

about President Clinton. "Every time I turn around, he's got his hand in my pockets and trying to take my money away in taxes," he said.

It is senseless to talk about poverty in Louisiana, Louis Boggs said, let alone to try to fix it with federal help. "For people at the low end of the wage scale in a state like this, a minimum wage increase is just a vicious circle. People keep talking about poverty. What's poverty? There's no such thing as poverty. There's just workers without skills."

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member rises to express his strong support for the conference report providing an increased minimum wage. This Member supported the bill when it was originally considered by the House and believes the time is right to increase the wage of working Americans. This Member is also pleased to see that the conferees included many important reforms which are designed to offset any potential costs associated with the increased cost in wages.

The minimum wage was last increased on April 1, 1991, from \$3.80 to \$4.25 per hour. Inflation has increased 15.90 percent since April 1, 1991. At that rate, to have the same purchasing power as the minimum wage did when it was last increased, the minimum wage level today would have to be set at \$4.93 per hour. With the buying power of the minimum wage at a 40-year low, this Member has advocated a modest 45-cent-per-hour increase, which would have appropriately returned the minimum wage close to its strength following the latest increase in 1991. Although the measure goes beyond his preferred position, this Member simply could not in good conscience vote against raising the minimum wage up to the level it should be after the effect of inflation. The September 1, 1997, figure of \$5.15 per hour will only be 22 cents more than it should be to adjust to the inflation level of July 1, 1996, so the prospective increases put in place are not out of line.

This Member is very pleased that a \$5,000 tax credit for adoptions is included in this conference report. As you know, the House passed this provision several times in the past 2 years; however, each time the overall bill was vetoed by the President. It is time that this family-friendly tax credit becomes law.

Additionally, this Member is extraordinarily pleased to see that conferees agreed to include the so-called Homemakers IRA. This Member joined 34 of his colleagues in sending a letter to the conferees requesting that they include the provision in the conference report. This Member would like to thank the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER], for his prompt response to the letter and thank the conferees for including this provision. The Homemakers IRA will allow America's middle-class families to prepare for their future by raising the tax-deductible amount nonworking spouses may contribute to individual retirement accounts. For a family which contributes the new maximum of \$2,000 for a nonworking spouse, assuming they begin when they are 30 years old and retire at 65, they would have contributed an additional \$63,000 to their retirement. This figure is strictly their contributions and does not take into account earnings on their savings.

Mr. Speaker, this Member believes the conference report should be approved and urges his colleagues to vote aye.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). All time has expired.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

Pursuant to House Resolution 440, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 354, nays 72, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 398]

YEAS—354

Abercrombie	Dreier	Johnson (SD)
Ackerman	Duncan	Johnson, E. B.
Andrews	Dunn	Johnston
Bachus	Durbin	Kanjorski
Baesler	Edwards	Kaptur
Baker (LA)	Ehlers	Kasich
Baldacci	Engel	Kelly
Barcia	English	Kennedy (MA)
Barrett (NE)	Ensign	Kennedy (RI)
Barrett (WI)	Eshoo	Kennelly
Bass	Evans	Kildee
Bateman	Everett	Kim
Becerra	Ewing	King
Beilenson	Farr	Klecicka
Bentsen	Fattah	Klink
Bereuter	Fawell	Klug
Berman	Fazio	Knollenberg
Bevill	Fields (LA)	Kolbe
Bilbray	Filner	LaFalce
Bilirakis	Flake	LaHood
Bliley	Flanagan	Lantos
Blumenauer	Foglietta	Latham
Blute	Foley	LaTourette
Boehkert	Forbes	Lazio
Bonior	Fowler	Leach
Bono	Fox	Levin
Borski	Frank (MA)	Lewis (CA)
Boucher	Franks (CT)	Lewis (GA)
Brewster	Franks (NJ)	Lewis (KY)
Browder	Frelinghuysen	Lightfoot
Brown (CA)	Frisa	Linder
Brown (FL)	Frost	Lipinski
Brown (OH)	Furse	Livingston
Brown (TN)	Galleghy	LoBiondo
Bryant (TX)	Ganske	Lofgren
Bunn	Gejdenson	Longley
Bunning	Gekas	Lowe
Buyer	Gephardt	Luther
Calvert	Gibbons	Maloney
Camp	Gilchrest	Manton
Canady	Gillmor	Markey
Cardin	Gilman	Martinez
Castle	Gonzalez	Martini
Chambliss	Goodlatte	Mascara
Chapman	Goodling	Matsui
Christensen	Gordon	McCarthy
Chrysler	Goss	McCrery
Clay	Graham	McDermott
Clayton	Green (TX)	McHale
Clement	Greene (UT)	McHugh
Clinger	Greenwood	McInnis
Clyburn	Gunderson	McKeon
Coble	Gutierrez	McKinney
Coburn	Gutknecht	McNulty
Coleman	Hall (OH)	Meehan
Collins (GA)	Hamilton	Meek
Collins (IL)	Harman	Menendez
Collins (MI)	Hastert	Metcalfe
Condit	Hastings (FL)	Meyers
Conyers	Hayes	Millender-
Costello	Hayworth	McDonald
Coyne	Hefner	Miller (CA)
Cramer	Heineman	Minge
Creameans	Hilleary	Mink
Cummings	Hilliard	Moakley
Cunningham	Hinchev	Molinari
Danner	Hobson	Mollohan
Davis	Hoekstra	Montgomery
de la Garza	Hoke	Moorhead
Deal	Holden	Moran
DeFazio	Horn	Morella
DeLauro	Houghton	Murtha
Dellums	Hoyer	Nadler
Deutsch	Hunter	Neal
Diaz-Balart	Hutchinson	Neumann
Dicks	Hyde	Ney
Dingell	Jackson (IL)	Norwood
Dixon	Jackson-Lee	Nussle
Doggett	(TX)	Oberstar
Dooley	Jacobs	Obey
Dornan	Jefferson	Olver
Doyle	Johnson (CT)	Ortiz

Orton	Sabo	Thompson
Owens	Sanders	Thornton
Oxley	Sawyer	Thurman
Pallone	Saxton	Torkildsen
Parker	Schiff	Torres
Pastor	Schroeder	Torricelli
Paxon	Schumer	Towns
Payne (NJ)	Scott	Traficant
Payne (VA)	Seastrand	Upton
Pelosi	Serrano	Velazquez
Peterson (FL)	Shaw	Vento
Peterson (MN)	Shays	Visclosky
Petri	Shuster	Volkmer
Pickett	Sisisky	Vucanovich
Pomeroy	Skaggs	Walker
Porter	Skeen	Walsh
Portman	Skelton	Ward
Poshard	Slaughter	Waters
Pryce	Smith (MI)	Watt (NC)
Quillen	Smith (NJ)	Waxman
Quinn	Smith (TX)	Weldon (FL)
Rahall	Smith (WA)	Weldon (PA)
Ramstad	Solomon	Weller
Rangel	Spence	White
Reed	Spratt	Whitfield
Regula	Stark	Wicker
Richardson	Stenholm	Williams
Riggs	Stockman	Wilson
Rivers	Stokes	Wise
Roberts	Studds	Wolf
Roemer	Stupak	Woolsey
Rogers	Tanner	Wynn
Ros-Lehtinen	Tate	Yates
Rose	Tauzin	Young (AK)
Roukema	Taylor (MS)	Zeliff
Roybal-Allard	Tejeda	Zimmer
Rush	Thomas	

NAYS—72

Allard	Ehrlich	Myers
Archer	Fields (TX)	Myrick
Armey	Funderburk	Nethercutt
Baker (CA)	Geren	Packard
Balenger	Hall (TX)	Pombo
Barr	Hancock	Radanovich
Bartlett	Hansen	Rohrabacher
Barton	Hastings (WA)	Roth
Boehner	Hefley	Royce
Bonilla	Herger	Salmon
Burr	Hostettler	Sanford
Burton	Inglis	Scarborough
Callahan	Istook	Schaefer
Campbell	Johnson, Sam	Sensenbrenner
Chabot	Jones	Shadegg
Chenoweth	Kingston	Souder
Combest	Largent	Stearns
Cooley	Laughlin	Stump
Cox	Lucas	Talent
Crane	Manzullo	Taylor (NC)
Crapo	McCollum	Thornberry
Cubin	McIntosh	Tiahrt
DeLay	Mica	Wamp
Doolittle	Miller (FL)	Watts (OK)

NOT VOTING—7

Bishop	Ford	Young (FL)
Brownback	Lincoln	
Dickey	McDade	

□ 1146

Messrs. MCCOLLUM, JONES, MICA, MYERS of Indiana, and KINGSTON changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. BACHUS changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 1316, SAFE DRINKING WATER ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1996

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 507 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 507

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (S. 1316) to reauthorize and amend title XIV of the Public Health Service Act (commonly known as the "Safe Drinking Water Act"), and for other purposes. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MCINNIS] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During the consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 507 is a simple resolution. The proposed rule merely provides that it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany S. 1316, a bill to reauthorize and amend the Safe Drinking Water Act. Additionally, this rule waives all points of order against the conference report and against its consideration.

Mr. Speaker, with the passage of the conference report on S. 1316 we can look the American people in the eye and say, we have come up with a good program that is going to protect the water supply for America. This is a good day's work.

The American people have called for a smaller, less costly, less intrusive government, and we have heard their calls. However, we are continuing our responsibilities of protecting the air we breathe and the water we drink. This measure, The Safe Drinking Water Act, provides this protection.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 507 is straightforward, and it was reported by the Committee on Rules by unanimous voice vote. I urge my colleagues to support House Resolution 507 as well as the underlying conference report.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank my dear friend and colleague, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MCINNIS], for yielding me the customary half-hour.

Mr. Speaker, I support this rule and I essentially support this bill.

Today's Safe Drinking Water Act is a sound improvement to our national drinking water laws. Those laws were enacted many years ago to help make our drinking water supply safe.

Although you wouldn't know it, Mr. Speaker, given what's coming out of the faucets in Washington, DC, these days, the safe drinking water regulations are a very important part of everyday life in this country.

This bill requires water systems to notify their customers annually of the contaminants found in their tap water. It helps small public water systems comply with national standards.

On the whole it's a good bill and we should pass it.

Unfortunately, the process by which this bill has come to the floor has been one more example of how my Republican colleagues are having trouble running Congress in an efficient and bipartisan way.

