

SEC. 02. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) implementation of the national ambient air quality standards published in the Federal Register on July 18, 1997 (62 Fed. Reg. 38856), would damage the international competitiveness of the United States manufacturing industry and effectively subsidize imports, penalize exports, and add to an already large United States trade deficit;

(2) Public Law 101-549 (commonly known as the "Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990") (104 Stat. 2399) established a number of measures and programs that address ozone and particulate matter pollution and the precursors to ozone and particulate matter pollution;

(3) as of the date of enactment of this Act, most of the measures and programs are continuing or have yet to be implemented;

(4) the United States has made significant progress in reducing atmospheric levels of ozone and particulate matter since the enactment of Public Law 101-549 and will continue to make significant progress in reducing atmospheric levels of ozone and particulate matter through continued implementation of that Act during the 5-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act;

(5)(A) the national ambient air quality standards for ozone that were in effect on July 15, 1997, are explicitly incorporated into part D of title I of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7501 et seq.); and

(B) the changes to those standards published in the Federal Register on July 18, 1997 (62 Fed. Reg. 38856), could nullify many of the ozone provisions in Public Law 101-549 and lead to disruptions and delays in the reduction of ozone and the precursors to ozone;

(6) the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency and the Clean Air Scientific Advisory Committee have recommended that additional research be conducted to determine any adverse health effects of fine particles (including research on the biological mechanism for adverse health effects, toxicity and dose response levels, and the specification of the size and type of particle that might have adverse health effects); and

(7) available atmospheric data regarding fine particle levels in the United States are inadequate to provide an understanding of any adverse health effects of fine particles or a basis for designating areas under title I of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7401 et seq.).

SEC. 03. PARTICULATE MATTER RESEARCH PROGRAM.

(a) INDEPENDENT PANEL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency (referred to in this title as the "Administrator") shall request the National Academy of Sciences to convene an independent panel of scientists with expertise in the health effects of air pollution to establish priorities for research on the health effects of particulate matter.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than February 1, 1998, the Administrator shall report to Congress on the recommendations of the independent panel.

(b) RESEARCH PRIORITIES.—At a minimum, the independent panel shall consider—

(1) the sizes and physical-chemical characteristics of the constituents of particulate matter;

(2) the health effects of individual exposure to concentrations of fine particulate matter at ambient levels versus indoor levels;

(3) the identification and evaluation of biological mechanisms for fine particulate matter as related to shortening of lives, acute mortality, and morbidity;

(4) controlled inhalation exposure as a determinant of dose-response relationships; and

(5) long-term health effect evaluations that examine individual exposure to fine particulate matter, other particulate indicators, and other copollutants and airborne allergens.

(c) INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the President shall establish a committee to be known as the "Particulate Matter Interagency Committee" (referred to in this title as the "Interagency Committee").

(2) PURPOSES.—The Interagency Committee shall—

(A) not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, develop recommendations for a program to coordinate the activities of Federal agencies engaged in research on human health effects of particulate matter that ensures that the research advances the prioritized agenda of the independent panel; and

(B) monitor, review, and periodically evaluate the program.

(3) COMPOSITION OF INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE.—

(A) MEMBERSHIP.—The Interagency Committee shall be composed of 8 members, of whom—

(i) 1 shall be appointed by the Administrator;

(ii) 1 shall be appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture;

(iii) 1 shall be appointed by the Secretary of Defense;

(iv) 1 shall be appointed by the Secretary of Energy;

(v) 1 shall be appointed by the Secretary of Health and Human Services;

(vi) 1 shall be appointed by the Director of the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences;

(vii) 1 shall be appointed by the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology; and

(viii) 1 shall be appointed by the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy.

(B) CHAIRPERSON.—From among the members appointed under clauses (ii) through (viii) of subparagraph (A), the Interagency Committee shall elect a chairperson who shall be responsible for ensuring that the duties of the Interagency Committee are carried out.

(C) STAFF.—Members of the Interagency Committee shall provide appropriate staff to carry out the duties of the Interagency Committee.

(d) REPORT TO INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall request the National Academy of Sciences to periodically submit to the Interagency Committee, the Clean Air Science Advisory Committee, and Congress a report that evaluates the prioritized research activities under the program described in subsection (c)(2)(A).

(2) EXPENSES.—The Administrator shall be responsible for expenses incurred by the National Academy of Sciences in carrying out paragraph (1).

SEC. 04. SCIENCE REVIEW.

Not earlier than 4 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall—

(1) complete a thorough review of the air quality criteria published under section 108 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7408) for ozone and fine particulate matter and a thorough review of the standards in effect under that Act for ozone and particulate matter; and

(2) determine, in accordance with sections 108 and 109 of that Act (42 U.S.C. 7408, 7409), whether to—

(A) retain the criteria and standards in effect under that Act for ozone and particulate matter;

(B) make revisions in the criteria and standards; or

(C) promulgate new criteria and standards.

