billions of people around the world. We are affected by the actions of other countries that create ozone depleting substances, overfish and dump low-level radioactive waste in the world's oceans, deplete our world's rainforests, and stress our Earth's ecosystem through overpopulation.

Secretary Christopher pointed out that the needs of the American people are not well served if our foreign policy does not address these global concerns—we may be ''Americans,'' but we live on a planet that does not recognize geopolitical boundaries.

In his speech, Secretary Christopher pointed out that environmental forces not only ''transcend borders and oceans to threaten directly the health, prosperity and jobs of American citizens,'' but that ''addressing natural resource issues is frequently critical to achieving political and economic stability and to pursuing our strategic goals around the world.'' He then outlined a series of initiatives the State Department will undertake to advance America's global environmental goals.

Through the State Department and Secretary Christopher's leadership, the United States is working to reform and strengthen the U.N.'s key environmental and sustainable development programs. We have joined forces with the World Bank to incorporate sound environmental policies in lending programs, and to fund projects through the global environmental facility that directly benefit our health and prosperity. In addition, we are striving through the new World Trade Organization to reconcile the complex tensions between promoting trade and protecting the environment.

We can look forward to a cleaner and healthier global environment in 1997. The State Department has begun negotiating global agreements to make further cuts in greenhouse gases, to address problems caused by migrating toxic chemicals, to promote sustainable management of our world's forests, to preserve biodiversity, and to safeguard ocean resources. The State Department is also taking steps to address scarce resource and overpopulation issues that are putting further stress on our environment and the environment our children will inherit.

Through the State Department the United States is recognizing the importance of working bilaterally with key private, government, and nongovernment partners around the world to jointly address environmental concerns. In India, we are investing in environmental technologies and controlling pesticides. In Brazil, we are working to improve the management of forest resources. In Russia, we are promoting the safe operation of nuclear reactors and safe storage of nuclear waste. In fact, we are even using satellite imagery once used to spot missiles and tanks to help clean up military bases and track ocean pollution.

As Secretary Christopher so eloquently stated:

> Our strength as a nation has always been to harness our democracy to meet new threats to our security and prosperity. Our creed as a people has always been to make tomorrow better for ourselves and for our children.

For the sake of future generations, we must meet the challenge of making global environmental issues a vital part of our foreign policy. By advancing these environmental goals, we have the opportunity to protect our Nation and make it truly free. The policies set forth by Secretary Christopher are far reaching. They are the necessary mission for the United States to carry forward. I rise in recognition and with deep respect for what Secretary Christopher has set forth. It is environmental statecraft.

THE BARTON CLEAN AIR ACT AMENDMENTS

HON. ROSA L. DELAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1996

Ms. DeLAURO. Mr. Speaker, on May 23, H.R. 3519 was introduced to amend the Clean Air Act. Its sponsor characterized his bill as ''minor,'' saying it in no way changes compliance timetables or standards, but ''simply provides more flexibility in doing so.''

I disagree. In short, the bill repeals the most fundamental aspect of Federal clean air standards—protection of public health. This bill is a polluter's dream.

The congressional majority's vision statement for the 104th Congress states that Republicans support air and water that is clean and safe. But if you read the fine print, the majority's agenda says that they support clean water and clean air as long as achieving it can be accomplished cheaply.

Everyone supports the bill's emphasis on the use of innovative technologies to achieve clean air standards. The problem with H.R. 3519 is that it eliminates pollution monitoring and turns off pollution controls except when the air is at its dirtiest.

Under H.R. 3519, major sources of pollution would no longer be subject to regulation. The Federal Government would no longer enforce healthy air requirements for States and localities. In addition, the bill would give polluters 10 years to clean up pollution that is causing health hazards, including cancer, today.

The fact is that this bill substantially repeals key provisions of the 1990 Clean Air Act Amendments signed by President Bush, and the fundamental principles of the original Clean Air Act signed by President Nixon.

