

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.

Mr. James Wood resigned from his position on January 1997 among various charges and countercharges with regard to foreign contributions during the election campaign. I leave the legitimacy of those charges to the investigators, but I simply wanted to note that congressional concerns regarding Mr. Wood were ignored by our State Department.

In response to this incident, I considered offering an amendment to the State Department authorization legislation that would have required establishing a post within the State Department that would be directly responsible for Taiwan Affairs. As part of negotiations over that amendment, I had the opportunity to discuss with the Secretary my dissatisfaction with the consultation process on matters relating to Taiwan.

The Secretary promised that she would rectify this situation and would in the future consult with Congress prior to naming future officers of AIT. She followed up on this oral promise with a letter dated July 30, 1997, that states that if the Foreign Relations Committee "expresses reservations about a prospective trustee, we will undertake to discuss and resolve the matter fully with the Committee before proceeding."

Mr. President, I ask that a copy of the July 30 letter be printed in the RECORD.

The Secretary held to her word and consulted with me and others prior to the selection of Richard Bush. I must admit, Mr. President, that this was an easy case. Mr. Bush is a talented individual who is well qualified to take this sensitive position. I had the opportunity to negotiate with Mr. Bush when he was advising Congressman LEE HAMILTON on Taiwan-related issues, and I found him well-spoken and honest. I look forward to the opportunity to continue to work with him in his new role.

I hope that Mr. Bush will use his new position to further strengthen and enhance United States relations with the people and the Government of Taiwan. Taiwan is our eighth largest trading partner, and I am confident that trade will increase further when Taiwan joins the World Trade Organization. In addition, I encourage the administration to send high-level officials to Taiwan to further strengthen our relationship and to work out the occasional disputes that cloud our relationship.

The letters follow:

U.S. SENATE

Washington, DC, September 23, 1997.

Hon. WILLIAM J. CLINTON,
The President, The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As you prepare for your summit with the President of the People's Republic of China, we thought it appropriate to share with you our thoughts regarding U.S. relations with the people and the government of Taiwan. We believe Taiwan has made extraordinary progress in recent years as the Republic of China has moved to establish a vibrant democracy with free elections, free press, strong trade unions and improved trading practices.

We believe the American people are united in their support for freedom and democracy on Taiwan. Time and again, Congress has made clear our commitment to Taiwan, beginning with the 1979 Taiwan Relations Act, and through many resolutions and bills since then.

With your important meetings in Washington with the leadership of the People's Republic of China scheduled for late October, there has been much discussion about how the U.S. government would respond to possible demands by the PRC Government regarding U.S. relations with the people and the government of Taiwan.

Mr. President, we urge you to oppose any efforts at the summit by the PRC leadership to diminish American support for Taiwan. We urge you to reject any plans for a "Fourth Communique" on issues related to Taiwan; to not weaken our defensive arms sales commitment to Taiwan; and, to not make any commitment to limit future visits by the elected representatives of the Republic of China.

We in Congress are prepared to reiterate the commitment of the American people to freedom and democracy for the people and government of Taiwan. We look forward to working with you and your Administration team on these issues in the weeks ahead.

Sincerely,

Frank H. Murkowski; Trent Lott; Jay Rockefeller; Tom Daschle; Craig Thomas; Sam Brownback; _____ Jesse Helms; Robert G. Torricelli; Charles Robb; Larry E. Craig.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE,

Washington, July 30, 1997.

Hon. FRANK MURKOWSKI,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MURKOWSKI: I refer to our conversation of June 17, in which you underscored the concern of the Foreign Relations Committee about the role of the Senate in monitoring our Taiwan policy and the Committee's specific desire that the Department consult with the Committee before appointing to the Board of Trustees of the American Institute in Taiwan (AIT) a Chairman/Managing Director for AIT.

As you know, under the bylaws of the American Institute in Taiwan, the Secretary of State appoints and removed trustees of the Institute. The Department continues to hold the view, expressed by Secretary Vance in his letter to then-Chairman Church at the time of AIT's establishment in 1979, that because the Institute is not an agency or instrumentality of the Government, and because its trustees are not officers of the United States, it would not be appropriate for the Senate to advise and consent to the appointment of trustees or officers. However, let me assure you, as did Secretary Vance, that the names of prospective trustees will be forwarded to the Foreign Relations Committee. If the Committee expresses reservations about a prospective trustee, we will undertake to discuss and resolve the matter fully with the Committee before proceeding.

This arrangement will enable the Institute to retain its character as a private corporation and assist the Senate in fulfilling its responsibilities for monitoring the implementation of the Taiwan Relations Act and the operation of the Institute.

Sincerely,

MADELEINE K. ALBRIGHT.●

NATIONAL DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AWARENESS MONTH

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, October has been designated National Domestic Violence Awareness Month, and

I rise today to speak briefly about our need to continue our struggle against this national problem.

Mr. President, over the past several years, the Congress, the Clinton administration, our State and local governments, and our community-based organizations have taken enormous steps toward eradicating the scourge of domestic violence—a scourge that for too long had been ignored as a family problem outside the scope of government responsibility. Congress' passage of the Violence Against Women Act [VAWA] as part of the 1994 crime bill, and the wide variety of enforcement and prevention grants available under that legislation, has ensured that our Federal, State, and local authorities have at their disposal the resources and legal authority needed to educate our citizens about domestic violence, and to prosecute those who have chosen to engage in such reprehensible conduct. The administration's development of informational initiatives, such as a toll-free nationwide domestic violence hotline and a Violence Against Women information homepage, have buttressed Congress' efforts, and provided law enforcement officials with a direct link to those who need assistance.

My State of Maryland has been at the forefront of these national efforts to combat domestic violence. With the assistance of over \$400,000 in grant funds made available under the 1994 crime bill, Maryland has formulated its Stop Violence Against Women plan, under which the State identifies cases of domestic abuse, safeguards victims, and coordinates and funds local community responses to incidents of domestic violence. To implement this plan, the Governor's office has established a statewide Family Violence Council, headed by Maryland's attorney general and Lieutenant Governor, which will continue to keep this issue in the public eye and to formulate additional initiatives in this area.

The Federal authorities in Maryland have been no less vigilant in their efforts to combat domestic violence. Maryland's U.S. attorney's office has developed a specific training program for prosecutors on VAWA, has drafted a VAWA manual now available to local law enforcement and community groups, and is in the process of prosecuting only the second interstate stalking case brought under that law.

In short, Federal, State, and local authorities in Maryland, as elsewhere, have embarked on a cooperative effort designed to educate our citizens about the plague of domestic violence, and to bring to justice those who violate our increasingly strict laws in this area.

At the same time, Mr. President, we still have a long way to go before domestic violence is evicted from our homes and communities. Last year alone, almost 4 million women were physically abused by their husbands or boyfriends. Women continue to be the victims of domestic abuse more frequently than they are victims of burglary, muggings, and all other physical