

and the recycling industry, a voluntary recycling program for nickel-cadmium batteries has been developed. The final step toward implementation of this program will be completed by passing this legislation today.

Two important provisions in this legislation establish uniform labeling procedures, and uniform collection, storage, and transportation requirements for these recyclable batteries. The labeling requirement will clearly inform those who buy the batteries that they are recyclable. The transportation requirements are streamlined, providing further encouragement for participation in this voluntary program.

The recycling program will promote the shipment of used batteries to a central recycling center, keeping them out of our local landfills and incinerators. The battery industry strongly supports this program, as well as the American people. At no cost to the Federal Government, we have the opportunity to efficiently and swiftly put these recycling programs into action.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to support this legislation which takes a positive step in working for the common goal of preserving the environment.

Mrs. THURMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to express my strong support for H.R. 2024, the Mercury-containing and Rechargeable Battery Management Act. Today, we will take an important step toward making this earth a cleaner place. The battery bill will ensure that nickel-cadmium batteries get out of the waste stream and into the recycling stream.

In my district, energizer power systems employ 1,400 people. In fact, our Alachua plant is one of only two facilities in the United States that produces nickel-cadmium batteries.

We may be one of the only one's producing them, but you all use them. Nickel-cadmium batteries are used in power tools, appliances, cellular and cordless phones, and so many other every day products.

Recognizing the danger the disposal of these batteries posed, 13 States, including Florida, took the initiative to label and recycle the batteries. Industry has done a terrific job in promoting the labeling and recycling programs, particularly through the creation of the Rechargeable Battery Recycling Corporation [RBRC] Manufacturers fund the recycling programs and the RBRC is charged with collecting and recycling the used batteries. The Federal Government isn't spending tax dollars to set up a new bureaucracy, industry is financing and administering the program itself.

Actions like these are examples of the kind of good corporate citizenship we want to encourage. More than 100 companies helped to create the RBRC and, together, they work to ensure that their products do no harm to our environment.

The problem is that conflicting State regulations about labeling and collecting have hindered the RBRC's ability to fully achieve its goals. Today, we will enact uniform environmental labeling standards and allow for national collection of nickel-cadmium batteries by retail stores. These actions will help the energizer bunny keep going and going—then be recycled—so he can keep going and going again.

I am delighted that we have bipartisan support for this bill that not only addresses nickel-cadmium, but also phases out the use of mercury in batteries. I am pleased that the 1,400

hard-working energizer employees in my district have taken an active role in promoting this legislation.

I commend their efforts and urge the House to vote for the passage of H.R. 2024.

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to see the House addressing the issue of recycling. The bill under consideration today would encourage voluntary battery recycling, curtail the use of mercury-containing batteries and improve the procedures for recycling such batteries. The bill is a step in the right direction, but it's only a very small, half-step. We can and we should be doing much more to fix our country's critical solid waste disposal problems.

Common items such as lead acid batteries, newsprint, motor oil and tires continue to clog neighborhood landfills, incinerators and sewers. Communities all over America continue to grapple with the serious health and safety hazards that result. There is a way, however, to turn these items usually treated as trash into valuable resources. And there is a way to meet this environmental challenge, which does not rely on command and control regulation.

Mr. Speaker, 7 years ago, along with the late Senator John Heinz and former Senator Wirth, I introduced a innovative concept in environmental protection. The idea was simple—use market forces to achieve environmental protection. Very simply, our legislation offered a solution to the demand side of the supply-and-demand equation.

Recycling is not just the process of having a product collected, recycling means turning the old product into a new product and using it again. Garbage is still garbage unless it has value throughout its lifecycle. Unfortunately, because there is currently no stable market for recycled materials, our separated garbage too often ends up buried in the dump.

The legislation I have reintroduced this Congress would give companies an incentive to recycle the goods they produce, while giving them the freedom to determine the most efficient and least expensive way to do so. The bills employ a system of tradable credits. The credits serve as the medium of exchange in recycling markets. Manufacturers would be required to use an annually increasing percentage of recycled materials. If unable to meet the content standard for a given year, a manufacturer could achieve compliance by purchasing recycling credits from other manufacturers who exceed their targets.

The bills, H.R. 1522, H.R. 1523, H.R. 1524, and H.R. 1525, represent innovative proposals to foster the lead battery, oil, newsprint, and tire recycling industries. I encourage my colleagues to consider these incentive-based bills and join me in promoting a more comprehensive approach to addressing the serious solid waste challenges we face as a nation.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OXLEY] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2024, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2024, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

EXTENDING TIME FOR DEBATE ON H.R. 1965, COASTAL ZONE PROTECTION ACT OF 1996

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during the consideration today of H.R. 1965 under suspension of the rules, debate be limited to 60 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking member of the Committee on Resources or their designees.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

COASTAL ZONE PROTECTION ACT OF 1996

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1965) to reauthorize the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1965

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Coastal Zone Protection Act of 1996".

SEC. 2. FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR DEVELOPMENT OF STATE COASTAL PROGRAMS.

(a) REAUTHORIZATION OF PROGRAM.—Section 305(a) of the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1454(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking "1991, 1992, and 1993" and inserting "1997, 1998, and 1999"; and

(2) by striking "two" and inserting "four".

(b) TERMINATION OF PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 305 of the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1454) is amended—

(A) by striking subsection (a);

(B) by striking "(b)"; and

(C) by amending the heading to read as follows:

"SUBMITTAL OF STATE PROGRAM FOR APPROVAL".

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 308(b)(2)(B) of the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1457(b)(2)(B)) is amended—

(A) in clause (iv) by adding "and" after the semicolon;

(B) by striking clause (v); and

(C) by redesignating clause (vi) as clause (v).

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This subsection shall take effect on October 1, 1999.

SEC. 3. IMPLEMENTATION ASSISTANCE FOR COASTAL ZONE ENHANCEMENT.

Section 309(b) of the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1456b(b)) is amended—

(1) by inserting "(1)" before "Subject to"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(2)(A) In addition to any amounts provided under section 306, and subject to the availability of appropriations, the Secretary may make grants under this subsection to States for implementing program changes approved by the Secretary in accordance with section 306(e).

“(B) Grants under this paragraph to implement a program change may not be made in any fiscal year after the second fiscal year that begins after the approval of that change by the Secretary.”.

SEC. 4. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR GRANTS.