The American public believes that the air should be clean enough to breathe safely. The American public also believes that the Government has a responsibility to set clean air standard which guarantee health protection. And the American public does not believe that the science of health should be compromised by cost alone.

For 25 years, clean air health standards have been based solely on the best scientific evidence available as to the impact of air pollution on the health of people. Congress has provided that cost considerations are appropriate when determining how quickly those standards should be achieved.

But now H.R. 3519 says that the health of people should no longer be the driving force behind our clean air programs. If the air is unhealthy but there is a cost of clean up, the health standards—not the pollution levels—should be modified.

For 25 years, no serious legislation proposed compromised health science on the basis of economics. For 25 years, no legislation proposed that basic scientific data on health effects be ignored. Yet this Congress is likely to vote on a bill that changes the rules so polluters won't have to protect health.

Americans need to send Congress the message that their health is not for sale to special interest groups. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the Texas Observer article ''It's the Environment, Stupid,'' be printed in the RECORD so Americans know how important their response to this bill is to protect their environment and health. Thank you.

[From the Texas Observer, June 14 1996]

IT'S THE ENVIRONMENT, STUPID

(By Louis DuBose)

Phil Gramm got the message in January when his pollster advised him that Republican voters don't trust their own party on environmental issues. Pollsters now trying to determine what will drive November's elections are discovering that environmental issues are a real public concern. Even Newt Gingrich is beginning to get it. The Speaker crossed the Potomac to salute environmental corps kid volunteers working on Roosevelt Island, and traveled to New York to embrace a panic-stricken wild pig on the ''Tonight Show.'' All of this to convince the public that Republicans are not enemies of the environment. And in Congress, the party is backing away from its assault on environmental protections—at least until after November's elections.

But Congressman Joe Barton—two years ago Phil Gramm's choice to replace Texas Republican Party Chair Fred Meyer, after fundamentalist Christians declared Meyer unworthy—is an exception. Barton recently filed the ''Clean Air Act Amendments of 1996,'' perhaps thinking that a bill filed so late in the session would not attract too much attention. He got caught. Frank O'Donnell of the Clean Air Trust got wind of Barton's bad air bill and began faxing it to media outlets around the country. ''It is very unlikely that the bill will get anywhere this late in the session,'' O'Donnell said. He added that he suspects that Barton is staking out a position for 1997, when the law will be reauthorized. But even O'Donnell admits he is surprised by Barton's timing, which could create problems for Republicans in November.

Perhaps Barton is determined, O'Donnell said, ''to complete the 'Texas Toxic Trilogy.' First congressman Tom DeLay proposed repealing the entire 1990 clean air law. Then Congressman Steve Stockman tried to pretend dirty air doesn't exist. And now Congressman Barton wants to repeal the heart of the 1970 Clean Air Act.''

Barton's legislation is aimed right at the heart of the 1970 law, a milestone in environmental legislation that established clean air ''standards'' that states are required to meet. Barton's bill replaces specific standards with vague ''goals''—a small semantic change that completely undermines the philosophy of the country's most basic clean air law.

But this is not merely an ideologue's philosophical assault on a law that passed with broad pubic and congressional consensus—after protracted negotiations that included environmentalists and representatives of industry. Barton has put together a technical bill, loaded with the same minutiae lobbyists wrote into Tom DeLay's bills—while they set up shop in his House office at the beginning of this congressional session.

Consider, for example, the following verbiage:

''If, based on photochemical grid modeling demonstrations of any other analytical method determined by the Administrator to be as effective, the Administrator determines that the area is a down-wind nonattainment area receiving ozone or ozone precursor transport from outside the area and control of ozone concentrations or beyond the ability of the area to control because volatile organic compounds and oxides

of nitrogen from sources within such do not make a significant contribution to ozone concentrations in such area (or in any other nonattainment area), the Administrator may redesignate the area as in attainment or having a lower classification.

Which, if properly punctuated, would mean: if it can be established that most of the pollution in a region comes from elsewhere—for example, chemical plants and refineries on the other side Galveston Bay—the air in that region could be declared clean.