SEC. 05. PARTICULATE MONITORING PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator may require State implementation plans to require ambient air quality monitoring for fine particulate matter pursuant to section 110(a)(2)(B) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7410(a)(2)(B)).

(b) GRANTS.—The Administrator shall make grants to States to carry out monitoring required under subsection (a).

SEC. 06. REINSTATEMENT OF STANDARDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The national ambient air quality standards for ozone and particulate matter under section 109 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7409), as in effect on July 15, 1997, are reinstated, and any national ambient air quality standard for ozone or particulate matter that may be promulgated after July 15, 1997, but before completion of the science review under section 4 shall be of no effect.

(b) REVISION OF STANDARDS.—The national ambient air quality standards for ozone and particulate matter reinstated under subsection (a) shall not be revised until completion of the scientific review under section 04.

SEC. 07. ALLERGEN RESEARCH.

The National Institutes of Health shall carry out a research program to study the health effects of allergens on asthmatics, especially asthmatics in urban inner city areas.

SEC. 08. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated for each of fiscal years 1998 through 2002—

(1) \$75,000,000 to carry out sections 01 through 06; and

(2) \$25,000,000 to carry out section 07.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I will make the same request that the Senator from North Dakota did. I will be wanting to come back and take up this amendment. I ask at this time it be set aside.

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

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a period of morning business until 5 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak for up to 15 minutes each.

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

Mr. BYRD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to speak for not to exceed 10 minutes.

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

SENATOR DASCHLE'S 50TH BIRTHDAY

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, South Dakota is a quiet state. Its cities are neither heralded in poetry like Carl Sandberg's "big shouldered" Chicago nor celebrated in song like New York and San Francisco. It is, nonetheless, a state of stunningly varied beauty, showcased in the wildflower-sprinkled

long grass prairie. It still boasts free-ranging herds of bison; and in the wind-and water-carved Badlands that glow with sunset colors under the azure skies. It can be a lonely state, with long ribbons of tarmac linking small towns for years haunted by the brooding presence of nuclear-tipped intercontinental range missiles and blanketed by driving snowstorms in winter. Strong-willed and resilient personalities are required to flourish in South Dakota, and she is blessed with such citizens. One of those strong-willed, resilient South Dakotans ably serves both the State of South Dakota and the United States Senate, where he will soon celebrate both the fourth anniversary of his election as Democratic Leader and the 50th anniversary of his birth in Aberdeen, South Dakota.

Ah, Mr. President—oh, just to be 50 again. I would be calling back almost 30 years in that event.

I am sure that everyone here would agree that Senator TOM DASCHLE is strong-willed and resilient. Indeed, Senator DASCHLE's virtues are common to those who claim the Mount Rushmore State as their home. Like the many ranchers and farmers who live in South Dakota, Senator DASCHLE is a patient, hard-working man who knows that one must toil today so that one may reap the fruits of one's labors tomorrow. And, as befits a man who hails from one of the country's most sparsely populated states, in which a majority of the inhabitants are rurally located, Senator DASCHLE is quiet, self-contained, independent and plain-spoken. Despite his quiet reserve, however, Senator DASCHLE is a warm and friendly man; these qualities well suit the resident of a state whose name derives from the Sioux word for "friends" or "allies."

I hope that Senator DASCHLE will permit me to indulge in a flight of fantasy by pointing out that he shares many of the geographic and meteorological characteristics of his state. Like a South Dakota blizzard, he is capable of driving the Senate with authority, but like the tall grass prairie, he is also capable of bending with the winds of change, adapting and modifying issues in order to reach a common consensus. Like the famed Black Hills of South Dakota, Senator DASCHLE possesses an implacable reserve; and, as befits the representative of a state which stands geographically at the center of our Union, he has claimed for himself the ideological middle-ground of this body and this country. As I list these many and varied characteristics, it occurs to me that here is truly a fitting embodiment of the state whose changeable climate and diverse geography have resulted in the appellation "the Land of Infinite Variety."

From the many and varied characteristics that I have enumerated, I wish to pluck one that best captures the essence of Senator DASCHLE. I refer to his quietness. Quietness is an underrated

and sadly uncommon trait, in this chamber and in this nation. Under-rated, perhaps, because it is often mistaken for timidity or lack of conviction; we Americans at times place too much faith in the hearty optimism and aggressive self-confidence of the extrovert. But the true optimist, the truly confident person, has no need for bluster or vituperation. Thus the Bible instructs us in Thessalonians 4:11, "Study to be quiet, and to do your own business." And Shakespeare, whose poetry and prose remain a bounteous font of wisdom, also said "truth hath a quiet breast." Indeed, truth does have a quiet breast, and the heart that beats within that breast is no more steady, dependable, diligent, or uncomplaining than is the senior Senator from South Dakota.