Section 318 of the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1464) is amended—

(1) by striking “SEC. 318.” and all that follows through subsection (a) and inserting the following:

“SEC. 318. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary, to remain available until expended—

“(1) for grants under sections 306, 306A, and 309—

“(A) \$47,600,000 for fiscal year 1997;

“(B) \$49,000,000 for fiscal year 1998; and

“(C) \$50,500,000 for fiscal year 1999; and

“(2) for grants under section 315—

“(A) \$4,400,000 for fiscal year 1997;

“(B) \$4,500,000 for fiscal year 1998; and

“(C) \$4,600,000 for fiscal year 1999.”;

(2) by striking subsection (b); and

(3) by redesignating subsections (c) and (d) in order as subsections (b) and (c).

SEC. 5. COASTAL ZONE MANAGEMENT FUND.

(a) AUTHORIZATION FOR ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—Section 308(b)(2)(A) of the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1456a(b)(2)(A)) is amended to read as follows:

“(A) Expenses incident to the administration of this title, in an amount not to exceed for each of fiscal years 1997, 1998, and 1999 the higher of—

“(i) \$4,000,000; or

“(ii) 8 percent of the total amount appropriated under this title for the fiscal year.”.

(b) AUTHORIZATION FOR PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT GRANTS.—Section 308(b)(2)(B)(v) of the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1456a(b)(2)(B)(v)) is amended to read as follows:

“(v) program development grants as authorized by section 305, in an amount not to exceed \$200,000 for each of fiscal years 1997, 1998, and 1999; and”.

SEC. 6. MATCHING REQUIREMENT.

Section 315(e)(3) of the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1461(e)(3)) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(C) Notwithstanding subparagraphs (A) and (B), financial assistance under this subsection provided from amounts recovered as a result of damage to natural resources located in the coastal zone may be used to pay 100 percent of the costs of activities carried out with the assistance.”.

SEC. 7. AQUACULTURE IN THE COASTAL ZONE.

The Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 is amended—

(1) in section 306A(b) (16 U.S.C. 1455a(b)) by adding at the end of the following:

“(4) The development of a coordinated process among State agencies to regulate and issue permits for aquaculture facilities in the coastal zone.”; and

(2) in section 309(a) (16 U.S.C. 1456b(a)) by adding at the end the following:

“(9) Adoption of procedures and policies to evaluate and facilitate the siting of public and private aquaculture facilities in the coastal zone, which will enable States to formulate, administer, and implement strategic plans for marine aquaculture.”.

SEC. 8. APPEALS TO THE SECRETARY.

The Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“APPEALS TO THE SECRETARY

“SEC. 319. (a) NOTICE.—The Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register a notice indicating when the decision record has been closed on any appeal to the Secretary taken from a consistency determination under section 307(c) or (d). No later than 90 days after the date of publication of this notice, the Secretary shall—

“(1) issue a final decision in the appeal; or

“(2) publish a notice in the Federal Register detailing why a decision cannot be issued within the 90-day period.

“(b) DEADLINE.—In the case where the Secretary publishes a notice under subsection (a)(2), the Secretary shall issue a decision in any appeal filed under section 307 no later than 45 days after the date of the publication of the notice.

“(c) APPLICATION.—This section applies to appeals initiated by the Secretary and appeals filed by an applicant.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] and the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] each will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON].

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. SAXTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the House is considering H.R. 1965, the Coastal Zone Protection Act of 1996. It is certainly an appropriate way to show our commitment to the environment and to celebrate Earth Day.

I introduced H.R. 1965 10 months ago, and 129 of my colleagues are now cosponsors. Certainly this broad bipartisan support shows the popularity of the Coastal Zone Program and the need to act on this reauthorization.

In light of the enormous growth of coastal populations, Congress passed, and President Richard Nixon signed into law, the Coastal Zone Management Act—also known as CZMA—in 1972. That growth has not abated in the 24 years since the original Act was passed, and forecasts predict that significant growth will continue in coastal areas. The CZMA provides grants to States that develop federally approved coastal zone management—or CZM—plans. It also allows States with approved plans to review Federal actions for consistency with those plans.

Twenty-nine of the thirty-five eligible coastal States and territories have federally approved CZM plans, and five others are working to prepare acceptable plans. These twenty-nine approved plans include 95,000 miles of coastline, almost 95 percent of the national total.

For a relatively small expenditure of Federal dollars and without imposing any additional Federal regulatory burden, this program has been very successful in getting States to improve their coastal planning programs on a totally voluntary basis.

H.R. 1965 reauthorizes funding for grants to States to develop, implement, and update their coastal zone

management programs for fiscal years 1997 through 1999; bases authorization levels for State grants and Federal administrative expenses on the amounts appropriated for these programs; provides the States with more discretion in the use of their grants; and sets a time limit for final decisions on consistency appeals.

This is an excellent bill. It continues the existing program with only minor modifications. However, those changes provide additional flexibility to the States, establish fiscally responsible authorization levels, and streamline the consistency review process. These are all positive accomplishments, and they deserve the enthusiastic support of this body.

I urge an “aye” vote on this most important environmental bill.

□ 1530

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 7 minutes.

(Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation, as I did with the previous legislation, and I want to commend the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] for his work on getting this reauthorization of the coastal zone management legislation passed in our committee and to the floor.

This is a good bill. The substitute amendment that has been suggested has been agreed to on a bipartisan basis and has the support of the administration.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that this discussion today is not just about coastal zone management or not just about battery recycling. What we went through with the presentation of the previous bill, and with this bill also, is that at a time when we were talking about recycling batteries and, therefore, removing toxics from the environment, what we saw is that most of the people who came and supported recycling batteries and removing toxins from the environment, in fact, had voted five out of five times against, in crucial bills, in the clean water bill and regulatory reform and amendments and motions to recommit, had voted against removing arsenic from drinking water, had voted against removing arsenic dioxin, lead and other cancer-causing pollutants, had voted to liberalize the rules on pollution.

So it was not about recycling batteries, and I daresay if the speakers on this legislation have the same voting record with respect to coastal zone management, then we, too, will award them fig leaves to show that they, in fact, cannot hide behind this good and noncontroversial bill when, in fact, they have voted previously in this session against coastal nonpoint pollution control to try to regulate many of the pollutions that flow into our coastal

zones for dumping more sewage into our oceans.

At a time when we want to regulate the coastal zone of our States and improve them for our citizens, they voted to liberalize how much more sewage we can put into the ocean. They voted against the protection of the wetlands in many of these same areas, an amendment that was offered on a bipartisan basis.