Predictably enough, such a declaration would make the air dirtier, because declaring an area ''in attainment'' means lifting environmental restrictions and allowing more local contamination of air already badly polluted by upwind sources. Barton's Bad Air Bill is filled with provisions like this one—in which ''attainment'' of clean-air standards is achieved by cleaning up the language of the law, rather than cleaning up the environment.

When (to cite another example of Barton's peculiar logic) the EPA establishes air quality goals for a region, ''infrequent episodic variations in air pollution levels that are cause by weather'' must be excluded from any clean-air calculus. So in Fort Worth, Dallas, Houston, San Antonio, and El Paso that will mean the elimination of protections against dangerously high summer ozone levels—rather than the elimination of dangerously high ozone levels. ''To create ozone,'' O'Donnell, ''you do need sunlight, which cooks the stuff, but you also need a source of pollution.'' Barton's bill ignores those sources of pollution and assumes that, like the weather, man-made pollution cannot be controlled. The result of such twisted logic can only be more air pollution.

More illogic? ''The [EPA] Administrator may not require that emissions of oxides of nitrogen from baseline vehicles using the reformulated gasoline be less than emissions from such vehicles when using baseline gasoline.'' Leave it to an EPA reg-writer to parse this sentence, which establishes that the quality of emissions are the same—when they aren't. It's just one small part of the bill's broad assault on reformulated gasoline requirements—a two stage program designed to lower tailpipe emissions. The first phase was put in place last year and regulations for implementation of phase two are not yet complete, and might not be if Barton, who once worked as a consultant for Atlantic Richfield, has his way. ''This will roll back a program already on the books that hasn't kicked in yet,'' O'Donnell said.

Perhaps the loopiest provision—it's tough to pick one—allows pollution control devices voluntarily installed ''prior to the designation of the area as a non-arraignment area to be credited as additional reductions. * * *'' But if air pollution in a region is too high, how does a pollution-control device already in place and working reduce it any further? Or is ''to be credited as'' what this is all about?

To be fair, not every provision in the bill is as circumspect as those already cited. A straightforward, two-line change extends from five to ten years the time in which a plant can operate without being subject to permit revisions; some revisions simply change must to may—for sanctions or requirements. And no bill like this one would be complete without the standard ''cost-benefit-analysis'' provision. Barton would ''require'' regulators to prove that ''the incremental costs of attaining [a] standard do not exceed the incremental benefits of attaining the standard.'' These provisions always provide an advantage to industry, which can provide exact figures of retrofitting a refinery with pollution control devices, then challenge whoever represents the public interest these days to predict and calculate long-term savings in public health, and quality of life—which has no dollar-equivalent market value.

What's driving Joe Barton's attempt to dismantle the Clean Air Act? The odd configuration of his Central Texas district provides him a completely safe seat, which he won by seventy-six percent in the last election; he's a true believer in the conservative agenda, and he's an engineer who understands this stuff better than, say, the average consumer of air. Yet it seems impolitic for someone who ran as the Washington candidate for the state Republican Party chair in 1994 to burden his party with another bad environmental bill—just as the 1996 election campaigns get underway. Maybe Tom Pauken, the fundamentalist Christian (charismatic Catholic variety) who defeated Barton two years ago, was correct when he argued that Barton was too much a Washington insider—too influenced by ''inside the Beltway culture.''

Pauken got it almost right during his fervent three-day state convention campaign. But the Washington culture he derided as the culture ''of big government'' is really the culture of big corporations. After twelve years in Congress Joe Barton understands that culture. And he has engaged in a bit of cost-and-benefit analysis that reads something like this: It costs him nothing to carry a bad environmental bill. The benefits, in contributions from the polluters PACs listed below, simply outweigh what his legislation will cost his party—and the breathing public.