For many persons, turning 50—as my friend from South Dakota will do on December 9th—marks an important milestone along the road of life, prompting thoughts about where one is heading and what one has accomplished. I know that Senator DASCHLE will not have to concern himself on the latter score, for his accomplishments are both numerous and widely acknowledged. A champion of veterans, a dedicated friend to farmers, an ally of Indians, and a powerful advocate of providing affordable health care to all Americans, Senator DASCHLE has proved time and time again his willingness to fight for those who are unable to fight for themselves. His courage and persistence in these endeavors may, perhaps, be traced to his service in the U.S. Air Force, which provides further evidence—as if more were needed!—of Senator DASCHLE's dedication to his country.

Clearly, Senator DASCHLE has no reason to concern himself on his upcoming birthday with fears that he has achieved too little. But what of that other concern I alluded to a few minutes ago, the sudden realization common to many fledgling quinquagenarians that they are leaving the comfortable environs of middle age and entering a new, unfamiliar, untested territory? I do not know whether Senator DASCHLE is experiencing such intimations of mortality—if he were, he would doubtless be loath to admit it—but I feel that on this account I may set his mind to rest. Allow me to offer a little of the perspective on aging that is the prerogative of those, like myself, who are more advanced in years.

For when I entered my 50th year, the Senate was a far different place than it is today. Senators were then paid \$30,000 a year. Senators Mike Mansfield of Montana and Everett Dirksen of Illinois presided masterfully over their respective parties in the Senate. It was a turbulent time nationally, and that turbulence was mirrored in the Senate. Senator Eugene McCarthy stormed out of one particularly contentious meeting of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, angered over the Presi-

dent's Vietnam policy. That same year, spectators dropped a flood of anti-Vietnam War literature from the galleries to protest a conflict that had already killed over 10,000 American soldiers; the Senate responded by, for the first time, banning demonstrations within the Capitol, and I joined in that protest against demonstrations in the galleries, as I think Senators who know me would understand that I would.

On a more positive note, that year also saw several important milestones in the history of the Senate. Maine's Margaret Chase Smith became the first woman elected to a leadership position in the Senate when she won a unanimous vote to be Chairman of the Republican Conference. That same year, the first black Senator in years, Edward W. Brooke of Massachusetts, was sworn in. Senator Brooke was not only the first black Senator since Reconstruction; he was also the first from a northern state and the first to be popularly elected to the Senate.

I hope, in suggesting how the Senate has changed since my 50th year, that I have both reminded Senator DASCHLE of his youth and suggested the breadth of change that he will inevitably see in this chamber over the next few decades. For if South Dakotans in their wisdom deem it, Senator DASCHLE may continue to toil in this chamber for many years to come, and I look forward to working with him as he builds upon his achievements. So today, before the Senate adjourns this session, allow me to look ahead to the ninth of December and wish my friend Tom Daschle a very happy 50th birthday.

To TOM personally, may I say:

The hours are like a string of pearls,
The days like diamonds rare,
The moments are the threads of gold,
That bind them for our wear,
So may the years that come to you
Such wealth and good contain
That every moment, hour and day
Be like a golden chain.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. DASCHLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I am very honored, very grateful and, I must say, humbled by the generous remarks of the very distinguished Senator from West Virginia, my friend, Senator BYRD. I can't think of a more pleasant way to ease my way into the half-century realization than to listen to the eloquence of this masterful speaker and legislator. I cannot think of a better gift to be given than the respect shown to me by Senator BYRD in the way that he has just expressed.

It has now been my good fortune to serve in the Senate for 10 years. As I continue to serve, my respect for him, the education I receive from him, the opportunities that I have in serving with him continue to excite me and provide what I consider to be some of the greatest experiences that I share in the Senate.

Someone once said that life has no blessing like that of a good friend. If

that is indeed true, then I have been richly blessed by my friends on both sides of the aisle in the U.S. Senate, but among them, there is no friendship for which I have greater pride and for which I treasure more than the friendship that I have been blessed to receive from the distinguished Senator from West Virginia.

So, I thank him for his kind words, for his eloquence, for the respect that he has shown me and also for being such an extraordinary instructor, not only to me, but to all the Members of the Senate as he continues to serve in such a magnificent way as the senior Senator from the State of West Virginia.

I yield the floor.

Mr. ASHCROFT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. ASHCROFT. Thank you, Mr. President.

NATIONAL TESTING

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I rise to speak of the need to preserve and protect the intense vital involvement of parents in decisionmaking in local schools all across America. If America is to succeed in the next generation, we have to have the capacity to have the kind of schools that meet the needs of our students. We will have to have the ability to experiment from one school district to another. We will have to have State and local governments that can tailor the programs which they have to meet the demands of their unique settings.