For example, Mr. Speaker, the authority to spend the money needed for this bill ran out 2 days ago.

That means that \$725 million that could have gone toward making drinking water systems safe all across the country is lost.

Even though the bill passed the House on June 25, the Republican leadership waited 22 days before appointing conferees.

That's right Mr. Speaker, the water systems for American cities and towns will be \$725 million poorer because my Republican colleagues didn't finish their work on time.

For example, because of Republican carelessness, my home State of Massachusetts has lost over \$7.9 million in funds to rehabilitate aging and dangerous drinking water systems.

And the 3½ million residents of my colleague's home State of Colorado have lost almost \$9.3 million.

Mr. Speaker, this is a disgrace.

And, to add insult to injury, the grant program in this bill is loaded down with 24 earmarked pork projects.

Those extravagant pork projects will take much needed money away from the State revolving fund.

It's going to take \$8 billion to do all we need to do to fix our Nation's drinking water problems. We ought to get our priorities straight.

I urge my Republican colleagues to get their work done sooner because it's 1996 and American citizens should have no doubts whatsoever about how safe and clean their water is.

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

Mr. MCGINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I remind all my colleagues that this bill came out of the committee unanimous. It has the support of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY].

This is what our debate is about here on the rule, and this is one of those few times where I think everybody in the Chamber is in agreement on the rule, so I see no further need to have speakers.

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

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

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the House Resolution 507, I call up the conference report on the bill (S.

1316) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (S. 1316) to reauthorize and amend title XIV of the Public Health Service Act, commonly known as the Safe Drinking Water Act, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 507, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of August 1, 1996, at page H9679).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLILEY] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] will each be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLILEY].

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

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

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, 1 week ago today I convened the first meeting of the conference committee on this proposal, the Safe Drinking Water Act Amendments of 1996.

I noted at that time that we had a big job to do and just a short time to do it. We had two bills that, while similar in significant respects, also contained serious differences. As we all know, we had just a small amount of time in which to accomplish our task.

I also noted that, on that occasion, the tremendous principles of both the House and the Senate in developing this legislation. First and foremost, this measure assures each of us, and our children, cleaner, safer, purer drinking water. It represents commonsense environmentalism rather than the rigid, inflexible mandates of prior law.

This measure, instead, promotes flexibility. It empowers States and local water authorities to focus their resources on those contaminants that pose the greatest risks. For the first time ever, it gives those same States and local water authorities the flexibility they need to get the job done.

I was privileged earlier in my life to serve as mayor of the city of Richmond. I have spoken with mayors about this measure and also to the Governors and to local water officials.

□ 1200

They tell me this bill is a godsend. According to the Congressional Budget Office, this conference agreement will "change the Federal drinking water program in ways that would lower the costs to public water systems of complying with existing and future requirements."

We authorize \$7.6 billion to the States to help public water systems comply with the Safe Drinking Water Act and for helping local water authorities solve the problem of source water pollution. That is on top of \$100

million for States to administer their own safe drinking water programs and \$80 million for new studies that tell us more about the health effects of arsenic, radon and cryptosporidium, and how best we can treat them.

Here in the District of Columbia we have seen in the last few weeks why this legislation is so important. Here, in the Capital of the richest, the strongest, the most technologically advanced Nation in the history of the world, people cannot trust the water that they drink. The water mains, hundreds of miles of them, are literally rotting away underneath us. This legislation helps fix the problem, not just here in the District of Columbia, but in cities and small towns from coast to coast.

But that still is not all this measure does. That is because, once this measure is signed into law, Americans will know more about the water that they drink than ever before. We provide for 24-hour notifications of violation. Today they have up to 2 weeks. We provide for community right-to-know, a detailed summary provided to every household telling them what is in the water that they drink.

Yes, this is fine legislation, legislation that reflects the kind of bipartisan spirit of compromise that we have always tried to foster on the Committee on Commerce. I said so at the conference, as others did, but I said something else too. I noted then that this measure has passed the Senate by a vote of 99 to nothing. I noted that it cleared the House unanimously as well, passed by voice vote, and I predicted that none of us, Democrat or Republican, House or Senate, would easily explain to the folks back home why such a good measure, a measure that cleared both houses unanimously, should be sacrificed because we could not resolve the details. The past week we have endeavored to do just that, to put our difference aside and reach common ground, and in the week just past we did just that.

I am proud to have stood shoulder to shoulder with my Committee on Commerce colleagues, Democrat and Republican alike, to defend the integrity of the Committee on Commerce bill. We succeeded. The measure before us reflects in virtually every respect that provisions that were approved unanimously in the Committee on Commerce.

In virtually every respect, this measure echoes the provisions that were developed in large measure because of the contributions of my good friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], and my good friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN]. That is why I regret that they have chosen not to sign the conference report.

Nonetheless, I submit that they will agree with me that even those minor changes that have been adopted in conference actually have improved the bill. Their argument does not focus on

the core of the bill, which they themselves worked on. Their argument is with the provisions not within our jurisdiction, provisions incidentally that were approved by this House by unanimous vote. I submit to my friends on the other side respectfully that they should not let perfection be the enemy of the good.

This legislation, my colleagues, is very, very good for the American people. Together with the food safety measure now on the President's desk, it will give this Congress two major pieces of environmental legislation of which we can be proud. Indeed, it will give Bill Clinton the first environmental accomplishments of his presidency.

Let us put the interest of the American people ahead of our own differences. This measure is long overdue. Let us pass it today.

I am very pleased also to congratulate the other body, Senator CHAFEE, Senator KEMPTHORNE and, in particular, my own colleague, the senior Senator from Virginia, JOHN WARNER, whose help was very instrumental in bringing us where we are today.

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 6 minutes.

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, this conference came up a day late and \$725 million short. The old saying is, "A day late and a penny short." We are \$725 million short and 2 days late. However, the \$725 million that should have gone for paying for safe drinking water for this Nation's community water systems somehow got misplaced on the way to the floor with this bill.

That is \$725 million that should have been there to help the States pay for what are now unfunded mandates created by this bill. It should have gone for community water systems to pay for filtration and disinfection plants. It should have funded a part of the grant to the District of Columbia to restore the decrepit and unsafe water system of this Nation's Capital.

What happened? That is the interesting story.

Well, it is a tale of speed, and it is a tale of greed. The speed, or should I say the lack of it, and both occurred at unfortunate times, with which the House leadership appointed the conferees made it virtually impossible for the conference to complete its work in time to secure the \$725 million that was set aside to make the drinking water of this Nation safe.

Let me explain further. The House has known since April that the 1996 appropriation for EPA included \$725 million, which would be immediately available for a new safe drinking water revolving loan fund, if the act was authorized by July 31.

Under the leadership of my distinguished friend, and I want to pay trib-

ute to him, the gentleman from Virginia, the chairman of the Committee on Commerce, the House passed without a dissenting vote a strong, bipartisan safe drinking water bill on June 25. That left us a total of 35 days to reconcile a Senate measure that passed that body, noted for its slow movement last year.

The Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure added to the House bill at the last minute some noteworthy porcine provisions, with the blessing of the leadership. Then, whether due to inattention or the intervention of the Speaker, the conferees on this bill were not appointed until the week the bill passed, the next week or even the next week. In fact, it took 22 days to appoint conferees. Worse, when the conferees were appointed, the leadership added layers of complexity by appointing from three committees. The Committee on Science latched on to a variety of provisions, but their success pales in comparison to their brethren at the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

The Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure desperately wanted their no-priority, high-waste, who-cares-about-State-needs, election-year, bringing-home-the-bacon, name-the-project-after-me, no shame pork fund.

Their insatiable appetite did face one hurdle. The bill included firewall provisions that provided they could not have their luau unless and until the state drinking water revolving fund was capitalized at 75 percent of its appropriation, or \$750 million.

Now, because I have dealt with the appetites of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure before, as have most of my colleagues, we made a motion to instruct to make sure that the House conferees would not forget this explicit commitment in the House-passed bill. That passed unanimously through this body.

But guess what? In the closing days of the conference, with the deadline staring us in the face, the conferees from the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure announced that they would not allow the conference report to be filed unless and until the firewall was removed.

In fact, at many points, the Senate offered to recede to the House on these provisions, but the conferees on the part of the House; namely, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, constantly and consistently refused. The Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure would not accept their own provisions unless and until the firewall was removed.

So yesterday, the Speaker gave in to their raid on the Treasury, and the 75 percent trigger was removed to create a \$175 million fund. Not surprisingly, and in complete disregard for the numerous claims made by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure porkmeisters during the debate on my motion to instruct, the statement of

managers quite without shame earmarks the money for 24 projects, many of which are in freshman and marginal Republican districts. Since there is only one pot of money available for safe drinking water, the gain of my pork-loving colleagues comes at the expense of the safe drinking water revolving fund.

I would like my colleagues to know that this raid and this wonderful pork is going to cost everybody except those Members who have been able to dip their hands into this fund to come up with a wonderful little helping of pork for their district, and it is going to come up without any regard to the need of the public or to the questions of public health and safety. It is simply going to be a short-stopping of funds, a plundering of a fund which is inadequate to meet the total needs and a fund which is absolutely necessary to assure the safety of the people from unsafe, unhealthy and dangerous drinking water.

That is what is at issue. This is why it will be impossible for me to support what had been a sound and fair piece of legislation, which is now converted into pure pork for the benefit of a few people who are happily situated.

Now, I want to make it plain that I think that taking care of districts is a good thing. I think that getting necessary projects to better the country is good. But I do not think that this kind of raid falls even within that category. It lies simply in the area of seeking special presents at the expense of all, and we will be submitting to my colleagues a list of how your State, my colleagues, will be adversely impacted by the events that have transpired previous to the bringing of this bill to the House floor.

Mr. Speaker, I include that list for the RECORD.

