

prohibits the city from sharing space in an existing Federal water delivery canal.

The city of Vallejo simply desires to wheel some of its drinking water through part of the canal serving California's Solano Project, a water project built by the Bureau of Reclamation in the 1950's. Vallejo is prepared to pay any appropriate charges for the use of this facility.

Allowing Vallejo to use the Solano Project should be a simple matter, but it is not. Legislation is required to allow the city to use the Federal water project for carriage of municipal and industrial water.

Congress in recent years has expanded the scope of the Warren Act to apply to other communities in California and Utah where there existed a need for more water management flexibility. The legislation I am introducing today will simply extend similar flexibility to the Solano Project and to the city of Vallejo.

CLEAN AIR STANDARDS WILL ADVERSELY AFFECT OHIO

HON. RALPH REGULA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 1997

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, Vice President GORE recently announced the final adoption of U.S. EPA's clean air standards for ozone and particulate matter. I, like many other members of the Ohio delegation, am particularly concerned with the more stringent regulations' implications on Ohio's economy. Eric Peters' recent editorial published by the Akron Beacon Journal, entitled "Clean-Air Rules: Taking a Bite Out of All Paychecks?" cuts to the heart of this issue.

I encourage my colleagues to take time to read Mr. Peters' comments and to evaluate the impact of these regulations on their congressional districts. Because of the standard's effect on my district, I have cosponsored H.R. 1984, legislation introduced by Representative RON KLINK. The bill would enact a 4-year moratorium on the promulgation of the standards and require EPA to conduct a more complete scientific review of ozone and fine particles.

I urge all my colleagues to consider supporting H.R. 1984. Let's give the current Clean Air Act regulations a chance to continue to clean our Nation's air without further expense and job dislocation to our precious economic base.

[From the Akron Beacon Journal, June 23, 1997]

CLEAN-AIR RULES: TAKING A BITE OUT OF ALL PAYCHECKS?

(By Eric Peters)

If you were disposed to being facetious, you could say the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's proposed new clean-air standards for ozone and particulate matter—English translation: smog and soot—contain both pluses and minuses.

On the one hand, the standards require significantly higher utility bills for American ratepayers and significantly higher price tags on a wide range of manufactured goods for American consumers.

On the other hand, they almost certainly will result in fewer jobs, lower wages and less economic growth.

Don't take my word for it.

Take the word of President Clinton's own Council of Economic Advisers, which pre-

dicts the national costs of reaching full attainment with the EPA standards will total upwards of \$60 billion—far exceeding the \$1 billion value of the benefits it projects. Even in Washington, D.C., a 60:1 ratio of cost to effectiveness is totally out-of-whack.

Indeed, if science and sound economic policy served to guide EPA policy recommendations, the agency's current clean air agenda would never have seen the light of day.

While virtually every state would lose under the Draconian EPA proposals, some states would clearly lose more than others.

The economies of such disparate states as Ohio, Virginia, Illinois, Kentucky, Minnesota, Indiana, West Virginia and Missouri all would receive sledgehammer blows from tighter standards that studies show would produce no overall measurable improvement in the nation's air quality.

Ohio is a particularly good case in point.

Although the Federal EPA estimates that the national compliance costs of its tougher ozone restrictions would be only \$600 million a year, Ohio's Environmental Protection Agency projects that the annual capital expenditures for Ohio utilities alone would exceed \$730 million a year.

The added expenditures would boost utility rates for Ohio ratepayers and consumers by as much as 17 percent in some areas, and would force an average increase of 7 percent throughout the Buckeye State.

Ohio manufacturers also are in a bind.

G&S Titanium, a company in northeast Ohio, desperately needs to expand to satisfy the demands of its current customers. Right now, the company uses the most modern technology available and complies with all Federal and local environmental standards.

It won't be able to comply with the new EPA rules for one simple reason: The technology for complying with the standards isn't available. As Ohio Gov. George V. Voinovich pointed out to a House Commerce Committee hearing last month:

These proposals are creating a catch-22.

"If they (businesses) do not expand," the Republican governor said, "They risk losing customers and market share. If they expand and the new standards are implemented, they risk being out of compliance."

Rep. John Dingell, D-Mich., who long has fretted about the erosion of America's manufacturing base, has urged President Clinton to recall the EPA's new clean-air standards and correct their major defects.

Failure to do so, Dingell observes, will permanently alienate working men and women—and doom the Democratic Party's chances of retaking the U.S. House and Senate.

Officials at the U.S. Departments of Commerce, Transportation and Agriculture, as well as at the Small Business Administration, have echoed Dingell's warnings in private meetings with White House officials.

Nevertheless, EPA Administrator Carol Browner adamantly defends the proposed new rules—particularly her agency's attempt to regulate particulate matter (soot) as tiny as 2.5 microns (about one-fortieth the width of a human hair).

