

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