DRINKING WATER STATE REVOLVING FUND CAPITALIZATION GRANTS LOST BECAUSE OF REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP'S DELAY ON S. 1316

State	Grant amount	Percent of available dollars
CA	\$41,827,400	6.03
TX	38,771,900	5.59
MI	32,984,000	4.75
NY	32,700,300	4.71
PA	29,441,200	4.24
NC	25,486,100	3.67
FL	24,943,600	3.59
OH	23,805,300	3.43
MN	23,259,900	3.35
WI	22,961,600	3.31
IL	21,279,400	3.07
WA	17,213,700	2.48
VA	16,272,200	2.34
NJ	15,445,900	2.23
AK	14,943,900	2.15
GA	14,245,400	2.05
IN	14,210,600	2.05
MO	12,080,400	1.74
CT	11,832,000	1.70
LA	11,286,000	1.63
OR	10,457,200	1.51
MD	9,749,900	1.40
OK	9,706,300	1.40
AZ	9,361,700	1.35
IA	9,316,900	1.34
CO	9,276,500	1.34
MS	9,105,200	1.31
MT	8,194,400	1.18
SC	8,191,900	1.18
MA	7,928,200	1.14
ID	7,825,000	1.13
KS	7,790,300	1.12
NH	7,602,300	1.10

DRINKING WATER STATE REVOLVING FUND CAPITALIZATION GRANTS LOST BECAUSE OF REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP'S DELAY ON S. 1316—Continued

State	Grant amount	Percent of available dollars
NE	7,087,800	1.02
TN	7,061,400	1.02
NM	7,052,400	1.02
ME	6,993,500	1.01
RI	6,941,300	1.00
VT	6,941,300	1.00
PR	6,941,300	1.00
DC	6,941,300	1.00
DE	6,941,300	1.00
WV	6,941,300	1.00
AL	6,941,300	1.00
AR	6,941,300	1.00
ND	6,941,300	1.00
SD	6,941,300	1.00
UT	6,941,300	1.00
WY	6,941,300	1.00
HI	6,941,300	1.00
NV	6,941,300	1.00
KY	6,941,300	1.00

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER], the very able chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to strongly support this legislation, congratulate my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, particularly the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLILEY], chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR], the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BORSKI], as well as the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BLUTE], the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. WAMP], and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MENENDEZ], who were all very positive forces to help bring about the passage of this very important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation improves source water quality. Our interest in the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure is essentially title 5, which deals with infrastructure.

I know the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], my dear friend, in years past when he was chairman of the committee, had an extraordinary ability to find elasticity in the jurisdiction of his committee. I guess that is still happening today. However, it is very clear title 5 is under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. Indeed, those were the conferees, exclusive conferees.

Mr. Speaker, I am also quite surprised to hear the gentleman taking umbrage at what we in our committee did, those of us who had jurisdiction on both sides of the aisle, over this legislation. I am particularly surprised to see him put pictures of porkers up there and talk about specific projects, when indeed the Rouge River in his district has had over \$320 million earmarked in the past for projects, and indeed in the current appropriation bill there is \$20 million of unauthorized appropriation. I guess we should be vigorously objecting to \$20 million that is earmarked in an appropriation bill for the gentleman's congressional district when it is not even authorized.

So it seems to me fair is fair here, and I guess we better focus a little more intently on some of these unauthorized projects. The good news about this bill is that it provides a billion dollars a year in a State revolving loan fund to finance State drinking water facilities; \$350 million a year for a national program for drinking water infrastructure; a program for grants to Alaska and to the States along the United States-Mexican border; a program for grants to the New York City watershed, which is of extraordinary importance.

So, Mr. Speaker, we are very pleased that we have been able to support this. It is a national bill. It is a bill that really makes the American public a real winner because we now have an excellent new drinking water law that provides assistance, not only to specific regions, but to the Nation as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this very powerful environmental legislation.

□ 1215

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

I just want to note that because the Republican leadership delayed the consideration of this bill past the Wednesday deadline to accommodate the gentleman from Pennsylvania's taste for pork, his State lost \$26.4 million which would have been used to improve the safety of the drinking water for its 12 million citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes and 30 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN].

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

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, before I focus on my substantive concerns with S. 1316, I want to recognize some of the Members and staff who have made invaluable contributions to this legislation: Congressmen JIM SAXTON, SHERWOOD BOEHLERT, and FRANK PALLONE deserve our thanks for their efforts on the right-to-know provision and NITA LOWEY, BART STUPAK, and SHERROD BROWN must be commended for their committed advocacy for the bill's estrogenic screening program. I also want to thank the House Democratic staff, Dick Frandsen and Bill Tyndall, Greg Dotson and Phil Schiliro for their work on this legislation.

In many respects, this is a good bill and one we should be proud to support. We worked hard on a bipartisan basis to resolve difficult issues. It was clear to me that both houses and both parties were committed to passing strong and balanced legislation. But I cannot support the conference report that is before us today. I will vote no for two reasons:

First, the State revolving fund, which is one of the most important provisions in this legislation, has just lost over \$700 million in guaranteed

funding because Congress missed the July 31 deadline. This is only half a bill without the SRF, and half a bill will not solve our drinking water problems.

There is absolutely no reason why the guaranteed money had to be lost.

The second reason I will not support this legislation is that pork projects took priority over protecting the public health and assuring drinking water standards. The reason this bill made sense is that we took the recommendation of President Clinton to have a revolving fund that would provide money to the water systems in this country to use to make the capital expenditures so they could have drinking water that would meet health standards. That was the carrot.

The stick in this legislation was if they did not do the things that were necessary, funds would be withheld from those water systems.

The bill made sense. The revolving fund was supposed to be distributed based on priorities and merit to those systems that needed those funds. That was the legislation that came out of our Committee on Commerce.

The Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure decided that they wanted \$50 million for special projects to be earmarked to receive their money, whether they deserved it or not. When the House bill passed, we incorporated a feature saying maybe some of these pork projects are inevitable. But let us be assured that the revolving fund is appropriated, at least 75 percent of it, before we start funding these special pork projects.

That was the House position. We had a unanimous vote of the House to support that position. And we went into meetings with the Senate and the Senate agreed with that position in conference. But then the chairman of the Transportation Committee insisted that he have his projects funded before the revolving fund would be funded. He insisted that his projects be funded in advance of the revolving fund.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican leadership should have taken the opportunity to show some leadership. They should have said if we could not do this before the deadline, let us extend the deadline, as we recommended by the gentleman from Michigan, Congressman DINGELL. The Republican leadership would not assert their role.

The second thing is that the congressional Republican leadership should have said no to the chairman of the Transportation Committee. You cannot get your pork barrel projects funded without the revolving fund being funded first. And the Republican leadership would not say no to pork.

Then the Republican leadership should have said to the Committee on Appropriations, we want to make sure that we are going to safeguard this money for the drinking water fund. And the Republican leadership would not say no.

If we are going to deal with the problems of fiscal responsibility in this

country, the leadership of this House must say no to pork. And if we are going to deal with the drinking water problems in this Nation and have a revolving fund, the leadership must say that fund will be available.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of sadness that I have to stand here, after having worked so hard on this bill, and to announce that I will vote against this bill. I will vote against it because the bill does not work if the revolving fund is not appropriated.

I feel that a miscarriage of fairness has taken place. I will yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER]. I want to point out, before I yield to him, that one of the projects that was earmarked for special consideration was in his district and it was mandated that the Corps of Engineers carry out this project, even though the Corps of engineers said to us they did not think it was a good project.

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

Mr. WAXMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, that is not accurate. There is no mandate that the corps carry out that provision, No. 1.

No. 2, there is nothing in this legislation that says the grants in title V will be funded first. No. 3, your commerce conferees violated the instructions of this House yourselves. You did not uphold the instructions and, most important, you sent us a letter to our committee asking us to earmark \$7 million for a Santa Monica project for yourself, for yourself, for your own project.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman does not know what he is talking about.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I have a letter right here.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is absolutely incorrect. Maybe it is better to be on the offensive rather than the defensive, but the gentleman is being offensive when he incorrectly states the circumstances.

The House voted unanimously to insist that his project do not get funded until 75 percent of the revolving fund is appropriated. That was disregarded and it means that we have no revolving fund to make the drinking water law work. I regret it and I think that we should unfortunately vote against this bill.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER].

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, we have right here the proposed Committee on Commerce offer which was that you backed away from the 75-percent trigger with regard to New York City and Alaska. So you violated the instructions of the House, No. 1.

No. 2, I have a letter from my good friend from California, dated March 29 of this year, asking for us to earmark \$7.5 million for a project in his district.

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

Mr. SHUSTER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WAXMAN. Is it not true that the Senate receded to the House to provide for the 75-percent funding and then the gentleman from Pennsylvania objected?

Mr. SHUSTER. Reclaiming my time, they did not yield on that simple point. They threw other provisions in as well which we could not accept.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina). The Chair would ask the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] if he could remove the item from the table.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to remove it, if the Chair can tell me what is objectionable here?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair believes it is a breach of decorum of the House.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, what is the breach? I am delighted to comply with the wishes of the Chair, but I am trying to understand what is it, where is the breach?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair believes that displaying the pig in front of the honored ranking member of the Committee on Commerce is a breach of decorum of the House and would ask that it be removed.

Mr. DINGELL. You mean this little pig, Mr. Speaker, is a breach of decorum of the House?

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection, if the gentleman wants to be identified with a pig in front of him. That is perfectly all right to me.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to comply with the wishes of the Chair. I just want to know what it is that the Chair is finding inconsistent with the rules of the House. I would observe that this pig would probably be more suitably displayed on the Republican committee table, but if the Chair desires that this pig be removed, I will, of course, remove it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair appreciates the gentleman's removal of it.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] is recognized.

Mr. DINGELL. I have no desire to speak at this time, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman wish to yield time?

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, am I instructed by the Chair to remove this pig or to keep it?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Yes, the gentleman should remove it. Does the gentleman wish to yield time?

Mr. DINGELL. Not at this time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes and 30 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. BILIRAKIS], distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Health and Environment of the Committee on Commerce.

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, let us get to the bottom line here. The conference has done its work and has produced a bill which will meet all of our objectives, every single one. First we have reformed and reauthorized one of our Nation's key environmental statutes. We have fundamentally changed the way the statute works and the way that the Safe Drinking Water Act allocates responsibilities between the Federal Government and the States.

Second, as opposed to previous mandates emanating from the ivory tower that is Washington—we are actually paying for new regulations up front. The conference agreement provides authorization for a \$7.6 billion State revolving loan fund to meet both past deficiencies and new requirements.

I think this bill makes it clear that we are no longer doing business as usual in Washington. Instead, we are producing legislation which advances the public health while making our laws and regulations more flexible, more sensible, and more responsive to local conditions.

