

In summary, all who know him or know of him will surely agree that Frank Veltri is an extraordinary individual. His tireless devotion to the residents of South Florida will be forever remembered. We all owe him a tremendous debt of gratitude.

#### THE KYOTO PROTOCOL

### HON. KEN CALVERT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, October 8, 1998*

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, last December I attended the international global warming summit in Kyoto, Japan. I took with me to the meeting information I had gathered at three hearings I convened in my Science Subcommittee on Energy and the Environment. At those hearings, where the Subcommittee took testimony from experts in climatology, it became obvious that there is no clear scientific consensus on which the Administration can base its claim that human-induced global warming is harming our planet.

Over the next few days I will submit for the RECORD portions of studies that bring to light the weaknesses in the Kyoto Protocol. Today, I am submitting an Executive Summary of an analysis of the agreement conducted by the Business Roundtable. The summary gives an excellent account of the key issues of concern regarding the Protocol, making clear that the agreement has serious flaws in terms of its ability to improve the environment without harming the economy:

#### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF THE KYOTO PROTOCOL: A GAP ANALYSIS

In an in-depth analysis of an international agreement to curb greenhouse-gas emissions, The Business Roundtable finds that the accord, known as the Kyoto Protocol, contains major gaps that must be filled before its impact on the world's environment and economy can be evaluated. The Business Roundtable recognizes that the Protocol is only a first step toward a comprehensive agreement to reduce emissions, but urges the Clinton Administration not to sign the Kyoto Protocol until these gaps have been addressed.

Background: On December 11, 1997, in Kyoto, Japan, the Parties to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change reached an agreement, known as the Kyoto Protocol, that sets legally binding limits on the mandated emissions of greenhouse gases from 38 industrialized countries. Global carbon emissions would continue to increase under the agreement because it exempts Developing Countries—including China, India, Mexico, Brazil, and 130 others—from any commitments to limit their rapidly growing emissions. Continued growth in energy demand, and thus greenhouse-gas emissions, by Developing Countries will more than offset the reductions made by Developed Countries. President Clinton is expected to sign the Kyoto Protocol later this year, but he does not intend to submit the agreement to the Senate for its constitutional role of advice and consent until "key" Developing Countries agree to "participate meaningfully" in the effort.

#### KEY ISSUES OF CONCERN

The targets and timetables would require the United States to make significant and immediate cuts in energy use. The Protocol would require the U.S. to reduce emissions 7 percent below 1990 levels by 2008-2012, an unprecedented 41 percent reduction in pro-

jected emission levels. The process of Senate ratification and the subsequent lengthy domestic implementation process post-ratification would leave the U.S. very little time to make the painful choices regarding energy use that will be necessary to achieve these reductions. In addition, because the Protocol sets different targets for each industrialized country and the target is based on what is now an eight-year old baseline, the U.S. in effect will shoulder a disproportionate level of reduction and may be placed at a competitive disadvantage.

Unless the Developing Countries also commit to emission reductions, the Protocol is incomplete and will not work. The Byrd-Hagel Resolution unanimously adopted by the U.S. Senate in July 1997 states that the U.S. should not be a signatory to any protocol unless it mandates "new specific scheduled commitments to limit or reduce greenhouse-gas emissions for the Developing Country Parties within the same compliance period." Many Developing Countries are rapidly growing their economies and will become the largest emitters of greenhouse gases in the next 15-20 years. Greenhouse gases know no boundaries, and stabilization of greenhouse-gas concentrations cannot be achieved without global participation in a limitation-reduction effort. Moreover, regulating the emissions of only a handful of countries could lead to the migration of energy-intensive production—such as the chemicals, steel, petroleum refining, aluminum and mining industries—from the industrialized countries to the growing Developing Countries.

Certain carbon "sinks" may be used to offset emission reductions, but the Protocol does not establish how sinks will be calculated. Carbon sinks, a natural system that absorbs carbon dioxide, have tremendous potential as a means of reducing emissions, but too much is currently unknown to make a fair determination. It is unclear how sinks might help the U.S. reach its emission-reduction commitment and, though the Parties to the Convention will work to develop rules and guidelines for sinks in Buenos Aires, the rules cannot be adopted until after the Protocol enters into force.

The Protocol Contains no mechanisms for compliance and enforcement.

Simply put, it would be inappropriate for any country to ratify a legally binding international agreement which lacks compliance guidelines and enforcement mechanisms. The Protocol outlines a system of domestic monitoring with oversight by international review teams, but what constitutes compliance and who judges it will not be determined until after the Protocol enters into force. The means of enforcement—also unknown—is equally critical, since a country's noncompliance could give it a competitive advantage over the U.S., and eviscerate the agreement's environmental goals.

The Protocol includes flexible, market-based mechanisms to achieve emission reductions, but it does not establish how these mechanisms would work and to what extent they could be used. The U.S. intends to rely heavily on market-based mechanisms to find the most efficient and cost-effective ways to reduce emissions. But until the rules and regulations are established it is uncertain how effective these mechanisms will be and to what extent they can be used by companies. Many countries are resisting these market-based mechanisms and their reluctance may hinder the development of adequate free-market guidelines. The absence of many countries from the marketplace, and the possible limitations and restrictions on the marketplace, could render these mechanisms useless or of little value.