They voted for gutting the Clean Water Act where, if we do not clean up our rivers and our streams and sewage and others, then it all flows into the coastal zone and we have an increased amount of pollution floating.

So what we are saying is we cannot have it both ways, we cannot engage in hypocrisy, we cannot say well, we are for coastal zone management because the whole Congress is for it, apparently. It is a unanimously supported legislation. It is a bipartisan bill. It is supported by the administration. But on these key issues earlier in this session of Congress, in this session of Congress, our colleagues voted five for five against the environment, just as many of the speakers on the previous legislation sought to support battery recycling, which is good, but the hypocrisy of their position when they voted not to remove lead and arsenic and dioxin and other materials from our environment.

Those are the records. Those are the votes. Those are the ones that are taken, and that is the record of their votes.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

So let me understand that unless every Member votes the liberal line on every environmental issue, then he is not—

Mr. MILLER of California. Reclaiming my time, no; that is not the issue. The issue is whether my colleagues vote for or against the environment, whether they vote for or against the environment on a consistent basis.

There is nothing liberal or conservative about taking arsenic out of the drinking water of children. There is nothing liberal or conservative about taking dioxin, lead, and other cancer-causing agents out of the environment of the children. There is nothing liberal or conservative about keeping people from dumping pollution into our oceans, about dumping sewage into our oceans that comes back to haunt the people who want to use the beaches, the wetlands, and the recreational area.

This is not about liberal or conservatism. This is about people's voting records who, on the day after Earth Day, under the direction of the majority leader, want to present a theme to America that somehow the Republicans are back on the environment.

The fact is for 16 months our colleagues have led the most comprehen-

sive assault on the basic environmental laws of this country, and we think there is a certain amount of hypocrisy in that, and we are seeking to point that out. And it has nothing to do with ideology. It has to do with the recorded votes taken by Members of this Congress in the previous four sessions on dealing with these issues of nonpoint pollution control, on ocean dumping of sewage, on protecting wetlands, on the Clean Water Act, on the question of removing arsenic from drinking water, votes that we all remember that we had on the floor of this Congress where the gentleman and others, myself and others, are all recorded on those measures.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OXLEY].

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me, and I cannot resist responding to my friend from California because it is really how he defines these votes, that somehow, if we happen to vote against his particular position, that happens to be allegedly a vote against the environment or some of his left friends who define it that way.

The fact is that all of us share this same goal of environmental protection, but we find that there are different ways to get there, sometimes more effective ways, if we used the power of the market, for example, to do that.

We did that in the clean air bill. My friend from California will remember when we provided SO₂ emissions allowances that are now being traded by companies in Chicago. It is a very effective way to delay with air pollution. I think there is a different way to do it, and I think a better way and a more effective way and a more efficient way. We differ on that. We do not differ on our goals, and I think that is where the gentleman is in error.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE].

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from California and point out how strongly I feel that what we are engaged in here today and what the Republican leadership is engaged in here today is essentially what I call a "green scam." They are putting up the Coastal Zone Management Act for reauthorization, which is certainly a good bill, but they are putting it up a day after Earth Day, an effort to try and give the impression that the Republican majority and that their leadership is in favor of protecting the ocean environment. And, in fact, nothing could be further from the truth.

The fact of the matter is, from the very beginning, this Republican leadership, from the very beginning of this Congress in 1995, brought up what I call the Dirty Water Act, an effort to essentially gut the Clean Water Act and many of the provisions of that bill

which passed the House but, fortunately, has not passed the Senate, has been stopped in the Senate, would have turned back the clock on efforts over the last 25 or 26 years to protect the ocean investment.

The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON], my colleague, has been very effective in trying to get this CZMA Act out of committee and brought to the floor, and I want to congratulate him today for the accomplishment of bringing it here to the floor. But the fact of the matter is that many times the Republican leadership fought very hard to have this bill not brought out of committee and to prevent it from coming to the floor. And they also tried to take away all the funding from the CZMA.

At one time I remember specifically there was no funding for the bill, and if it was not for the fact that he and some of the other Republicans that do care about clean water were willing to take a stand, we would not be here today.

But that does not take away from the fact that the Republican majority and their leadership has been adamant in their effort to cut back on the Clean Water Act.

I just want to mention a few of those things today. I am going to give out 2 big leaves to two individuals: The gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] stated before, he talked about what he was trying to do to protect the environment. And, of course, now the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OXLEY] was saying the same thing. But on five key votes, both gentlemen, the gentleman from Alaska and the gentleman from Ohio, joined with the Republican leadership five out of five times to vote against coastal nonpoint pollution control, for dumping more sewage in the ocean, something that I think is very important to me, that we not have ocean pollution in the dumping of sewage; against protecting wetlands; for gutting the Clean Water Act; and, finally, against allowing the EPA to enforce wetlands protection. This continues. They are joining with the Republican leadership on these points, and, therefore, I give both of them a fig leaf at this time.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Fort Yukon, AK [Mr. YOUNG].

(Mr. YOUNG of Alaska asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, we only get figleaves from fruit trees.

Now that we have got in this debate seriously, and I have listened to the people on the other side of the aisle talk about the environment, let us talk about Congressmen that want total central control. Let us talk about Congressmen that want power in mighty Washington's hands. Let us talk about Congressmen who vote for socialized Government. Let us talk about Congressmen that, in reality, do not believe that private property rights, owners have any rights at all. Let us talk

about Congressmen that decide what is the environmental agenda as being touted by the 57 environmental organizations when they are rated 100 percent by the Sierra Club and Friends of the Earth, et cetera.

Let us talk about the Congressmen that do not care about jobs, about people that want to work. Let us talk about Congressmen that believe a kangaroo rat is more important than a man's livelihood or the homes that were burnt down because a person could not farm that land, and after they could not farm the land the rats left because there was nothing to eat.

Let us talk about a Government that does not listen to the people any more and the Congressmen that support that type of Government. Congressmen have believed, in reality, that there is no freedom of individuals that is good for the masses, control from Washington, DC.

And this is what this talk about the environment is all about.

On my side of the aisle, I have said the environment must include man. We cannot exclude man or eventually man will destroy the environment. But on that side of the aisle, we cannot touch anything or that person is against the environment. One cannot build a house, one cannot drill for oil, one cannot take and build a dam. One, in fact, cannot catch a fish, let alone do anything else, because they are destroying the environment. It is part of the zealism of that side of the aisle by certain leaders that believe that man is the enemy and he is not to be included. And that is what the two gentlemen from California and New Jersey are talking about, centralized government power over the individual person.