The old Safe Drinking Water Act simply did not work well enough. Evidence of that fact is no more than a few steps away at any drinking water tap in the U.S. Capitol. The smell of extra chlorine lets you know we have a problem.

I believe we have a large part of the solution in this bill and expect that appropriations will be made available, starting in October, to provide money to the State Revolving Loan Fund. In addition, the conference report authorizes new studies on the health effects of drinking water contaminants, the biomedical effects of contaminants in the human body and on the occurrence of waterborne disease.

These efforts should help reassure all Americans that we are taking problems, such as those experienced by the District of Columbia this year and Milwaukee in 1993 very seriously. The final legislation will enhance both our knowledge and our ability to take corrective measures.

But these efforts are only part of the solution that this conference report offers. Under the legislation, EPA will have to "right size" its regulations—identifying affordable technology which can be used by public water systems as small as 25 customers. In addition, public water systems are offered relief from requirements which only increase their costs without a resulting benefit.

We also are promoting the establishment of State programs to train public water system operators and to help ensure that both new and existing systems have the technical, financial, and managerial capacity to meet drinking water standards. Altogether, we are telling the States to develop individual solutions to their local problems and are rejecting the notion that each and every regulation must come from EPA headquarters.

But more than that—I believe this legislation will help to reassure people

that the water which flows from their faucets will not cause them harm. In this legislation, we have accelerated public notice of drinking water violations and incorporated a new consumer confidence report to keep people informed, on an annual basis, of the quality of their water.

All of these things are accomplished in a bill which literally pays for itself. According to the Congressional Budget Office, and I quote, "the bill would change the Federal drinking water program in ways that would lower the costs to public water systems of complying with existing and future requirements. On balance, CBO estimates that the bill would likely result in significant net savings to State and local governments."

Mr. Speaker, this legislation passed my subcommittee on a unanimous vote of 24 to 0. It then passed our full committee by a vote of 42-0 and was approved by the full House without dissent. This conference report represents a further refinement and improvement of the underlying statute. I urge its immediate adoption.

□ 1230

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STUPAK].

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, it should be pointed out that because of delay of the Republican leadership and consideration of this bill past the Wednesday deadline, the gentleman from Florida, his State lost \$25 million to improve the safe drinking water for its 13½ million citizens.

I was a member of the conferees on this report and my colleagues know I was very proud of the bill we have. It is a great public policy bill. But to meet our needs we need \$8.6 million to provide for all the Safe Drinking Water Act projects in this Nation. But instead, we found out that pigs do fly and there is such a thing as a pig in a poke because we have lost money because of delays, and we have also lost money because of the earmarking that went onto this bill, something we strongly objected to.

For the past 4 years some of us have tried to come to this Congress to knock off the pork-like projects. Let my colleagues' projects stand on the merit of their project and not on who sits on a committee. That is the way it should be. But no, we cannot have that.

As my colleagues know, we made a historic move this week. We did welfare reform, we did minimum wage earlier today, and we did some health care, but we just cannot seem to get away from those old bad habits we just cannot resist.

Later today we are going to do a motion to recommit. The motion to recommit is going to say let us knock off the pork projects, let us let the legislation, let our colleagues' water projects stand on the merits, project against project. I am proud to put up my district against any district here on the projects.

Let us not do this earmarking. It is wrong. It is contrary to why we came here. I hope each and every Member will look closely at our motion to recommit and knock off the earmarks. Let us break the bad habits that lead us to deficits that we struggled to get under control.

We can do it if we would work together, but to take the needs of this country and for certain Members to carve out their own exception so they can have something to go back home and campaign on is wrong.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT], a member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

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

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to watch some of the people who are complaining so vociferously against the enlightened action of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. The same people, one after another, come before me as chairman of the Subcommittee on Water Resources and the Environment and asked for this project and this project and this project.

As for my distinguished colleague from Michigan, he is the graddaddy of them all. Do my colleagues know that little pig he had on this desk? That piggy is named River Rouge. Do my colleagues want to know why? Because he got \$325 million over 6 years earmarked for River Rouge. He is so found of that that he needs that little piggy, River Rouge. Glad to see the gentleman bring it here; good to see it once again.

Let me tell my colleagues, today we are taking a historic step toward improving the quality of the water we drink and the environment on which we all depend. The Safe Drinking Water Act Amendments of 1996 is the most significant environmental legislation since President George Bush signed the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 on December 11, 1990.

That historic legislation that President Bush signed, the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] and I were teamed up and we worked very hard to have an acid rain provision in that bill.

I am sorry we do not completely come eye-to-eye on this bill today but, quite frankly, my colleagues know what the drill is. It is a matter of jurisdiction, and the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. DINGELL, does not like the fact that the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. SHUSTER, came up with a good idea in the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and Mr. SHUSTER has designed a program that we are warmly embracing.

Now my colleagues have got to accept the fact that other people have ideas and other committees other than the Committee on Commerce have some jurisdiction. It is a reality of life that we have to accept. I have, and I think most of our conferees have.

The conference report before us today embodies most environmental aspects of the drinking water bills produced by the House and Senate, and I am proud to identify with them. The drinking water provisions before us are pro-environment, pro-State and local government and pro-business.

Every major environmental group in the Nation, the Sierra Club, the Audubon Society, the Natural Resources Defense Council, and the list goes on and on, strongly supports the Safe Drinking Water Act amendments of 1996, and do my colleagues want to know why? It is because we provide \$7.6 billion through the year 2003 for improvements to our Nation's crumbling drinking water infrastructure. We provide up to \$50 million annually in grants to assist America's poorest communities in providing safe, dependable drinking water. We provide critical new information to consumers on drinking water quality through community right-to-know provisions.

This is a good bill.

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

Mr. BLILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SHUSTER. My friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STUPAK], who is railing against earmarks, has a request before our committee to earmark \$4 million for the Grand Maris Harbor for himself.

Mr. BOEHLERT. The gentleman from Pennsylvania proved my point.

Mr. Speaker, I tell my colleague this: If you are for a cleaner, healthier, safer environment, and I think you all are, support this important legislation.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN].

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I only want to correct the record. The environmental groups that had supported this legislation have withdrawn their support because they know this law will not work unless we have an appropriation for that revolving fund.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER].

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I do not have a dog in this fight and I certainly do not have a pig in this bill, but I did come to this floor to hopefully argue the merits of this bill and to support this bill, and I will argue that there are three good reasons to support this bill.

However, there are two good reasons not to support this bill, and after coming along so quickly with welfare reform and health care reform it is a travesty. We have not only hit a speed bump here but we have gone down into a ravine, with \$725 million being lost because this bill was not done in a bipartisan way, and with the pork that is in here with such things as studies and multimedia programs.

I will recommend to most of my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, that we support this bill with those two big flaws in it.

First of all, this gives the EPA better flexibility and our small municipalities

better flexibility for alternative and affordable water systems; second, we use risk and cost-benefit analysis, something that I have been a strong advocate for on the Committee on Science for several years. Third, we give better right-to-know for our customers. When there are contaminants in the tap water, every year the water systems must report on those problems.

Now I was a conferee on this conference, Mr. Speaker, and I am very saddened by the fact that we have lost \$725 million and the pigs have been added into this bill. I will reluctantly encourage a "yes" vote.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. CRAPO], a member of the committee.

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

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to come here and support this bipartisan bill. It has been crafted with strong support from both parties throughout the process. I am a little saddened to see the tenure of the debate today because of the issues that have been raised, but let me talk about why this bill is so important for us to move forward.

Many of my colleagues know I come from a rural State and, like many of the environmental mandates imposed on our States, the original Safe Drinking Water Act was crafted without the careful consideration of the ramifications that cookie-cutter solutions imposed by Washington will have on the States, the counties and cities across our country.

Idaho is home to about a million people, and of the 2,700 water systems in my State, all but 12 have less than 10,000 users. Again and again and again across our State people have asked me to let us use the kinds of scientifically based solutions that will make our drinking water clean without forcing us to spend so much money on the cookie-cutter solutions that do not work. This bill does that.

This bill makes it so that no longer will the EPA be forced to regulate from Washington in a way that does not make sense. We will not have to continue to look for contaminants that do not exist on our water, and we can focus on the things that will work.

The EPA has estimated that the cost of cleaning up the clean water and the systems in our country will be about \$8 billion, and this bill provides a revolving State loan fund that will give us the ability to bring those resources to bear to clean the water across our country.

It provides technical assistance for rural water systems like those found in my State, Idaho.

It provides for risk assessment and cost-benefit analysis, and it assures that the public will get clear and accurate information about the effects of contaminations in their population and subgroups and the health risks that they may face.

This is the kind of bill that we ought to be linking arms to move forward to pass, and I encourage Members from both sides of the aisle to put aside our differences. Let us again step forward in this Congress and make some significant progress for the clean drinking water of America.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Oregon [Ms. FURSE].

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Speaker, Members of this Congress are hired to do a job. We are not hired to get reelected. When one is in the majority, one of the jobs they have to do is, they have to get bills to the floor on time.

Now there are few things more important to Americans than the quality of the water they drink. In my hometown, Portland, OR has worked very hard to get safe drinking water, but the job of the Congress is to take care of the details. It is to see that our work gets down on time, and the devil is in the details.

Unfortunately, the Republican leadership took so long to get this bill to the floor that we have lost, we have lost \$275 million for projects. Why? Why was there this delay? Well, I would think it is politics. Oregon, my home State, has lost as a real consequence \$10.5 million.

I would say let us not worry about pork projects for people who maybe need to get reelected. Let us rather worry about clean drinking water for the people who live in this country, our American citizens.

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

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to address the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER]. He indicated that I had a Grand Maris project in this bill. Nothing could be further from the truth. He should have been honest with the American people.

Now this is a Safe Drinking Water Act. What the gentleman talked about is a break wall. Now I do not know last night if, in expending their definition of pork under Safe Drinking Water Act, they are now adding break walls.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, I never said it was in this bill. It is in another bill the gentleman has before our committee.

Mr. STUPAK. Would the gentleman like us to take down his words so he can remember what he said?

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I did not say it was in this bill.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BILBRAY], a member of the committee.

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, I am very impressed with my colleagues who are concerned about the effective and efficient use of taxpayers' funds. I think all of America will be very impressed with the fact that Congress is finally very, very sensitive on that issue. But let me remind my colleagues, if we defeat this bill here

today we will lose over \$500 million that can be used for safeguarding our drinking water.