This despite the fact that the Federal Government's own figures show that some 83 percent of all such emission are generated by "fugitive dust," which comes from such benign sources as farmers plowing fields, animals with dandruff and pollen released from flowers, weeds and other fauna.

Most of the remaining 17 percent of particulate matter comes from burning wood, stoked-up barbecues and idling internal-combustion engines that already have reduced emissions by more than 98 percent.

Since the Nation's ambient air quality has improved exponentially over the past two decades, one can only wonder about the

EPA's motives in pursuing standards that are virtually impossible to meet.

Rather than voluntarily cut back its staff and budget and earn grateful applause from American taxpayers, the agency apparently has decided to try its hand at regulating areas and items that literally defy regulation.

POLLUTING A NATIONAL RESOURCE

HON. CHARLIE NORWOOD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 1997

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, on a recent trip to foster environmental partnerships, Vice President AL GORE visited China. This is a nation that burns more than a billion tons of coal a year—one-third more than it did just a decade ago.

As coal burns, it sends millions of tons of carbon dioxide into the atmosphere, where the chemical traps heat and warms the earth. We Americans, though, are in a poor position to cast blame. For every year, the average U.S. resident breathes a portion of the 1,442 million metric tons of carbon the United States emits. Because there are no boundaries in the atmosphere, we breathe the same air into which we casually spill carbon, sulfur dioxide, and other gases. Carbon dioxide invades the air like a filthy pall that blankets the Nation's urban pockets and others throughout the world.

But there is a technology that makes clean air entirely effortless—one that Americans take for granted because its merits too often go unnoted. It is nuclear generation of electricity.

Nuclear energy already supplies 20 percent of the Nation's electricity. And in at least seven States, unplugging that power would darken the majority of the States' homes, industries, and office buildings without a readily available backup supply.

We live in a world where one-third of the world's inhabitants cook, clean, and work without electricity. Within the next two decades, they will seek to change their cycle of energy poverty. A 1996 report by the International Nuclear Societies Council projects that increased energy demand in developing nations will be three times the 1990 level in 2020 and about six times greater than that level by 2050.

It is no surprise that the need will be greatest in the developing world. The cheapest power option is fossil fuel. And who will convince leaders in developing countries that the byproducts of fossil fuels could cause more harm to the environment than good derived from an energy supply that would fuel economic growth?

Each year, U.S. nuclear power plants prevent the discharge of 146 million metric tons of carbon. The power generated by one nuclear plant keeps 1.4 million metric tons of carbon out of our air. Imagine how clean our air would be if nuclear power provided more electricity.

Nuclear power alone isn't the answer. But it is part of an essential mix of energy sources in countries that must assume the responsibility for others that will not or cannot protect our air.

My purpose today is simple, Mr. Speaker. I want to urge action on H.R. 1270, the Nuclear

Waste Policy Act of 1997. This legislation, through its used nuclear fuel management program, would ensure that we can continue to produce energy cleanly at nuclear power plants—many of which are running out of storage capacity for used reactor fuel. This legislation would make us guardians of a cleaner planet. Supporting H.R. 1270 is the right thing to do.

**GILMAN SPONSORS LEGISLATION
URGING WAR CRIMES TRIBUNAL
AGAINST SADDAM HUSSEIN,
HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLU-
TION 137**

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 1997

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to inform my colleagues that today, on behalf of myself and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], I am introducing legislation that calls for the formation of an international criminal tribunal against Saddam Hussein and other members of his despotic and cruel Iraqi regime.

The dictatorship of Saddam Hussein has created an environment of fear and terror within Iraq and throughout the region, with its gross violations of international law and human rights. The people of Iraq are subject to summary and arbitrary execution, torture, and repression of the freedom of speech.

Saddam Hussein is reported to have used chemical weapons to annihilate entire Kurdish villages. Over 182,000 Kurdish civilians disappeared, and over 400 villages have been destroyed in these attacks, known as the Anfal campaigns. The Iraqi use of chemical weapons is the most severe use of such inhumane devices since the First World War. The United States cannot allow such atrocities to go unpunished if we want to prevent the proliferation of these weapons of mass destruction.

Under Saddam Hussein, the Iraqi Government has been particularly active in its persecution of indigenous minority groups. Members of Shiite Muslim groups along with members of the Turkomen minority have been massacred and arrested. Assyro-Chaldean churches have also been destroyed.

A war crimes tribunal will go a long way to eliminate such flouting of international law and treaties. The tribunal would bring Saddam Hussein to justice as well as his henchmen, by prosecuting them for their crimes against humanity. Because the Republic of Iraq is a signatory to both the Geneva Convention and the Universal Declaration on Human Rights, it should be compelled to comply with these obligations.