If I own a piece of property and it is mine, and I have an endangered species there and it is there because I have taken care of it, I can be punished because of these two gentlemen. I should be rewarded because I protect the species.

But under this administration and past administrations, the agencies themselves have come in and told me: "You are a sinner because you have the species on your property; thus, you no longer can do anything with your property. You, in fact, ought to be punished."

That is the philosophy of these two gentlemen.

Today the House is considering H.R. 1965, the Coastal Zone Protection Act of 1996. This bill was introduced by JIM SAXTON, and he deserves a great deal of credit for his efforts on behalf of this program.

Enacted in 1972, the CZMA encourages States to regulate land and water uses which affect their coastal zones. The program is voluntary, but States receive grant money to develop a plan which, when approved by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), makes the States eligible for more Federal assistance to help manage their coastal program. In addition, States can review and, in some cases, veto certain Federal activities which affect their coastal zones and

which are inconsistent with their approved programs. Twenty-nine States and territories have approved coastal zone programs.

In fact, to use my home State as an example, the Alaska Coastal Management Program coordinates the permitting process between Alaska's 33 coastal districts and local, State and Federal agencies. This coordination assures that localities have the opportunity to have their views on Federal activities fully considered, and reduces the time and cost of permit approvals. The coastal zone program has also funded development of comprehensive wetlands management plans in Juneau and Anchorage. These plans emphasize local decisionmaking and reduce the regulatory burden for low value wetlands.

The bill before us today re-authorizes the Coastal Zone Management Act through fiscal year 1999. It provides the States with more flexibility in program management, and it sets fiscally responsible authorization levels. I urge you to support this bill.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE].

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I am so glad that the previous speaker, the chairman of the committee, brought up this job-versus-the-environment issue, because I think it is really crucial. The fact of the matter is that a good environment mean good jobs and better jobs and a better economy. No better illustration of that took place than in 1988 when I was first elected to Congress. We had medical waste, we had sewage sludge washing up on the Jersey shore. Our beaches were closed. Billions of dollars were lost to the New Jersey tourism industry because we had dirty water.

The Clean Water Act made it possible for us to clean up those beaches and provided the funding to do so by upgrading sewage treatment plants. Now that tourism is back, the people are back, the jobs are back. A good environment and a clean ocean means good jobs, and it means a bigger economy.

Do not let anybody from the other side or anybody try to kid and to say that there is an issue here of jobs versus the environment. The two go together, and a clean environment means more and better jobs.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Utica, NY [Mr. BOEHLERT], my good friend.

(Mr. BOEHLERT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon in strong support of H.R. 1965, the Coastal Zone Management Reauthorization Act of 1996.

As we celebrate Earth Day, it is important that we remember the many successes we have had in improving the quality of America's waters since the first Earth Day in 1970. The Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 has been an important component of our Nation's efforts to improve coastal waters, and today's consideration of legislation to reauthorize this act is in keeping with the spirit and intent of Earth Day.

□ 1545

The Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 was signed by President Nixon and was one of his many environmental initiatives, which included the creation of the Environmental Protection Agency, the enactment of the Clean Air Act, and the establishment of the Endangered Species Act. I am proud that a Republican Congress is forwarding legislation to reauthorize the Coastal Zone Management Act.

Before I go further, I would like to thank the leadership of the Committee on Resources, the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON]. This bill is an excellent example of a bipartisan commonsense approach to protecting the Nation's coastal resources.

The Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 responds to this environmental need with a Federal-State partnership intended to encourage wise coastal resource management. The program consists of limited Federal funding, planning requirements, and tools for the States to ensure consistency and coordination in their management efforts. In general, it has worked well and has helped to supplement other important programs, such as the Clean Water Act.

Today the needs for a strong partnership for coastal perfection are greater than ever. For example, the Environmental Protection Agency has documented that 97 percent of the Great Lakes shoreline miles surveyed have water quality that is impaired. In addition, many estuaries are not meeting their designated uses due to excessive loadings of pollutants. This can be devastating to not only our environment but our economy as well.

For example, most of our Nation's fish and shellfish industry relies on bays and estuaries and their adjacent wetlands as a breeding ground for the species they harvest. The future of America's multibillion dollar recreational fishing industry also depends on clean, healthy coastal waters.

Because of this connection to water quality, the Clean Water Act, and coastal protection, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure has a significant interest in the Coastal Zone Management Act and H.R. 1965. This is particularly true for the Subcommittee on Water and Power Resources in the Committee on Resources.

At the outset of the 104th Congress, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure acquired jurisdiction over marine affairs, including coastal zone management, as they relate to oil and other pollution of the navigable waters. This is in addition to our existing jurisdiction over pollution in coastal waters. The Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure also has jurisdiction over natural resources damages programs under the Clean Water Act, the Oil Pollution Act, and Superfund.

Section 6 of H.R. 1965 has provisions relating to natural resource damages.

It is our understanding, however, that nothing in the bill expands or affects authorities under those acts.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to engage the chairman of the subcommittee in a colloquy with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OXLEY].

Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman from New Jersey, as he knows, the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act, the Clean Water Act, the National Marine Sanctuaries Act, and the Oil Pollution Act authorize natural resource damages to be used only to restore, replace or acquire the equivalent of such damaged natural resources.

Is that correct?

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOEHLERT. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, that is correct.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOEHLERT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is our understanding that section 6 of this legislation does not in any way alter the determination and use of natural resource damages collected pursuant to the Clean Water Act, the Oil Pollution Act, the Natural Marine Sanctuaries Act, or the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act, is that correct?

Mr. SAXTON. If the gentleman from New York will continue to yield, Mr. Speaker, that is also correct.

Mr. BOEHLERT. If we could follow up with a hypothetical, for example, natural resource damages might be paid to a Federal, State, or Indian tribal trustee for the restoration, replacement, or acquisition of equivalent resources in order to compensate for those resources that are damaged at a specific location or site. Is that correct?

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, that too is correct.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, some have raised the issue that section 6 could be used to facilitate the development and use of regional restoration plans. Is it your understanding that under this legislation, NOAA would have no authority to create regional restoration plans?

Mr. SAXTON. That is correct, under this legislation. However, I do want to point out that they could have such authority under some other existing law. This provision will not give them any such authority.

Mr. BOEHLERT. I want to thank the chairman of the committee and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OXLEY] for participating in this colloquy.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, let me say this: Pollution knows no political affiliation, it knows no artificial geographic boundary. There are those on the right and those on the left who are trying to get this into a heated battle

on the floor of the House of Representatives to lead the American people to believe that one party or another has exclusive concern about the environment.