Mr. Speaker, what we are talking about here today is having a new Safe Drinking Water Act that fulfills the promises of the old act. One example is that there are many assumptions that the voters and the citizens of America make about their drinking water.

One of them was the fact that when one bought a bottle of water, that the Federal Government assured that it was as clean as what was coming out of the tap. Under the old act that assurance was not a reality. Under the new act that assurance will be in reality.

Now, our bottled water in America has been very good, but I think the assurance that it is, and will remain good is what the new act is all about. We are fulfilling the promises of the old act with the new act.

□ 1415

Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to live in the community of San Diego, which, according to every major environmental group that has investigated it, has some of the safest drinking water in the entire United States. It is too bad, though, that when I fly across the country every week and come to work in Washington, I cannot be assured that in Washington, here in the Nation's Capital, where the Federal Government has its greatest responsibility, our drinking water is not as safe as it is on the Pacific coast.

I would ask that my colleagues find reasons to improve on the old, to be able to move forward in a progressive way. This bill is the progressive bill, the bill that fulfills the promises of the old that never were fulfilled. Today it is time to move forward. Let us not find excuses to walk away from our responsibilities. Let us do what is right and approve this new, progressive Safe Drinking Water Act.

I rise in strong support of this progressive and bipartisan bill, which will have an enormously beneficial effect on the health and environment of the American people. As a conferee on this landmark legislation, I can tell you that this conference report on the Safe Drinking Water Act [SDWA] marks a major shift away from the regulatory status quo of placing undue value and emphasis on the regulation itself, toward what the practical effect of the regulation actually is on the public health and our natural resources. This is as it should be.

It is this kind of outcome-driven and science-based environmental policy-setting that I have been proud to be a part of in this Congress. This is the kind of process in which I was used to operating during my time in local government, and the results of this cooperative and effective policy-making which we see here today will allow us to better serve the public health needs of the American people.

It has been a privilege for me to have been able to play a close role in strengthening and improving such an important statute as the SDWA. These amendments will provide for sensible and much-needed reforms in how the SDWA is implemented.

H.R. 3604 will help to refocus EPA's priorities and resources toward those contaminants which present the greatest and most immediate threat to public health, provide EPA and local water authorities with greater flexibility in implementing the improved SDWA law, and place new emphasis on ensuring that public water systems have the necessary technical, managerial, and financial resources available to comply with the SDWA.

Mr. Speaker, this also marks a significant achievement in our ability to recognize and address flaws or gaps in our existing environmental or public health strategies. Laws such as the SDWA were clearly well-meant at the time of their inception—in this case, the 1972-era SDWA has not been reauthorized since 1986.

However, the passage of time invariably exposes weaknesses or shortcomings in the strongest of our statutes, and we need to recognize and respond to this. In the past, it has often been easier to confront problems by simply blaming a law, instead of working together to determine whether the law in question is being properly implemented, or whether it is still effective in serving its intended purpose. These laws need to be as dynamic and flexible as the rapidly changing environments we intend for them to protect, and the people who live in them.

This means that occasionally such laws must be reexamined and renewed, in order to ensure that their original goals are still being achieved.

I have always believed that we ought not to cling to the conventional wisdom that our public health and environmental laws are "set in stone", and incapable of being improved with the application of new knowledge. In order to maintain their effectiveness, we have the responsibility to see to it that when modern science and technology can be applied to improve these laws, we take the appropriate action to do so.

Many of our "crown jewel" environmental laws were written over 20 years ago, and it is incumbent upon us in to make these needed improvements when necessary. With this comprehensive reauthorization, this Congress accomplished a challenging but long-unachievable task on behalf of all of our constituents nationwide. I want to commend my chairmen, Mr. BLILEY and Mr. BILIRAKIS, and my other colleagues who worked hard together, in a bipartisan manner, to help make this happen.

In addition to the sound science-based foundation of this bill, I am particularly proud of section 305 of the bill, which addresses health standards for bottled water. Section 305 is a refinement of legislation, H.R. 2601, which I introduced earlier in this Congress. My language will simply require that any EPA regulation which sets a maximum contaminant level for tap water, and any FDA regulation setting a standard of quality for bottled water for the same contaminant, take effect at the same time. If the FDA does not promulgate a regulation within a realistic time frame as established by section 305, the regulation established by the EPA for that element in tap water will be considered the applicable regulation for the same element in bottled water. This will provide consumers with the health assurances that the water they can purchase off the shelf meets at least the same standards as their tap water. I have a letter from the International

Bottled Water Association which elaborates on the benefits of this provision, which I would like entered in the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to conclude with an observation. In my hometown of San Diego, my family and my constituents are very fortunate to already enjoy an extremely high standard of quality in our drinking water, in fact a recent study by a national environmental group found that water systems in the San Diego region reported zero health advisories over the last three years.

By comparison, the same study found that an alarmingly high percentage of water systems in some regions of the country—including Washington, DC—had reported health advisories or compliance failures during the same time period. The Safe Drinking Water Act amendments we will pass today, and which will soon be signed into law, will strengthen and improve the weak links in the existing statute, and in so doing will help bring these high levels of health and environmental quality which we appreciate in San Diego to other communities nationwide.

Again, and I can't emphasize it enough, this is a progressive step forward, away from a 1970's-era process which places higher value on process and regulation itself, towards a more responsible and outcome-based approach which focuses on the product that is generated.

This will help us reinforce our common goals of better serving the public health needs of the American people, and providing us with a cleaner and safer overall environment, which is something we ought to be ever mindful of, and never take for granted.

INTERNATIONAL BOTTLED  
WATER ASSOCIATION,

Alexandria, VA, June 25, 1996.

Hon. BRIAN BILBRAY,  
Longworth House Office Building, House of  
Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR REP. BILBRAY: The International Bottled Water Association, which represents over 85 percent of all bottled water sold in the United States, would like to thank you for your help in drafting the bottled water provision of the Safe Drinking Water Act legislation. We are also grateful to the committee staff who developed this improved version of the Senate bottled water provision in cooperation with your legislative director, Dave Schroeder.

Our industry strongly supports the principal objective of this provision, i.e., to require that any EPA regulation setting a maximum contaminant level for tap water and any FDA regulation setting a standard of quality for bottled water for the same contaminant take effect at the same time.

One in six households relies on bottled water as their source of drinking water. There are 430 companies producing bottled water in the United States with annual sales estimated at \$3.4 billion, making bottled water one of the fastest growing segments of the beverage industry.

Bottled water is regulated by the FDA, the states and through IBWA's own model code. The bottled water provision will ensure that a FDA standard for a contaminant in bottled water is set in a timely manner and is no less protective of the public health than the EPA regulation for the same contaminant in tap water.

We look forward to seeing the Safe Drinking Water Act legislation signed into law this year. Thank you.

Sincerely,

SYLVIA E. SWANSON,  
Executive Vice President.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Ms. ESHOO].

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member of our committee for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind our colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. BILBRAY], that because the Republican leadership delayed consideration of this bill past the Wednesday deadline, that our great State of California, the greatest State in the Union, has lost almost \$42 million to improve the safety of the drinking water for our 31 million citizens.

Mr. Speaker, there are many that begin their remarks with, and I remember a famous politician that said, "There you go again." There goes the Congress again. We had a darned good bill that was a bipartisan bill, worked up and worked out over a period of time by the members of the Committee on Commerce. I was proud that the Committee on Commerce rose above what I thought were election year politics to craft a workable solution to a very, very important problem in our country. That was then, and this is now.

Here is a list. Here is a list of the pork. We are mixing pork with water. Here is the list. These are some of the most vulnerable Republican freshmen in the House of Representatives. Now there is a rush to mix pork with water. It is being taken out of the revolving fund, the capitalization grants for States, \$725 million, and we have mixed the pork in with it. Where are the reformers in the Congress to rush to this floor? Where are the reformers in the Congress coming to the floor and saying, "This does not belong in this bill"? It is placing at risk one of the most important issues in our Nation.

Every American should be able to travel anyplace in this country and rely on safe drinking water. Instead, this has been bollixed up with pork. So this is not a safe drinking water bill. Now because of the Speaker and the Republican leadership, they have turned it into a safe reelection bill. I urge my colleagues to vote against it. This is not what the bill should be.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes and 30 seconds to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR], a member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

When all else fails, Mr. Speaker, read the bill. The findings section of the Safe Drinking Water Act says:

The Congress finds that the Federal Government commits to maintaining and improving its partnership with the States in the administration and implementation of the Safe Drinking Water Act. States play a central role in the implementation of safe drinking water programs and need increased financial resources and appropriate flexibility to ensure the prompt and effective implementation of safe drinking water programs.

Under the rubric of States come cities. Cities are entities of the States.

What we are doing here is helping cities deal with the problems of providing clean and safe drinking water for their people.

Mr. Speaker, I do not have a little friend to bring with me down here to the podium, but I do have an example. Just about 4 years ago, the people in the city of Milwaukee were frightened out of their wits by an attack that hospitalized thousands and affected 400,000 people with abdominal pain, diarrhea, dysentery, and caused 131 deaths when an attack of cryptosporidium found in the drinking water was unable to be cleansed by the drinking water treatment system of the city of Milwaukee.

If ever there were a red flag on the horizon for America to wake up and deal effectively with both the standards and the infrastructure for providing safe drinking water for our people, that was the wake-up call. This legislation originated in the 103d Congress, moved out of our Committee on Public Works and Transportation, did not make it through the Congress; but what we have today is an adaptation of that legislation.

I simply want to emphasize that, while there is a great deal of talk about specific designation of projects, that is in the report language. It is not in the bill. We do this regularly in numerous pieces of legislation. Statements of managers in conference reports make specific references. This is not law, this is an exhortation of examples of the kinds of projects that need to be done and communities that need to be helped. We have rendered that judgment. I urge my colleagues, this is a fine bipartisan piece of legislation. Support the bill.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS].

(Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, there was a bipartisan agreement on giving EPA the authority it needs to ensure the safety of the drinking water. It would have guaranteed the public the right to know if their drinking water was safe. It would have required EPA to issue regulations to prevent deadly microbial contamination of public drinking water supplies. It would have prohibited the use of lead pipes, solder, and flux in the installation and repair of any public water system, as well as repair of any facility connected to that public water system.