The Protocol leaves the door open for the imposition of mandatory policies and meas-

ures to meet commitments. Just as the U.S. favors flexible market mechanisms, the European Union and many Developing Countries favor harmonized, mandatory "command-and-control" policies and measures—such as carbon taxes and CAFE standards—to meet commitments, and they will have numerous opportunities to seek adoption of these policies.

Finally, the procedures for ratification of, and amendment to, the Kyoto Protocol make it difficult to remedy before it enter into force. The Protocol may not be amended, nor can rules and guidelines be adopted, until after the Protocol enters, into force. The Clinton Administration is now considering the negotiation of a separate or supplemental protocol to attain necessary additional commitments, but this approach would open all issues to further negotiation.

The Business Roundtable believes that the Congress and the American people cannot evaluate the Kyoto Protocol until the Administration sets out a plan as to how it intends to meet the targets of the Protocol. To place the magnitude of the U.S. reduction commitments in perspective, it is the equivalent of having to eliminate all current emissions for either the U.S. transportation sector, or the utilities sector (residential and commercial sources), or industry. The Administration needs to detail how targets in the Protocol will be met, and how the burden will be distributed among the various sectors of the economy.

The Business Roundtable feels it is imperative that a public dialogue take place on the major issues highlighted in our Gap Analysis before the Protocol becomes the law of the land and government agencies begin to write regulations.

#### TRIBUTE TO CARNEY CAMPION

### HON. NANCY PELOSI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, October 8, 1998*

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to Carney Campion, General Manager, Golden Gate Bridge, Highway and Transportation District. Mr. Campion will retire from his position on November 30, after 23 years of dedicated work to the Bridge District.

During Mr. Campion's tenure, the Golden Gate Bridge and associated transportation services have undergone numerous service and safety improvements. Achieving these improvements has required a combination of vision and commitment. Through his effective leadership, Mr. Campion has ensured that the Golden Gate Bridge remains one of San Francisco's most lauded landmarks.

Among his many accomplishments, Mr. Campion has worked with the San Francisco Bay Delegation to secure \$51.8 million in federal funding for the seismic retrofitting of the Golden Gate Bridge, received approval for a median barrier to eliminate two-way accidents, redecked the Bridge, instituted public safety patrols and placed crises phones in key locations to deter suicides, and developed specifications for an electronic toll system. In addition, under Mr. Campion, the Bridge District became the first public transit system in the Bay Area to comply with the Americans With Disabilities Act.

However, these significant accomplishments are only a part of Mr. Campion's overall commitment to continuing and strengthening the

Bridge District's mission of providing safe and efficient transportation. The successful operation of the Golden Gate Bridge and its bus and ferry units are vital to the San Francisco Bay Area economy. By improving overall transportation efficiency and pursuing alternative modes of transportation, such as adding a high-speed catamaran to the ferry fleet, Mr. Campion has played an important role in ensuring that Bay Area residents can conveniently and safely commute between San Francisco and outlying areas.

In addition to these contributions, Mr. Campion has accomplished many personal achievements. He is a member of numerous community organizations and serves as director for a YMCA, a theater company and the Marin Forum. Furthermore, Mr. Campion has served on or chaired Presidential task forces and international associations throughout his career.

Mr. Speaker, San Francisco has been the fortunate beneficiary of Carney Campion's steadfast and thoughtful leadership. His presence will be greatly missed. I know my colleagues will join me in wishing him well in his future endeavors.

THE 100/240 CELEBRATION OF THE FRIENDS MEETING HOUSE AND CEMETERY ASSOCIATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF RANDOLPH, COUNTY OF MORRIS, NEW JERSEY

**HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, October 8, 1998*

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 100/240 Celebration of the Friends Meeting House and Cemetery Association of the Township of Randolph, County of Morris, New Jersey.

On October 11, 1998, the Friends Meeting House and Cemetery Association of the Township of Randolph will celebrate the 100th Anniversary and the 240th Anniversary of the 1758 Friends Meeting House and Cemetery which it now owns and preserves. The Meeting House is the oldest church in continuous use in Morris County and the oldest Quaker Meeting House in northern New Jersey.

The Quakers who migrated to the Mendham area of Morris County occupied land that belonged to William Penn. They began arriving in the 1740's, establishing farms, mills, and iron forges along many brooks and valleys of the area. They organized as the Mendham Friends Meeting. In 1758, they built their Meeting House and established their cemetery. A national, State, and local treasure, the hand-crafted building of oak and clapboard is little changed from the eighteenth century. In 1805, Randolph set off from Mendham Township, and in 1817 the name was changed to the Randolph Friends Meeting. In 1865, the original meeting came to an end.

From 1865–1898 descendants of the original Quaker families and the last few surviving members of the former meeting cared for the cemetery and grounds and maintained the Meeting House. Memorial services were held annually at the Meeting House for those buried in the cemetery. There was an occasional wedding or funeral.