Selected polluter PAC supporters of Congressman Joe Barton, 1995–1996

Air Products and Chemicals, Inc	$1,000
Alabama Power Company/Southern Company	250
American Electric Power Company	500
American Portland Cement Alliance, Inc	1,000
American Trucking Association	2,000
Amoco Corporation	1,000
Arizona Public Service Company	500
Ash Grove Cement Company	500
Atlantic Richfield Company	2,000
American Gas Association	1,000
Baltimore Gas and Electric Company	1,000
BP America	1,000
Burlington Resources/Meridian Oil	1,500
Carolina Power & Light Company	1,000
Cement Kiln Recycling Coalition	1,000
Centerior Energy Corporation	250
Chrysler Corporation	1,000
COALPAC/National Mining Association	1,000
Columbia Hydrocarbon Corporation	1,500
Commonwealth Edison Company	1,500
Consolidated Natural Gas Service Company, Inc	1,000
Consumers Power Company	1,000
Dominion Resources Inc./Virginia Power Company	500
Detroit Edison	1,000
Duquesn Light Company	1,000
Edison Electric Institute	500
E.I. DuPont de Nemours and Company	2,500
El Paso Natural Gas Company	1,000
Elf Atochem North America, Inc	2,000
Entergy Corporation	500
Entergy Operations, Inc	500
Enron Corporation	2,012
Exxon Corporation	1,000
Fina Oil and Chemical Company	500
Ford Motor Corporation	1,000
Florida Power Corporation	500
Florida Power & Light Company	2,000
Flour Corporation	4,000
General Public Utilities Corporation	500
Hoechst Celanese Corporation	1,000
Houston Industries, Inc	4,759
Intel Corporation	250
Interstate Natural Gas Association of America	1,000
Kansas City Southern Industries, Inc	500
Kerr-McGee Corporation	500
LaFarge Corporation	100
Marathon Oil Company/USX Corporation	1,500
Mobil Oil Corporation	500
National Automobile Dealers Association	4,000
New England Power Service Company	500
North American Coal Corporation	250
Northeast Utilities Service Corporation	500
Occidental Petroleum Corporation	1,000
Ohio Edison Company	500
Pacific Gas and Electric Company	1,000
Panhandle Eastern Corporation	2,000
PECO Energy Company	500
Pennzoil Company	500
Phillips Petroleum Company	1,000
PSI Energy Inc./Cinergy Corporation	500
Public Service Electric and Gas Company	200
Shell Oil Company	1,500
Society of Independent Gasoline Marketers of America	1,000
Southdown Inc	1,000
Southern California Edison Company	2,000
Southern Company	750
Southwestern Public Service Company	500
Tenneco Inc	1,000
Texaco Inc	1,000
Texas Utilities Company	500
Texas-New Mexico Power Company	500
USX Corporation	500
Valero Energy Corporation	3,000
Westinghouse Electric Corporation	1,500
Weyerhaeuser Company	1,000

Source: Federal Election Commission.

A TRIBUTE IN HONOR OF BASILLIO VILLARREAL, FORMER MAYOR OF RIO GRANDE CITY, TX

HON. FRANK TEJEDA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1996

Mr. TEJEDA. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to honor an outstanding individual from Rio Grande City, TX, who in words and deed exemplifies strong leadership and an uncompromising dedication to positive values. Basillio Villarreal, who recently retired as mayor of Rio Grande City, is a hard-working businessman who dedicated his life to his business, family, and community. I take this opportunity to acknowledge his many accomplishments and thank him for his efforts.

Mayor Villarreal was the first mayor in Rio Grande City in more than 60 years. He fought hard for the reincorporation of Rio Grande City, after decades without a city charter. As the first mayor of this newly re-incorporated city, Mayor Villarreal combined his vision for the city with the courage necessary to make real progress for the community. As mayor, Basillio Villarreal took on the difficult task of organizing the structure of city government in Rio Grande City, and he proposed establishing effective police and fire departments. He knew the value and importance of public safety and made it a priority within his public agenda. He established and then required strict adherence to new ethics standards for city employees. He expected no less of himself, always proud to uphold a strong personal code of honor.