Unfortunately, these are not the things my Republican colleagues care most about. Instead, at the very last minute, and despite the strong opposition of Democratic Members and the administration, they have turned the safe drinking water conference into the biggest pork barrel this House has seen in years.

In clear violation of the House's instructions to the conferees, the Republican conferees have in fact earmarked \$175 million for low-priority pork

projects. The conference report forces the EPA to fund 25, 25 earmarked projects, most of which are in the districts of Republican freshmen and other Republicans in marginal districts. What does this tell the American people about the Republican majority in this House and the environment? It tells them that the only way Republicans can support environmental legislation is if it is laden with pork that will help their politically vulnerable Members return to their seats in Congress and keep pork chops on their own tables.

They don't care whether EPA has the authority to combat deadly microbial organisms like cryptosporidium in the drinking water supplies. Last year, Republican Members voted for legislation to prohibit EPA from even working on, much less issuing a rule to keep deadly microbes, like cryptosporidium, out of drinking water.

It was on February 24, 1995, my Democratic colleagues and I offered a motion to recommit the regulatory moratorium bill. The only thing the motion to recommit would have done was to exempt the microbial prevention rule from the moratorium.

The motion was defeated by my Republican colleagues. The vote was 172 yeas and 250 nays. Two hundred and twenty-six Republican Members voted "no," while only one, I repeat, only one Republican Member voted "yes."

This is how Republicans vote when the question is simply whether or not we work for safe drinking water. They oppose it, almost unanimously.

Mr. Speaker, in 1993 an outbreak of the deadly microbe cryptosporidium poisoned the water supply of Milwaukee, WI, making 400,000 people in that city sick and killing over 100 other people. Surveys also showed that cryptosporidium was a problem in municipal water supplies all over the country, not just in Milwaukee.

In addition, last year, water here in Washington had such high levels of bacteria, including E coli, that the public had to boil their water. This year, children and the elderly were advised to refrain from drinking it.

The public is rightfully mad. They are demanding better protection from their Government—protection of their health and safety, not protection of the political careers of freshmen Republican Members.

It is time for us all to do what is right for the people we serve, simply because it is the right thing to do and not because we want some project to talk about at election time.

It is time for this Congress to get on with doing the things that matter: keeping deadly microbes out of our drinking water; keeping bacteria and pesticides out of the meat, poultry and food we eat; and keeping cancer-causing chemicals out of the air and water.

The sooner my Republican colleagues devote their attentions to these fundamental public needs, rather than election year pork, the safer and healthier all Americans will be.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BORSKI] to discuss the subject of pork.

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I think I want to thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure Democrats, I want to urge

support for this bill. Our committee had sole jurisdiction over title IV, which provides grants for needy communities all over this country to meet their drinking water needs. Money for projects under this title is available for every area of the country. It is funding for drinking water projects for communities that badly need these funds.

As a conferee on this title, Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Chairman SHUSTER, and the gentleman from New York, Chairman BOEHLERT, who negotiated with the Senate and carefully crafted this compromise on this section of the bill. I want to urge support for the bill and opposition to the motion to recommit.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. WAMP].

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

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the safe drinking water conference report.

Mr. Speaker, as vice chairman of the Water Resources and Environment Subcommittee of the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, I know that among the most important items we have considered in this 104th Congress is the Safe Drinking Water Act reauthorization. This has already been an active week, and we have seen just how productive our majority can be when we work with our colleagues across the aisle to do the Nation's business, the people's business, on behalf of all those who sent us here. If we are to see progress in our environmental laws to give us cleaner, safer, healthier water, we must work in a timely and bipartisan manner. That is what we have done, with the help of some dedicated staff from both our committees and the other body.

I have been especially interested in the area of providing safe drinking water supplies to communities in need. While we have debated some important national policy items this year in both Chambers, and I'm sure we will again in the remaining days of the 104th Congress, nothing we do is more important to the individuals residing in districts across this country than ensuring their ability to drink clean, pure, safe water. As I hear from the people in my district so often, this is "where the rubber meets the road" on our national water policy.

One last note about meeting our most pressing local needs: in communities where there is no reliable supply of water—either due to contamination of their wells from natural causes or human activity or because of other circumstances beyond local residents' control—our constituents don't think that getting help hooking up to a nearby public water system is anything more than fulfilling our responsibility to provide for their health and safety. Every community with needs like that should have a chance to look for help from this bill, and priority should be given to those in the most urgent state of need.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, Chairman SHUSTER and Chairman BLILEY, and my other fellow conferees, I appreciate being given the opportunity to work with you and everyone on this conference committee to lend a hand to shaping this legislation. East Tennessee—and par-

ticularly Chattanooga—has a reputation for being pro-active in finding solutions to our environmental problems and working together as a community to promote sound, scientific research in many areas, but especially in the area of water. I've pledged to the people I represent to make water quality a top priority while I'm in Congress, and participating in this conference has been a great help to me in understanding these complex issues even better.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT].

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to make four points. This is inside baseball.

Point No. 1, in response to the gentlewoman from California, the conference was not delayed by inaction on the part of any Republican. As has been accurately reported in National Journal's Congress Daily, the conference was delayed because two Members, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] and the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN], objected and refused to sign the conference agreement.

Point No. 2, this is very important, the dollars that are claimed to have been lost I am convinced will not be lost, because every Member of this body and the other body wants to make certain that that 24-hour delay does not in any way jeopardize the funding that we need for safe drinking water.

Point No. 3, the total amount in dispute is one-quarter of 1 percent of the total amount of money funded in this bill.

Point No. 4, the grants program we are talking about is to help needy communities who are striving to provide a cleaner, healthier, safer environment for their constituents by improving their water system. That is what this program is all about.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to give this bill the support it deserves.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MINGE].

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

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Speaker, manipulation of the conference committee process and deadlines to take moneys from general funds from all States to finance specifically named projects for a select few for their political advantage is wrong. It is reprehensible.

The Pork Busters Coalition cannot object strongly enough. Leadership may change, the abuse of the process goes on.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BILIRAKIS].

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to make two points here, and in a way I suppose at least one has already been made.

First, we are not losing money today here, as people on the other side are saying. It is unfortunate, we have all

worked so well together on this piece of legislation, and all of a sudden we are throwing stones at each other. It is just a terrible thing to see.

We are not losing money today, because the States could not possibly have been prepared to use the money effective yesterday, which is when this thing was supposed to go into effect. We are not talking about the States sitting there basically just waiting for this money to start putting it into effect right off the bat. It is impossible.

What we are doing today, of course, is granting the legal authority to spend the \$7.6 billion on safe drinking water. Actually providing this money, as we all know, but nobody seems to be saying it, is the job of the Committee on Appropriations, as it always is. Can we guess what the Committee on Appropriations is going to do in forthcoming years? I think not.

Second, my colleagues complained rather loudly about so-called pork. They do not talk about the 99.75 percent of the bill that they agree with. Let the record show that the funding under attack here represents less than one-quarter of 1 percent of all funds authorized.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KLINK].

Mr. KLINK. I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me, Mr. Speaker.

I have grave concerns, Mr. Speaker, about the fact that it does appear, from everything I have said, and I am just talking to counsel, now, that we have indeed lost \$725 million that could have been used to clean up the drinking water of this Nation.

When we take a look at the amounts of moneys different States have lost, California, almost \$42 million; Texas, almost \$39 million; my own State of Pennsylvania, \$28.5 million. We could use that money to clean this up. I think what they are saying on the other side is, "Trust us, we will figure out a way to fix it."

The fact of the matter is that the Speaker did not appoint the conferees in time to get this bill done. There is a pattern of this which really is very bothersome to me.

Earlier this week we brought out the fact, and I hope Members on both sides of the aisle will note, that Members are not having their bills paid in their offices. Take a look. For the first time in the history of this institution, in June, your rent payments were not made. That costs us credibility, it costs us money, it costs every Member in this office. Now we are not appointing conferees in time, so the States of this country do not in fact have tens of millions of dollars that they normally would have in order to clean up this water.

When we were doing the contract on America we were marching through, the trains were running on time. Now all of a sudden it comes time for Congress to either pay its bills, pass legislation on time, or lose three-quarters

of a billion dollars, and we cannot do it on time.

□ 1300

How can you run this country when you cannot run this Congress? That is the question that needs to be asked today.

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY].

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago the House freshmen came to Washington to carry out a revolution. They promised to balanced the budget, to slash wasteful spending, to end pork-barrel spending. Now, 2 years later, two unsuccessful Government shutdowns later, the freshmen are running scared.

The voters have said no to Medicare cuts, no to education cuts, no to mean and extreme programs dealing with the environment, no to the Gingrich revolution. So what do the freshmen do now in their desperate attempt to save their own political hides? They attach \$350 million for pork-barrel projects for themselves in a clean drinking water bill while more important programs, of course, are going to suffer in the 50 States where the money should have been spent.

So here is what we have:

One little piggy goes to Iowa; one little piggy program stays home in Ohio; one little piggy program gets money for Washington State, and other more important programs get none; and 13 vulnerable House Republicans go wee, wee all the way home with their pork.

Mr. Speaker, if this is a revolution, if this is the most important thing that we can be doing in this country for the next generation, it would be like fighting the French Revolution and not attacking the Bastille for the Republicans to have all this pork in this safe drinking water bill, and for all of them to unanimously be saying vote for it.

What a transformation for the freshman class, so proud that they are now able to stick port in for their own district while knowing that it violates the instructions of this very House, of the recession of the Senate to our position that there should be no pork, and at the same time delaying so long in figuring out how to put in the pork that an extra \$725 million are lost across this country for safe drinking water projects in every State in the Union.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BARCIA].

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Speaker, This bill will enhance the tools that our Government has to assure a safe drinking water supply. The bill will also protect the taxpayer, providing more flexibility to local officials by maintaining standards, but easing excessive requirements. The public has a right to clean water and has a right to know when, and by what, their water supply is at risk. For that reason, the agreement

also makes the public right to know part of the law of the land.

With flexibility and protection, we still have billions of dollars in unmet water infrastructure needs. This legislation incorporates provisions of the Water Supply Infrastructure Assistance Act of 1995, which provide for a new State revolving loan fund, which will provide loans and technical assistance to communities with drinking water quality problems.