Moreover, over 600 Kuwaitis who were taken prisoner by Iraqi soldiers during the Persian Gulf war remain unaccounted for. It has been 6 years since the war, and the families of these MIA's deserve answers and the return of their loved ones. Iraq must be made to account for these individuals under the terms of the Geneva Convention.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, it is clear that a war crimes tribunal is necessary. I urge my colleagues to join Congressman PORTER and me by cosponsoring this measure, House Concurrent Resolution 137.

IN HONOR OF CONGREGATION
BETH JACOB

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 1997

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay a respectful tribute to Congregation Beth Jacob of Astoria on the 70th anniversary of its founding. The congregation's history is one of perseverance and growth, supported by a foundation of worship, education, and dedication.

Beth Jacob was founded in 1927 by a small group of Hungarian Jews who were determined to have their own congregation. These founders had very little money and could only afford to erect a fragile, one story structure which leaked badly after the first rain. However, the congregants were determined to have a home.

Their weak structure never fell. In fact, it grew, as did the number of people who prayed there. And in 1938, in the midst of the destruction of synagogues throughout Germany, the growing congregation rebuilt their temple.

In 1951, upon the completion of a second story, Beth Jacob truly began to flourish. At this time, it housed a Hebrew school with 126 students and three teachers. The Yeshiva of West Queens also began at Beth Jacob and had to move when its students overfilled the available classrooms. Worshipers filled the synagogue beyond capacity on holidays.

Since the 1960's, the size of the Jewish community in Astoria has decreased. However, Congregation Beth Jacob has maintained its lively atmosphere, providing a center for Jewish life for residents from Astoria and nearby communities.

Consistent with its tradition of growth, Congregation Beth Jacob now has a young new rabbi, Rabbi Zev Itzkowitz, and is always expanding its educational offerings, including adult classes and special programming.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues rise with me in this tribute to Congregation Beth Jacob as it celebrates 70 years of a most vibrant history. I am honored to have such a thriving synagogue in my district, serving as a center for Jewish life and a home for Jewish education and worship.

INDIA'S 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF
INDEPENDENCE

HON. BOB FILNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 1997

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, August 15, 1997 will mark the 50th anniversary of India's independence, and I, as a United States Congressman, am excited about it.

Why am I excited about another nation's independence? For the same reasons that all Americans should be excited. As the largest democracy in Asia, India is celebrating the very same liberties and values which America cherishes. Over 500 million people turned out for India's free elections. 500 million. That is twice the population of the United States. India is not just a democracy—it is a democratic powerhouse.

I am also excited about India's development as an economic market. As one of the top 10 emerging open markets, India has crossed the threshold of global commercial competition. Large U.S. enterprises such as Coca-Cola, GM, Enron, and Sun Microsystems, among others, are expanding to the Indian Subcontinent, creating employment opportunities for Americans and Indians alike.

Mr. Speaker, America has maintained a strong relationship with India that began long before its independence in 1947. Woodrow Wilson and Franklin D. Roosevelt both championed a free India. We must continue to uphold this friendship and help celebrate this momentous occasion. I urge all Members of Congress and the people of America to join in the festivities sponsored nationwide by Indian-Americans to commemorate India's 50th anniversary of independence. Through this participation, we will strengthen the democratic bonds between our countries and realize the value and potential of India.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2015,
BALANCED BUDGET ACT OF 1997

SPEECH OF

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 1997

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the balanced budget agreement recently negotiated between the President and congressional leaders. And, while this agreement is not perfect in the eyes of many, it is an example of the democratic process and the consensus building and compromise that it embodies. It is an agreement which incorporates all of the principles which I believe are essential in a budget agreement. In this legislation, we will achieve a balanced budget for the first time in a generation, invest in our people for the future, and provide substantial middle-class tax relief.

Four and a half years ago, we set out on a course toward economic recovery, striving to get our fiscal house in order. And, as we revel in our accomplishments on this day, to finish the job of balancing the budget, we must not overlook the magnitude and importance of the 1993 budget plan. For it was that historic and courageous vote that cut the deficit from \$290 billion in 1992 to a projected \$41 billion this year. That comprehensive budget strategy made difficult spending cuts and raised needed revenues by asking our Nation's wealthiest to contribute to our economic recovery. The leadership of the President and the Democratic Congress in adopting that budget plan has contributed to record economic growth, low inflation, the creation of over 12½ million new jobs in our Nation, and a deficit that has shrunk by more than 80 percent. The bipartisan budget plan that we enact today would not be possible had we not made the tough choices, politically and substantively, that we did in 1993.

Mr. Speaker, there are some today who advocate finishing the job of balancing the budget before we enact tax cuts of any kind. Others in the Congress believe that enacting tax cuts will help spur the economy and contribute to the economic stability we all seek. I believe that this is a sound agreement and a good