Sometimes when we think about achievement, sometimes when we think about success, we think it might be necessary to try and impose the so-called "wisdom of Washington" upon the Nation generally. But, I think that temptation ought to quickly fly from us if we would think of what would have happened, for instance, if we decided there needed to be a single uniform type of computer and we had imposed it from Washington saying there would just be one way of doing things. Maybe we would have chosen Apple computers and their way of doing things instead of IBM and their way of doing things. Or maybe we would have chosen a single software company and said that is the only way it could be handled, and we wouldn't have the flourishing and the flowering and the kind of intense opportunity and plurality for the generation of marvelous alternatives that have made America the far and away overwhelming leader in terms of the technology.

I think whenever we feel that temptation to draw to Washington, DC, the decisionmaking and the prerogative of developing for the Nation a single uniform policy which would take the diversity and the creativity out of the system and would cheat America of the vital creativity and opportunity that is expressed when people at the local level are involved, whenever we have

that temptation, we should think about how bad it would be in so many areas had we had that kind of policy.

America's ability to flourish as a success reflects the diversity of this country and the ability of different groups of individuals to approach things differently and to do so successfully. Not only does it provide for us an energy which carries us to excellence, it also means that we don't ever have all of our eggs in a single basket. We have the capacity to meet a variety of challenges. We have innovative and creative thinking. We have the capacity to look at things from different points of view.

One of the things that the President sought to bring to the United States—and I think his intention was good—was he wanted to improve education, by bringing to us national testing, testing of students on an individual basis all across America with a uniform test promulgated by bureaucrats in Washington, a single test which would, unfortunately, chart the direction of education all across the country.

When you make a test, you decide that you are testing for something. So if you are going to make up a test that is going to be imposed on the country, you are going to be testing for something and you have to define what you are testing for.

So the development of a test, although it might not seem to be at first blush, is really the development of a curriculum. If you decide what you are going to test for, you have to decide what you are going to teach. Once you decide what you are going to teach, you have established a national curriculum.

Oddly enough, even deciding what you are going to teach probably isn't all that is controlled with the development of a test.

The development of a test probably decides how you are going to teach it, because if you teach English, for instance, with phonics, teach people how letters sound together, and combinations and the like, that is one way of teaching the English language and would be tested differently than teaching the English language with the so-called whole language approach where you just have the recognition of words by rote or memorization.

So when you have something like a national test proposed, you have to understand that you are talking about uniformity, that you are going to impose a single system all across the country, going to make everybody pretty much the same, you are going to deprive the system of the creativity and the vitality and diversity of what a lot of different folks can do when they are working simultaneously on a problem.

Second, you are not only going to have uniformity, but you are going to determine from Washington, DC—if you have a uniform test, you are going to have a uniform curriculum. What to

teach and how to teach it then becomes a uniform decision by bureaucrats. Because in order to test accurately, you have to know exactly what you are teaching and, of course, what you are teaching for will depend on how you are teaching.

It troubles me to think that we might take these most fundamental decisions in education and pry them from the prerogative of parents and move them to the educators or bureaucrats of Washington, DC.

As a matter of fact, the bureaucrats, educational bureaucrats, in Washington, DC, do not have a very good record. The bureaucrats in Washington, DC, run a couple school systems. We know that.

As a matter of fact, they run the Department of Defense Dependent School System. A year or two ago they tried to put the so-called whole math into that system. The results were devastating. The median percentile computation scores on the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills taken by more than 37,000 Department of Defense dependent school students, 1 year after the Defense Department introduced whole math, dropped 14 percent for third graders—this is the median percentile score—dropped 20 percent for fourth graders, 20 percent for fifth graders, 17 percent for sixth graders, and 17 percent for seventh graders. One year's implementation of a fad, of the new whole math, devastated the performance of those students.

I am not sure we want to yield the control of our public schools to the Federal Government so we can have that kind of devastating impact. I sure do not.

Maybe, if you think the Federal Government does things particularly well, you should look at another school system which the Federal Government runs. It is called the District of Columbia School System, where, I think, we have the highest per capita expenditure on students anywhere in the world, and we have some of the lowest achievement levels.

What I am trying to say is, we do not need to forfeit to the Federal bureaucracy in Washington, DC, the decisionmaking in education of what to teach and how to teach it, and we need far less to take parents out of the equation.

Some people might not understand the value of parents in education, but there has been a lot of work in the educational research area about the value of parents in education. A 1980 report in "Psychology in the Schools" shows that family involvement improved Chicago elementary schoolchildren's performance in reading comprehension dramatically.

One year after initiating a Chicago citywide program aimed at helping parents create academic support conditions in the home, students in grades one through six "intensively exposed to the program" improved .5 to .6 grade equivalents in reading comprehension