In discussing this historic compromise, I feel compelled by misleading comments made by a few of our colleagues to discuss a provision in the bill which provides specific assistance for several communities in our Nation. One of those communities is Bad Axe in my Fifth District of Michigan. I have been working with officials in that town for years to find a solution to their problems with arsenic, barium, and visible iron. No resources have been available to address their lack of resources. Their efforts to fix the existing system have cost money, raising citizens' monthly bills. To complicate matters, the water has so much foreign matter that it necessitates the early replacement of pipes, water heaters and other home and municipal water equipment, placing another financial burden on the town and its citizens.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, the solution lies just 17 miles away in three different directions. But, because Federal and State resources are not available, and taxpayers already bear too large a tax burden for a rural farm economy to support, the attempt to connect to one of three plants in adjacent towns has not been possible. Instead, good money is thrown after bad, wasted on stop gap measures to provide enough water which may be appropriate for non-drinking uses like washing clothes. These few dollars are the only way for Bad Axe to solve its drinking water crisis. So, Mr. Speaker, when someone tells the people of Bad Axe that they are the recipients of pork, Federal Government largess, let us remember that we are talking about citizens in need; citizens in a small town which is over-extended which lies in a State which receives one of the lowest national returns on its Federal tax dollar. If this is pork, Mr. Speaker, pass the platter.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE].

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, in June we had a very good bipartisan bill passed out of the Committee on Commerce, but unfortunately the Republican leadership could not leave well enough alone. They had to take it into their back rooms and load it up with political pork. This is the same Republican leadership that claims to be for reform and for cutting unnecessary spending.

The House passed the bill on June 25, yet once again the Republican leadership still could not get it right. They delayed and they delayed. It took an

astounding 3 weeks for the leadership to appoint conferees.

Now, it is August 2 and we have lost \$725 million in fiscal year 1996 funds. In my own State alone we have lost nearly \$15.5 million in grants funds. On top of that the Republican leadership has earmarked for their vulnerable Members on a political basis \$175 million of what is left.

Mr. Speaker, this is simply an outrage. They have taken legislation that was supported by the industry and environmentalists, by Democrats and Republicans, by the right and the left, and they have basically made it almost unsupportable at this point. It is a real shame. It is a tragedy. This could have been a bill that everyone would have supported and that we could have used as an example of good legislation that this House could pass this session, and instead we have this bill, loaded up with pork that is practically unsupportable at this time.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN].

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to set the record straight about the delay on this conference report. The deadline for approving the fund was July 31. We did not get the conference report papers until August 1. The gentleman from New York indicated that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] and I might have been responsible for that. It was the mangers of this legislation.

The last point I want to make is the House voted unanimously for one position. That was to keep these pork projects out of that revolving fund and let them stand in line later if they can claim on the merits that they should be funded, and that position was rejected.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I would begin by expressing great respect and affection for my dear friend from Virginia. He worked well with me in the consideration of this legislation. He is a fine and valued Member of this Congress.

I also want to express great respect and affection for the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER]. That may come as a surprise to the gentleman, but I do feel that way.

I want to talk a little bit about what has happened here and why we are in this mess.

The leadership, the Speaker, took about 3 weeks in which to appoint the conferees. The deadline for money being available under the appropriations law was the last day of July. That deadline passed. It passed in good part because the Public Works Committee and my good friend from Pennsylvania, Mr. SHUSTER, did not accept the concession of the Senate in which the Senate agreed they would recede and concur with regard to the handling of the moneys within the bill.

One of the important things to note is that what is at issue here is not just

pork. I have always voted, almost without exception, with the Public Works Committee and at one time I was a member of that committee and I understand the art of pork and the art of taking care of Members of this Congress. But the point that needs to be made is that we have here a fund which is too small. It is about \$725 million. That is all that is available to address the problems of clean water in all the districts in this country. The Committee on Public Works has short-stopped half of that money, \$350 million worth of it. That means that they will allocate—not on the basis of merit but on the basis of pure, raw, unadulterated politics—money which should be allocated on the basis of real need. There is not enough money. Need should be the basis on which the money is going to be allocated, but that mechanism will not be used. Rather, this money will be short-stopped.

The consequence of this is that in district after district, all around the country, in every State in the union, major projects which need to be addressed on the basis of safety and the public health will not be addressed because money has been allocated on a political basis, not on the basis of need and not on the basis of public health. That is why this is a bad action, and it should be clear in the record as we go forward in our business.

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

This has been an interesting debate. I would like first to clear up what I consider to be a few inaccuracies. First, this bill is \$7.6 billion in total. All of this fuss is over \$25 million.

I would also like to point out in this, for all of the Members, those present and those who may be watching, this is very, very important. This motion to recommit that will be offered, I understand, if it is offered, is not debatable.

What it means is that the bill would then go back to conference. It is not something that would come back immediately to the floor, which means you would go home and you would not have passed this vital piece of legislation and we would lose additional millions of dollars of money for these vitally needed projects. That is absolutely important.

Mr. Speaker, we need to pass this bill, this conference report, send it over to the other body, and have them pass it, so that we can ensure the quality of the drinking water of the communities and the citizens of this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the conference report.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to praise the work of the staff: My chief of staff, J.E. Derderian; Bob Meyers; Nandan Kenkeremath; Chris Wolf; and our general counsel, Charles Ingebretson.

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3592, the Water Resources Development Act of 1996. I com-

mend Chairman BUD SHUSTER and Chairman SHERWOOD BOEHLERT for their diligent work in drafting this important legislation.

The Water Resources Development Act of 1996 contains several provisions drawn from legislation that I introduced earlier this year to help our Nation's ports. For centuries, our ports have been the arteries that have kept our economy thriving. More than 95 percent of our Nation's commerce relies on our ports to send or receive goods and raw materials. Our ports not only provide an economical and energy-efficient means of transportation for thousands of businesses, they are also a major source of jobs. Some 15 million people work in port-related jobs across the country. In my region alone, the Port of New York and New Jersey provides jobs for 180,000 workers.

But today, the economic viability of our ports is being threatened by Government regulations that have severely curtailed the centuries-old practice of dredging berths and channels. Ports throughout the Nation, from Oakland to Duluth, Houston to Newark, are facing serious economic consequences because of their inability to dredge.

For decades, the Army Corps of Engineers and private contractors have dredged our Nation's channels and disposed of most of the dredge sediments in the ocean. But as stringent new procedures have been put in place to prohibit the dumping of contaminated materials in the ocean, an increasing amount of dredged material is no longer eligible for ocean disposal. This has led to a national debate over how to safely and economically dispose of the mud. In my State, the Port of New York and New Jersey is already losing business because of the inability to dispose of contaminated sediment.

The lack of dredging is having consequences that reach far beyond the loading and offloading of container ships. Everyone who lives or works in my State benefits from the port. For consumers, it means lower prices for the products they buy. For businesses, the port provides a convenient and inexpensive way to send or receive final products or raw materials. And for workers, the port is a source of thousands of jobs both at the port and at the thousands of businesses that rely on the port itself to transport their goods.

In 1994 alone, 409,000 automobiles passed through our port. In all, some 4,000 ships arrive at the Port of New York and New Jersey every year.

Until recently, 95 percent of the dredged sediment in the Port of New York and New Jersey passed ocean dumping standards. But now, with better testing criteria in place, nearly two-thirds of the sediment lying at the bottom of the Port of New York and New Jersey is so contaminated that under regulations promulgated by the Environmental Protection Agency, it is considered category III and cannot be disposed of in the ocean. With no other viable dredging disposal option yet in place, dredging in the port has literally ground to a halt.

For several years, I have been working with the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey and the two States to help find workable solutions for this dredging crisis. This past March I introduced H.R. 3170, the Port Revitalization Act of 1996. Since then, this legislation has drawn the support of Republicans and Democrats from both New York and New Jer-

sey, businesses, labor groups, and the environmental community.

H.R. 3170 addresses the root cause of the problem now facing the Port of New York and New Jersey and others in the United States, which is to develop a safe and economical means of disposing of contaminated dredged materials. The Water Resources and Environment Subcommittee held hearings on this legislation and the issue of dredging, and much of my bill is incorporated as part of H.R. 3592.

Specifically, my legislation authorized the construction of a long-term confined disposal facility for dredged sediments from the Port of New York and New Jersey. Such a facility could meet the port's dredging disposal needs well into the next century. Like the successful disposal facilities in Baltimore and Norfolk, a contained facility will provide an environmentally safe way of disposing of dredged materials that are unfit for ocean disposal.

There are a variety of types of confined disposal facilities that could be constructed under this bill, including containment islands, subaqueous pits, near-shore facilities, or upland disposal. Moving forward with a long-term disposal facility for the port is essential to assure the shipping community that this port won't be reliving this dredging nightmare every 2 or 3 years. We simply must develop a long-term facility if we are to keep the current shipping business at the port.

This section of the bill complemented New Jersey State legislation that would dedicate substantial State funds to begin dredging and the construction of short- and long-term confined disposal facilities. In fact, this November New Jerseyans will vote on a \$300 million bond issue to help with the dredging of our harbor. Together, the Federal Government and the States of New Jersey and New York can provide a permanent and long-term disposal solution to preserve the vitality of this port.

Next, H.R. 3170 opens up the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund to allow this fund to help finance the construction of a long-term disposal facility and the search for a short-term, interim solution to our region's crisis. This fund, which is supported by a tax on shippers, established in 1986 to make sure channels are dredged regularly so they are safe and navigable. But under current law, the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund cannot be used to help pay for the construction of new disposal facilities.

At a time when ports across the country cannot be dredged because there is no safe place to dispose of the dredged materials, it makes no sense to keep such tight restrictions on the use of this fund. The Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund has a huge \$600 million surplus, a surplus which is expected to grow by \$100 million annually. My bill makes this trust fund a significant new funding source for a variety of containment facilities and disposal options being considered for our port.

Another provision of the bill would enable the Federal Government, through the Army Corps of Engineers, to assume 65 percent of the cost of building new confined disposal facilities for dredged sediments, regardless of

where they are located. Under current law, the Federal Government is authorized to pay out of general revenue for 65 percent of the cost for only ocean disposal of dredged sediment. The Port of New York and New Jersey, and many others, can no longer rely exclusively on ocean disposal for dredged sediment, and need to find upland or other confined facilities to deposit contaminated mud. Through this provision, my bill ensures that the Federal Government remains a major financing partner in the construction of modern dredged disposal facilities.