Let me tell the Members, Republicans care about the environment just as Democrats care about the environment. We are concerned for our families and we are concerned for future generations. I urge passage of this important bill, and I urge us to go forward in the spirit of bipartisanship to do what is good for America for generations to come.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY].

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, this week we celebrate the wonder and beauty of the Earth. As we celebrate, I feel especially grateful for the area I represent. I am privileged to represent Marin and Sonoma Counties in California, the two counties just north of San Francisco, across the Golden Gate Bridge. The diversity of nature is prominent in this area where the rolling hills, redwood forests, and rugged coastline meet.

I am privileged to represent 140 miles of the northern California coastline. Each year, numerous visitors come to Marin and Sonoma Counties to see one of our Nation's most picturesque scenes: Our coasts. It is hard for visitors to the area to even imagine that there are troubled waters off our beautiful coasts, but there are. Due to extensive recreational and commercial use, a serious toll has been taken on our coasts, a toll that threatens the health of our marine resources and of our coastal economies.

If California's coast is to be utilized by future generations, Mr. Speaker, as it is today, it must have strong protection now. Passing this legislation to reauthorize the Coastal Zone Management Act will help meet this need and the needs of all America's coasts. Coastal zone management programs offer tremendous opportunities for conserving and maintaining this country's most outstanding marine resources. Mr. Speaker, coastal programs are not only successful, they are also cost effective.

H.R. 1965 will assist in the effort to be good stewards of our coasts. Let us pass this bill and continue the vital work of the Coastal Zone Management Act. Let this not be a figleaf. Let this not be a Band-Aid, but let it be a precedent for future meaningful legislation to protect our fragile environment.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring forth to the body here that we want to protect the environment, and we also want to protect private property, the basis of our Constitution.

The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] had a zero, a zero rating for private property. He does not believe in private property. The gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] did a little better. He had 7 percent. He slipped up; I do not know what happened. I think the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. REED], he has not spoken as yet, he also got a zero.

What we are saying is private property and the environment, together we can prevail. We ignore private property, we destroy the Constitution.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1965, the Coastal Zone Management Reauthorization Act of 1995, and in particular, the manager's substitute, which has incorporated an important provision on aquaculture. Also I want to thank the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG], the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS] for their support of this important provision.

This provision was originally part of H.R. 2046, a bill I introduced this year to authorize States to formulate, administer, and implement strategic plans for marine aquaculture. Indeed, H.R. 2046 was based on previous legislation sponsored in the last Congress by myself and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS].

This provision will foster economic growth and create jobs by encouraging aquaculture development in our lakes and coastal areas. Aquaculture represents a promising economic development opportunity for the State of Rhode Island. At the turn of the century, Rhode Island's shellfishermen harvested so much shellfish from Narragansett Bay that this harvest would be worth almost \$1 billion in today's dollars.

This provision would enable States like Rhode Island that have no comprehensive plan for aquaculture development to get started in the process of creating jobs and economic development through aquaculture.

It is important to recognize that development of a marine aquaculture industry will not be easy. Difficult issues such as private use of public resources, conflicts with other coastal user groups, and the development of streamlined regulatory and permitting requirements will have to be addressed.

However, other nations around the world have already recognized the potential of aquaculture and the important role government can play in developing this industry. The Governments of Japan, Norway, and Chile are supporting aquaculture development programs and giving their citizens the opportunity to reap the accompanying economic rewards. In fact, these countries are exporting their aquaculture harvests of fish and shellfish to America.

Mr. Speaker, this provision will go a long way in helping States like Rhode Island become competitive in this growing global industry. Again, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS] for his strong support of this provision, and I urge my colleagues to join with me in support of the passage of this bill.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Sanibel, FL [Mr. GOSS], who, as Mayor of that community, helped to initiate and found Florida's coastal zone management program.

(Mr. GOSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to rise in support of this bill because it is a solid, responsible piece of bipartisan environmental legislation, and by the by, a great bill for Florida.

I want to commend the tremendous work done by my good friend, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON], who has put this thing together and moved it to the floor in a timely fashion. This should be held up as model environmental legislation. It is a rare example where we finally got the Federal Government doing a program that is both effective and voluntary. I think its success can well be measured by the fact that since its creation in 1972, 34 out of 35 of the eligible States in this Nation have become involved in the program. Twenty-nine have approved programs, and five more are working towards that goal.

The CZMA is a cooperative effort that recognizes States as full partners, sharing the costs and the responsibilities for setting standards geared towards protecting local coastal environments. The good thing about it is the flexibility. Michigan can do what is best for the Great Lakes, Florida can do what is right for the situation along the Gulf and the Atlantic coast in Florida.

Specifically I would like to single out two other aspects of the CZMA because of their importance to my State of Florida. One is the question of consistency, and the other is the question of the National Estuarine Reserve System. Consistency simply says that the Federal Government cannot come along and do something that the State of Florida does not think is good for the State of Florida.

We have seen this work and help us in our protection of our Outer Continental Shelf and in the oil and gas exploration issues we have faced in the State of Florida throughout the years. Without these consistency provisions, we would not have been able to succeed, and we are in fact relying on them today.

Mr. Speaker, it is important to us. Florida has lots of tourists, many visitors. Many in this body go there at this time of year and enjoy themselves. We want to keep it that way, at a place where you will continue to go back. This act will help us do that.

With regard to the reserve areas, the estuarine research reserve areas here are areas where we are protecting pristine estuaries, while at the same time we are opening up the area for public study and education. This has had an extraordinary residual benefit for the people of this country. This is a good bill, and it deserves Members' support.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] made the point that we are making. That is, there are those individuals who seek to come to the floor to support this legislation and try to hide an atrocious environmental record where they have voted 5 for 5, in some cases 15 for 10, against very important environmental protections: the removal of arsenic from drinking water; the removal of dioxin from our environment, from our drinking water; the removal of lead, to protect children; those kinds of measures. The gutting of the Clean Air Act, they supported it.

The gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] has a perfect record on that. He needs a fig leaf, because he is trying to hide that record by supporting this legislation. The gentleman would say that the last three speakers in fact do not need a fig leaf, because their environmental records have been consistent. They have been consistent because of the tough environmental bills they have supported true environmental protection, and on this legislation they are supporting a good piece of legislation.