In 1898, as the last members of the former Meeting became too infirm to oversee the

property, a group of descendants in the Morris County area came together and formed the Friends Meeting House and Cemetery Association of Randolph Township. Membership was open to anyone whose ancestors had worshipped in the meeting house or was buried in the cemetery as well as to members of the Friends faith who had an interest in preservation of this important place. The sole goal of the Association was preservation of the site.

Mr. Speaker, for the past 100 years, the Friends Meeting House and Cemetery Association has faithfully pursued preservation of the Friends Meeting House and Cemetery, a monument in Morris County for 240 years. Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues to join me in congratulating all past and present members of the Association and Meeting House on these special anniversaries.

THE FASTENER QUALITY ACT: FIX IT OR FORGET IT!

**HON. DONALD A. MANZULLO**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, October 8, 1998*

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, any lasting resolution to modify the Fastener Quality Act (FQA) must address the concerns raised by the small manufacturers within the fastener industry. If their concerns are not addressed, I believe most small firms would favor repeal of the Act. I am privileged to represent the "fastener capital of the United States," Rockford, Illinois. There are more fastener manufacturers per capita in Rockford than in any other city in the nation. Implementation of the FQA and any recommended changes to it are of key importance to northern Illinois and the industry overall.

Fasteners are the sinews of a modern manufacturing nation. Disruption in the supply of fasteners would be the equivalent of a nationwide trucking or rail strike. Amidst an increasingly volatile national economy this would have devastating consequences for the country, with reverberations throughout industries dependent on supplies of fasteners.

When the National Institute of Standards and Technology released the latest set of regulations last April, I surveyed the fastener manufacturers in northern Illinois for their input. A third of these answered my survey—a very high response rate. Let me review for my colleagues on the panel the results of the survey: (1) 54 percent of the fastener manufacturers still do not know which fasteners are covered by the FQA; (2) 46 percent of the fastener manufacturers are so small that they cannot afford to adopt the expensive Quality Assurance System (QAS) though they have their own system of testing and insuring quality. Thus, the April regulations permitting larger companies who use QAS to become FQA-certified means nothing to these small fastener firms; and (3) 92 percent—almost every one of the fastener manufacturers in northern Illinois—do not know what they have to do to fully comply with the FQA regulations.

I have met with or been contacted by numerous fastener companies in my district, all of which express concerns reflective of the findings in the survey. For example, there's Pearson Fastener, a 35-employee family enterprise in Rockford. For years Pearson has

been manufacturing fasteners. For the last eight years they have been wrestling with the FQA, wondering why existing independent accredited laboratories cannot continue to test their fasteners instead of the company having to switch to as yet unidentified and unaccredited labs. Aside from the added costs involved, newly accredited labs may not offer every testing service needed by the diversity of fastener manufacturers in Rockford. For instance, Pearson could not get one accredited lab to give them a price quote for a salt spraying test on fasteners they make for outboard engines on motor boats.

Camcar, a division of Textron Fastening Systems of Rockford that has manufactured fasteners since 1943, complained that they could not get an approved signatory to sign test reports, as the regulations require. Since no one can observe all the test results, nobody is willing to sign off on the reports.

Elco, also of Textron Fastening Systems and a major fastener manufacturer in Rockford declares the FQA "a showstopper to our industry . . . [It] penalizes every U.S. fastener company with hundreds of millions of dollars of extra costs in testing and paperwork when the original intent of the Act was to keep out foreign, fraudulent bolts. This particularly affects smaller companies within our industry."

The problems with the FQA from the perspective of small fastener firms are manifold: ambiguity about which fasteners the Act covers; availability and proximity of accredited labs; confusion about the definition of certification, prohibitive compliance costs; over-regulation of the industry; loss of market share to foreign competitors because the FQA exempts fasteners imported as components of larger parts; and lack of information about required tests of a specialized product are all major concerns of fastener manufacturers in my district. Resolution of these matters needs to be a part of any final modification of the FQA.

It has been eight years since the FQA was enacted. During that time, technological advances within the fastener industry have greatly improved testing techniques so that the failure rate for fasteners has been practically eliminated. Obviously, this necessitates a re-examination of the Act to see that it is applicable to the industry in light of these advances. If some basic, common sense changes are not made to the FQA, I believe most small fastener manufacturers would like to see a total repeal because it is currently unworkable. This is the problem with the FQA as it is currently written. I hope Congress, the National Institute of Standards and Technology, the fastener industry, and others can work together to fix it, or else resolve to abolish it.

We all want to make a genuine effort to work out the problems with the FQA. I submit that the approach we ought to take should address the concerns of all fastener manufacturers. At the same time, we should avoid a course that seeks a solution through exemptions for specific industries. A solution that fails to resolve the issues raised by both large and small fastener firms is no solution at all. Otherwise, down the road we again will find ourselves wrestling with the same problems that threaten the viability of the fastener industry and, consequently, the very health of our economy.

Even at this early juncture, we already know that any future workable regulatory document