workers who often risk their lives to deliver assistance.

Natural disasters and civil unrest can produce countless refugees with no way of feeding themselves. Humanitarian relief workers often brave grave dangers in these situations to deliver food to the hungry. One of the many heroes who risk their lives to feed the needy is, Russell Ulrey, of Detroit, MI. In 1993, Mr. Ulrey served as emergency logistics coordinator in southern Sudan for the World Food Program, the largest international food aid organization in the world. During his time in Sudan, Russell Ulrey led a barge trip up the Nile to feed hungry Sudanese. This dangerous trip led Ulrey through the heart of that nation's bloody civil war.

Ulrey's mission came under fire several times but succeeded in delivering eight barges carrying 2,600 tons of food. Ulrey's trip up the Nile was the first of 25 that WFP made, delivering 65,000 tons of food.

Mr. President, I am pleased to highlight the exploits of Russell Ulrey and the thousands of other relief workers that risk their lives daily to feed the world's needy. I know my Senate colleagues join me in honoring their efforts and World Food Day.

U.S. RELATIONS WITH TAIWAN

• Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, as Congress prepares to leave for the Columbus Day recess, I notice that there are other celebrations going on around Washington, including "National Day" celebrations in Chinatown. These celebrations brought to mind several issues that I wanted to share with my colleagues regarding United States relations with Taiwan.

As Washington prepares for the State visit of President Jiang Zemin of the People's Republic of China, some press reports have speculated that the issue of Taiwan might be on the summit agenda. First, let me say that I welcome the visit of President Jiang. High-level dialogue with the Chinese should be regular and routine, and this summit presents an opportunity to discuss many issues of mutual concern to our two countries. But let me add that improving relations with the PRC need not, and indeed, should not, come at the expense of our relationship with Taiwan.

Therefore, I sent a letter, signed by 10 of my colleagues including Majority Leader TRENT LOTT, Minority Leader TOM DASCHLE, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee JESSE HELMS; and East Asia and the Pacific Subcommittee Chairman CRAIG THOMAS, to President Clinton urging him to oppose any efforts at the summit by the PRC leadership to diminish American support for Taiwan.

Mr. President, I ask that a copy of that letter be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. President, I wish President Clinton and his administration success at the upcoming summit, and I urge him to respect the views of me and my colleagues, which I think represents the views of many Americans, that our support for Taiwan's democracy and freedom cannot be sacrificed.

I also want to use this opportunity to express my gratitude to Secretary of State Madeleine Albright for her efforts to consult more closely with Members of Congress with regard to issues related to Taiwan. I refer specifically to consultations regarding the recent selection of Richard Clarence Bush III as Chairman of the American Institute in Taiwan [AIT].

Some of my colleagues, Senate Foreign Relations Committee Chairman JESSE HELMS, in particular, will remember that the consultation process did not work when the prior AIT Chairman, Mr. James Wood, was selected.