That is not what is going on here. That is because of the fact that under a directive from the caucus they are putting this measure forward. The gentleman from Alaska has always found some reason why he could not support environmental legislation. He does not like the Federal government. He does not think we should be able to have some kind of national standards for clean air or clean water.

But as I think one of the previous speakers said in support of this legislation, the environment knows no geographic boundaries. If you have dirty air, if you have dirty air in California, people in Nevada and Arizona end up breathing it.

□ 1600

If we put dirty water into the Mississippi River at the top, the people down in Louisiana and elsewhere end up having to contend with that dirty water. That is because we need those standards, and before we had those standards, that was a problem.

Coastal zone management: What moves up and down the coast between the Carolinas and Virginia and Florida has to be somehow managed in a fashion to protect all coastal communities. That is true on the West Coast and others.

That is what we are talking about, that there is some consistency between

people's records. You cannot just trot out unanimous bills that there is complete agreement on and therefore say that somehow you have created the environmental record when for 16 months, when given the opportunity, people have voted and earned themselves a zero rating. That is the point being made.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from California for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I just simply want to say, we were talking about fig leaf awards as well. We were talking about seaweed awards. We had a number of gimmicks we were thinking about. I think it might be a question of approach.

Mr. MILLER of California. Seaweed?

Mr. GOSS. For the Coastal Zone Management Act, we thought seaweed might be appropriate. You can drape it around yourself in certain ways and get the same result as with a fig leaf. It is really heavy, though.

The reason we thought it was appropriate, I recall the gentleman actually caused us a great deal of problem with our Outer Continental Shelf protections back in 1992. The gentleman is well known as a champion of the environment. It is just we had a different agreement on how to protect our Outer Continental Shelf. I am glad we have done a better job of doing that, and I am glad to see the gentleman's support for this bill.

Mr. MILLER of California. And the point made by the gentleman is in fact historically we have worked on a bipartisan basis on most of these measures.

Mr. GOSS. We have.

Mr. MILLER of California. The Outer Continental Shelf was passed on a bipartisan basis, as was Clean Air, Clean Water, Endangered Species Act, all of the other great environmental laws.

Mr. GOSS. We have.

Mr. MILLER of California. What we have seen is unfortunately people like the gentleman from Alaska apparently prevail in the caucus, rather than the gentleman himself.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. HORN].

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, the California coast is one of the world's natural treasures, and Californians know that they must preserve these wonderful shores so that not only will Californians enjoy them but people from all over the world will enjoy them.

The Coastal Zone Management Reauthorization Act of 1996 will help California meet this responsibility. The bill's annual grant program will ensure that the wisest protections and the best usage of the coastal areas are maintained.

California's coast belongs to the generations yet to come. This legislation

ensures that this great treasure will remain for a very, very long time.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE].

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the previous speaker is supporting this bipartisan non-controversial bill to reauthorize the Coastal Zone Management Act, but this is really again just a fig leaf to hide the fact that Republicans have consistently voted against protecting the environment and the health and safety of the American people.

On five key votes that I mentioned before, the gentleman from California who previously spoke four out of five times joined with the Republican leadership: first against coastal nonpoint pollution control; second, for dumping more sewage into the ocean; third, against protecting wetlands; and, finally, for gutting the Clean Water Act, the dirty water bill that we mentioned before.

So for the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN), I give him his fig leaf.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from California [Mr. HORN].

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, I am bemused and amused by my colleague from New Jersey. The same reason that some have said these are not really environmental votes stands in that case. They were private property votes, most of them.

I believe that if you are going to save the environment, you have got to follow the fifth amendment to the Constitution of the United States, just as the Supreme Court said you have to follow it with reference to the California coast. You cannot take people's property and say, "Well, sorry, you lived there for five generations and you are going to give it up to the State at no cost." That is nonsense, and I will continue to vote for private property.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE].

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate what the gentleman said, because I think it harks back to what the gentleman from Alaska said before when he talked about the ratings from this private property group and said that I had received a zero. He, on the other hand, the gentleman from Alaska, received a zero from the League of Conservation Voters for being antienvironment.

If we track the votes that the League of Conservation Voters used and the private property rights group used, they basically used the same votes. If you get a zero on private property, you get 100 percent from the league, and vice versa.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Vineland, NJ [Mr. LOBIONDO].

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Coastal Zone Protection Act.

This legislation reauthorizes the Coastal Zone Management Act, established by Congress in 1972. Intense use of the coastal zone—defined as the coastal waters and adjacent shorelands—has significant impacts on water quality, the abundance of wildlife, coastal ecosystems, and shoreline erosion.

Over 60 percent of all Americans live within 50 miles of the Atlantic, Pacific and Great Lakes coasts, and this population is expected to grow by 15 percent in the next 20 years. As such, it is important to have protective measures in place for the fragile coastal ecosystem.

I support this bill and urge all Members to vote "aye."

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, that is to say, those who want to not only have a fig leaf to hide behind, as the gentleman from California just earned by his voting record, but those who now want to suggest they were hiding behind property rights, I do not know what the property right is that allows you to take pollution from your land and dump it into the streams and the bays and the waterways of this Nation. I do not know what that property right is that allows you to take non-point pollution, pesticides and toxics, and dump them into the bays and the rivers and eventually end up in our coastal zone. There is no property right that gives you the right to pollute the public waterways and to diminish the resources available to other Americans.

I know the gentleman came on the floor a little late, and so maybe he got caught up in the rhetoric of the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] about private property. That had nothing to do with the voting records, on whether or not you voted to dump sewage into the oceans or control nonpoint pollution, or voted for the Clean Water Act or allow EPA to enforce wetlands protections.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Santa Barbara, CA [Mrs. SEASTRAND].

Mrs. SEASTRAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1965 to reauthorize the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972.

Coastal zone management has been a significant priority for my home State of California for over 30 years now. Since the establishment of our Federally Approved Program in 1976, we have attempted to take full advantage of assistance offered to States through the Coastal Zone Management Act. I feel that the accomplishments of the California coastal management program indicate how worthwhile, efficient and cost effective State management can be.

Now, in the absence of the Coastal Zone Management Act, our State participation would not be possible. Californians recognize that our robust economy and superior quality of life

depend on a healthy and scenic coast, especially true on the central coast of California, Santa Barbara and San Luis Obispo County, and they strongly support sound management of the State's coastal zone.

Eighty percent of Californians live and work within 50 miles of our coast. Millions of other people from all over the United States and the world come to California for business and pleasure. Coastal and ocean dependent industries generate \$17 billion for California's economy each year, and nearly \$10 billion of that comes from recreation and tourism. It is clear that State coastal management programs advance the national interest in healthy coastal economies, necessary infrastructure and the protection of vital natural resources.

Since 1981, the California Coastal Zone Management Program has used \$20 million to leverage another \$100 million from both public and private sources. We have applied for these funds to over 60 coastal projects, such as establishing networks of coastal parks to improve public access to our coastlines, constructing docks and marine berths to assist the commercial fishing industry, and building public piers and fishing wharfs to restore our urban waterfronts.

Also under the direction of the Coastal Zone Management Program, the State of California and Vandenberg Air Force Base have become partners in water conservation planning, in the creation of miles of shoreline access trails, and in the protection for endangered and threatened species. Again, after thorough Federal consistency reviews by our State program, billions of dollars worth of Federal projects have been allowed to proceed, all while protecting the environment, enhancing communities, and increasing recreational access to coastal resources.

Clearly, the Coastal Zone Management Act deserves to be reauthorized. In California, and in coastal States across the Nation, coastal zone management programs have long demonstrated that the delicate balance between responsible coastal development and sound environmental policy can be achieved.

I applaud the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] for his leadership on this, and I encourage an "aye" vote on this bipartisan bill.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE].

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, again, I am glad the previous speaker, the gentlewoman from California, is supporting this reauthorization of this CZMA.

Again, she has earned her fig leaf and she cannot hide behind it, because she consistently voted against protecting the environment and the health and safety of the American people on five key votes. The gentlewoman joined with the Republican leadership five out of five times to vote against coastal

nonpoint pollution control, for dumping more sewage into the ocean, against protecting wetlands, for cutting the Clean Water Act, and against allowing the EPA to enforce wetlands protection, and she earned a zero voting record from the League of Conservation Voters. So I present her with this fig leaf.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. SEASTRAND].

Mrs. SEASTRAND. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague on the other side of the aisle for yielding the time. I would just say I am one of those freshmen that came here to Washington, DC, to take care of the bureaucrats here in this city and to make sure that the people on the central coast of California got what they wanted for their tax dollar: cleaner water, cleaner air, and to make it a better place.

They realize that the bureaucrats here can usurp a lot of those tax dollars and not accomplish what we truly want on the central coast of California. They want to do away with the regulations, the duplicity of laws, and they want to get on with it.

So I would just say that I am proud of my voting record that I have had here and I will continue to do so.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Eastern Long Island, NY [Mr. FORBES].

(Mr. FORBES asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Coastal Zone Management Act.

This is an important tool for America. It is important to my own State of New York, in which we have some of the most pristine beaches in the world and some of the most beautiful coastline, obviously, in the world. A good, healthy environment obviously is a good economic environment.

On Long Island, where tourism is a key industry, we believe the Coastal Zone Management Act has been a wonderful, wonderful tool. I am pleased to have played a role last year in the funding of the Coastal Zone Management Act, in making sure that that very important law was fully funded.

My own State of New York benefits to the tune of \$2 million to have adequate planning, to provide for the future safety of our estuaries, our bays, our creeks. In Nassau and Suffolk County, the Coastal Zone Management Act is an incredibly important device. One million dollars goes to the good planning efforts. I rise in support of this very important measure.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the time remaining on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. UPTON). The gentleman from New Jersey has 8 minutes remaining and the gentleman from California has 12 minutes remaining.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MILLER of California. We have no further speakers, but I reserve the

balance of my time, given what happened on the last bill.

Mr. SAXTON. Does the gentleman intend to yield back the balance of his time?

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, it depends on how many speakers the gentleman from New Jersey has. If I can say to the gentleman, at the moment, I would not yield back my time. Does the gentleman have additional speakers?

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, we have three additional speakers, I would prefer at this point that the gentleman alternate on time as we go along.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I have pending no further requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

The gentleman wants to close, I assume. I will yield back the balance of my time to allow the gentleman to close.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to speak for a moment with the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

□ 1615

Mr. Speaker, the problem is that much of the debate on the gentleman's side has been about matters other than the bill, and I suspect that one of the strategies that you could have would be to save your 12 minutes to continue the same kind of rhetoric which I do not think is helpful to the debate. That is why I am reluctant at this time to yield time.

I would further point out that the gentleman has missed a couple of turns here, and I think it would be prudent for the gentleman to use whatever time is available at this time.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, if I might inquire of the Chair, am I correct in my understanding that the gentleman has the right to close and I have the right to reserve my time? I have no pending requests at this moment. He has additional speakers. I obviously at some point will yield back my time, when the gentleman is ready to close.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. UPTON). The gentleman from California is correct. The gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] has 12 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE].

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1965, a bill to reauthorize the Coastal Zone Management Act.

Mr. Speaker, summer is rapidly approaching, marking the start of a time when an estimated 94 million people a year enjoy boating and fishing along the coast.

Soon much of the Washington, DC, population as well many other people across the country and throughout my State will head to southern Delaware

to enjoy our many beaches and beautiful coastline.

I think the Delaware beaches truly are one of this region's most treasured assets, as many people enjoy fishing in Lewes, surf boarding at Indian River Inlet, swimming in Dewey Beach, and walking on the boardwalk in Rehoboth.

The Coast Zone Management Act is one of the reasons why Delaware's inland bays, wetlands, estuaries and dunes have been protected throughout the years, thereby helping our environmental areas as well as providing a tremendous boost to tourism in the Delmarva region.

This bill, which reauthorizes the Coastal Zone Management Act, assists Delaware and 28 other coastal States in developing management programs to preserve our beaches and natural areas.

This bill is voluntary for States, and provides grants to those coastal States which develop programs protecting natural areas, under several Federal parameters. I am pleased that most of our coastal States participate in this program.

This bill is a good example of how Federal State and local governments and communities can work together to protect the environment and ensure an environmental legacy for our future generations.

This bill will help preserve the dunes, keep the water clean, safe and pollution-free, and protect coastal wildlife—all of which will make our beaches and natural areas more enjoyable for many Americans.

I am proud to cosponsor this important environmental initiative, and I am pleased to see a bipartisan commitment to reauthorize and fund this important program.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from West Palm Beach, FL [Mr. FOLEY].

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, representing 42 miles of ocean coastline, I strongly support H.R. 1965.

Many States such as Florida depend on a healthy coastline for commerce, transportation, fishing, and recreation. In fact, over half of our Nation's population live in coastal areas and this population is expected to grow by 15 percent in the next 20 years.

Under this voluntary program, States receive Federal matching grants to implement a plan to protect coasts and prevent ocean pollution.

This program also extends to our Nation's estuaries. In my community, the St. Lucie River Initiative, a group of concerned citizens, businesses and local community leaders, have worked together to protect the St. Lucie Estuary, the largest tributary to the Indian River Lagoon. This once vibrant body of water and habitat for plant and wildlife species is in serious decline today due to federally built canals that have disrupted the natural flow of water into the river.

Today, we have an opportunity to continue the Federal-State partnership in protecting our Nation's estuaries and coastlines.

I urge my colleagues to support the passage of H.R. 1965.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE].

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, again I am pleased that the previous speaker, who said that he represents part of the ocean coastline in the great State of Florida, which practically the whole State is along the coast, is supporting this Coastal Zone Management Act reauthorization. But he deserves a fig leaf. He earned a fig leaf and he cannot hide behind it. He cannot hide the fact that Republicans and he have consistently voted against protecting the environment and the health and safety of the American people.

On five key votes, the gentleman from Florida has joined with the Republican leadership four out of five times to vote for dumping more sewage into the ocean, against protecting wetlands, for gutting the Clean Water Act, and against allowing the EPA to enforce wetlands protection. So I give him his fig leaf that is duly earned.

Mr. FOLEY. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE]. I appreciate it. It is a great honor.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TORKILDSEN].

Mr. TORKILDSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1965, the Coastal Zone Protection Act of 1996, and I look forward to its passage today.

The Coastal Zone Management Act [CZMA] is a voluntary, incentive-based program which protects coastal States, such as Massachusetts by giving States the authority over Federal activities that affect the State's coastal resources. The Federal CZMA has a strong track record of successes and bipartisan support because it is voluntary. CZMA enables States to protect their rights while protecting and promoting important coastal dependent industries such as shipping, fisheries, tourism, and recreation. CZMA continues to play an important role in Massachusetts promoting environmentally sustainable economic development.

In 1978, the Massachusetts Coastal Zone Management Program [MCZM] became the first on the east coast to receive Federal approval. Since that time the Massachusetts program has played an integral role serving as liaison among local, State, and Federal agencies providing technical review and assistance in marine policy, law, and the sciences.

Today, it works to reduce water pollution from point and non-point sources thereby enabling hundreds of acres of commercially important shellfish beds to be reopened. Last year, over 400 acres were reopened and predictions are 1,000 acres will be reopened in the next year.

Currently, Massachusetts Coastal Zone Management is assisting important ports and harbors throughout

Massachusetts to assess their dredging needs and develop cost effective and environmentally safe disposal solutions. At the request of Governor Weld, Massachusetts is leading the development of a State strategy for aquaculture. These initiatives are expected to assist in the economic revitalization of Massachusetts ports hard hit by the New England fisheries collapse.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge an "aye" vote on H.R. 1965.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time on my side.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I thank the gentleman for yielding back the balance of his time.

Mr. Speaker, let me just make a couple of points. First, Mr. Speaker, I believe that inasmuch as this bill has made it to the level that it has in this debate, and inasmuch as I think Members on both sides of the aisle understand how important it is to protect the environmental ecosystems in all coastal areas around our state, that the bill certainly deserves the full support of all Members of the House. I hope it will pass unopposed.

I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that in states like New Jersey, where the gentleman from New Jersey, [Mr. PALLONE] and I come from, this bill take on enormous importance, because in highly populated areas like our State, east of the Garden State Parkway and to the Atlantic ocean, the people who reside in those areas and the wildlife that reside there and the wildlife that reside in the ocean, for that matter, participate in a unabashed way in being able to use those ecosystems which are protected through this act.

I must also say, Mr. Speaker, I was somewhat disappointed by the tenor of this debate, because we have tried to approach this matter from the beginning, in the subcommittee and thereafter, as a bipartisan issue. As a matter of fact, I think many members of the subcommittee on both sides are proud to have participated in the various debates that have led us to today.

So, Mr. Speaker, without further ado, I ask that the vote be considered at this point, and again I ask for the affirmative support by Members on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1675 because it will reauthorize the 1972 Coastal Zone Management Act. There are many reasons to champion the CZMA. But one reason stands above all others: This law saved our coasts. Back in the late sixties and early seventies we all saw runaway urban sprawl eating up some of our most precious coastlines at breakneck speed.

And my own home State of California led the race. At the development rates of the time, we thought that the entire California coast would be an unbroken chain of housing tracts, hotels, and condos by the turn of the century. The entire burden of planning and coping with

this coastal development was left to local counties—which didn't have the resources or expertise to deal with the problem. They also only focused on their stretch of coast and could not see the forest through the trees.

Then came the CZMA. It said to the States "If you come up with a plan to manage your State's coastal resources, then the Federal Government will provide funding to help you implement the plan." California and 28 other States took up the offer and designed and implemented coastal plans.

In California, voters passed the Coastal Act which created the California Coastal Commission and the California Coastal Conservancy. These twin State agencies have worked over the past 20 years to manage growth along California's coast and to preserve the coast's most unique and valuable resources.

These State agencies have used the CZMA to help stem the runaway sprawl along the California coast and we are the only statewide land use planning body in California.

And that kind of planning has helped protect California's economy. My friend Doug Wheeler, California's Secretary of Resources, recently released a report on the role of California's coastal resources in its future. The report found that coastal dependent industries contributed over \$17 billion a year to California's economy and supported over 370,000 jobs. Coastal tourism alone contributes \$10 billion a year to the State's economy.

In closing I want to thank JIM SAXTON, chairman of the Oceans and Fisheries Subcommittee, for his leadership and hard work in getting this bill passed. It has been a hard up-hill fight for him. Although reauthorization of the CZMA now seems noncontroversial, the chairman had to fight against his own party's leadership which held up this legislation for over 1 year.

In fact, one of the assumptions of the failed 1995 budget resolution was the termination of the entire Coastal Zone Management Program. So I think that any credit claimed by the Republican leadership for the passage of this bill belongs solely to JIM SAXTON.

H.R. 1965 is crucial to the environment and economies of all 35 coastal States. I urge its passage.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1965, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5, rule I, and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

COOPERATIVE FISHERIES MANAGEMENT ACT OF 1996

Mr. TORKILDSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2160) to authorize appropriations to carry out the Interjurisdictional Fisheries Act of 1986 and the