Finally, H.R. 3170 reauthorizes the decontamination technology pilot study now underway by the Environmental Protection Agency and raises its authorization level to \$10 million annually. Congress must continue to invest in dredged sediment decontamination technology to make the dredged material environmentally safe and eligible for either beneficial upland use or ocean disposal.

I am pleased that each of these provisions in H.R. 3170 is included in the Water Resources Development Act of 1996. Mr. Speaker, each of these provisions will make a significant impact on the status of dredging projects in the ports of the United States.

In addition to these provisions, there are two additional authorizations in this legislation which directly affect the Port of New York and New Jersey.

First, H.R. 3592 provides additional funding for the deepening of the Kill Van Kull shipping channel to 45 feet. The Kill Van Kull is a channel in the Port of New York and New Jersey with a current maintained depth of 35 feet. Having the channels deepened to 45 feet will enable the largest oceangoing vessels to reach the berths of the port without fear of scraping bottom.

The Water Resources Development Act of 1986 authorized this deepening project at the level of \$325 million. However, after the completion of the first phase of this deepening project down to 40 feet, this authorization level had been exceeded and the dredging was put on hold. H.R. 3592 raises the authorization for this deepening project to \$750 million, allowing the Army Corps to continue with the second phase of the deepening project down to 45 feet.

Second, this legislation increases the authorization for a similar deepening project in the Arthur Kill, a channel between Staten Island, NY, and New Jersey. The new authorization level is \$82 million, which will cover the increased costs of deepening this section of channel. Both of these projects will provide invaluable assurance to the shipping companies that depend on the depth of the channels to safely bring their goods to port.

In closing, let me once again thank the chairman of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee and the chairman of the Water Resources and Environment Subcommittee for their work in drafting this bipartisan, non-controversial legislation. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill.

Mr. POSHARD. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to comment on the Water Resources Development Act [WRDA]. This is an important, bipartisan piece of legislation that will provide the country with the resources to meet many pending infrastructure needs. I am particularly concerned with flood-control provisions in this legislation. As we continue to see on a daily basis, investing in sufficient flood-

control measures protects our families and property from the devastation in floods. I am concerned that the cost-share formula for these projects is becoming prohibitive for our rural communities. This bill calls for a future formula of 65 percent Federal, 35 percent local, and this will have a significant impact on smaller localities, where this help is needed most.

We must continue to be farsighted in our approach to these problems, including cost share, and I would like to thank the chairman of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, Mr. SHUSTER, and the ranking minority member, Mr. OBERSTAR, as well as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment, Mr. BOEHLERT, and the ranking minority member, Mr. BORSKI, for their leadership in this regard. The committee staffs worked tirelessly in the spirit of cooperation while crafting this measure, and that attitude has clearly followed this legislation to the floor, as we are considering it as a suspension bill. I hope the rest of the legislative process in regard to WRDA moves this swiftly.

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Speaker, as a cochair of the Congressional Porkbusters Coalition and a Member interested in improving the integrity of Congress, I am strongly opposed to the method by which earmarked water projects were included in the Safe Drinking Water Act. Most, if not all, of these projects circumvented established congressional procedures and were inserted into the bill by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. Congressional districts benefiting because a Representative holds a position of influence on a committee or has made a special arrangement with a member of the committee is simply wrong.

The American people are fed up with the backroom dealing and horse trading that has characterized congressional politics to this day. The time has come to bring fairness and objectivity to the authorization and appropriation processes. If a Member of Congress believes that a project should be funded in their district, then let us hold open, public hearings on that project. We can hear about the merits of the project and why American taxpayers should shell out their hard-earned dollars to pay for it. Let us apply objective criteria to the numerous projects that seek funding in order to create a prioritized list. We then can match our priorities against our limited Federal resources and make fair, impartial decisions as to which projects should be funded.

Mr. Speaker, I share your concern for eliminating the deficit and balancing the budget. To do both, many difficult decisions must be made. One of the easiest decisions, however, should be to eliminate earmarked projects that have not passed the scrutiny of established Congressional procedures and competitive selection processes. Let us begin by opposing these earmarked water projects in the Safe Drinking Water Act.

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support for the conference report to S. 1316 the Safe Drinking Water Act Amendments. The Safe Drinking Water Act was first passed in 1974 to protect drinking water supplied by public water systems from harmful contaminants. The conference report before us today is commonsense legislation that will continue to assure the safety of our drinking water.

Under this conference report State and local authorities can enhance the purity of drinking

water, and focus resources on those contaminants that pose the greatest risk to human health. Local water systems will no longer have to test for contaminants that have never been detected in their water supply.

Also, under this legislation, consumers will be given more information about their drinking water than ever before. Under provisions in the conference report, water systems will be required to mail an annual report to every consumer concerning the levels of regulated contaminants.

This conference report also authorizes \$80 million for new studies. These studies will examine the health effects of such substances as arsenic and sulfate.

Finally, this conference report will provide State and local water authorities with the resources they will need to get the job done. H.R. 3604 creates a \$7.6 billion State revolving fund. This fund will provide direct grants and loans for compliance activities, enhancement of water system capacities, operator training, and development of solutions to source water pollution.

Mr. Speaker, the public deserves to feel confident that the water they drink is safe. The conference report to S. 1316 accomplishes this. It is commonsense legislation that improves the current drinking water standards, while at the same time lowering costs to water authorities. I would encourage my colleagues to support passage of the conference report so that we may enact meaningful reform of our safe drinking water laws. Thank you, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the conference report on S. 1316, the Safe Drinking Water Act Amendments. The Science Committee was given conferees on the drinking water research provision in the House and Senate bills. I would like to thank the Science Committee conferees, Congressman ROHRBACHER, and Congressman ROEMER, for their help and support during conference.

The bill as agreed to in conference includes numerous important research provisions. The bill authorizes \$26.6 million for safe drinking water research each year for fiscal year 1997 through fiscal year 2003. This authorization is intended to enable the Environmental Protection Agency's [EPA] Office of Research and Development [ORD] to continue its Drinking Water Research Program.

The conference report further authorizes an additional \$10 million a year from the new drinking water State revolving loan fund [SRLF] for health effects research on contaminants in drinking water such as cryptosporidium, disinfection byproducts, and for the implementation of a plan for research on subpopulations at greater risk. This \$10 million is new money derived from the SRLF and should boost ORD's ability to conduct priority research on drinking water contaminants.

The conference report also includes \$2.5 million per year for fiscal year 1997 through fiscal year 2000 for research on arsenic. Finally, the report contains \$12.5 million a year for 7 years to develop a research plan and conduct research on harmful substances in drinking water.

Along with these important research authorizations, the conference report includes an important new research review requirement which should help ensure that the drinking water research conducted by EPA is of the

highest quality. Section 202, Scientific Research Review, requires the Administrator of EPA to develop a strategic plan for drinking water research. It also requires the Administrator to review all drinking water research conducted by the Agency to ensure it is not duplicative and of the highest quality. This provision is similar to the research review requirement passed by the House earlier this year as part of H.R. 3322, the Omnibus Civilian Science Authorization Act of 1996.

Mr. Speaker, I support the conference report accompanying S. 1316, and I encourage my colleagues to vote for its passage.

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this bipartisan and bicameral agreement to modify and strengthen the Safe Drinking Water Act. I applaud the conferees for working together on such a short timeframe and delivering a good compromise bill.

Getting a final agreement on this issue has taken nearly 3 years. I remember working with my colleagues last Congress on issues that continued to be the sticking points again this Congress. I'm so relieved that we have reached consensus on these major issues of contention.

My main interest throughout this debate has been to create a more flexible regulatory approach that protects our Nation's drinking water without wasting valuable financial and human resources. I come from an extremely rural area where most people obtain their drinking water from private wells or small water systems. Most of these small water systems operate on a tight budget with only one employee operating the system. If these small systems are forced to monitor for contaminants that do not exist in their watershed or are compelled to comply with other regulations primarily aimed at protecting drinking water from large systems, they must divert valuable dollars that could be better used in addressing problems unique to the specific system. This bill recognizes that small systems are inherently different from larger systems and often have different needs in maintaining compliance with the drinking water standards.

In particular, S. 1316 relieves onerous and excessive monitoring requirements, establishes the development of small system technologies, provides money for the rural water technical assistance and circuit rider program, creates a State revolving fund to provide needed capital to upgrade and build systems and realigns standard setting criteria to take into consideration sound science and cost/benefit analysis. However, this bill does not only ease burdensome Federal requirements, but it also requires the implementation of new obligations. For example, S. 1316 mandates the establishment of State capacity development and State operator certification programs. While these programs will ensure that our water systems are well operated and in compliance with the act, it does compel States and systems to go that extra mile in evaluating the health of their drinking water.

S. 1316 is widely supported—from the environmentalists to the Governors—and I want to urge my colleagues to support this common-sense bill.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, all of us want to make sure that the food we eat and the water we drink is clean and safe. That's why I am proud to support a safe drinking water bill that will help make sure we are doing the best job possible to keep our drinking water supplies clean.

Today, as we vote on the Safe Drinking Water Act of 1996, we are showing the American people all the good that can result when Congress works together to get something done.

But this bill is about more than just getting something done. Rather, it is a perfect example of how updating our environmental laws and reducing regulatory hurdles can result in better environmental protection. I believe this bill represents what this Congress is all about—making Government work better by giving local governments more flexibility to make their own decisions.

I truly believe that given the opportunity, local governments, not Federal bureaucrats, are better able to determine the needs and priorities of their own communities. The SDWA gives States more flexibility and does away with the one-size-fits-all approach that is prohibiting some local governments from using new technologies to manage their water supplies.

A perfect example of why we need greater flexibility can be found in the Puget Sound region—which includes a large part of my district.

Most of my constituents get their water supply from the Cedar River Watershed which is run and protected by the city of Seattle. As debate over the SDWA began, I sought input from the city of Seattle and others to determine how we could develop a bill that will result in stronger protection and more flexibility.

The bill we will pass accomplishes both those goals.

Under the current SDWA, which was originally signed into law in 1974 by President Ford, the city of Seattle, and many other larger metropolitan cities, do not have the flexibility to determine what type of water treatment system to use. Seattle is currently required to use the filtration method, even after finding that ozonation can provide a greater degree of protection at a lower cost.

Under this bill, the city of Seattle and many other cities would be able to use alternative treatments to filtration—providing that the alternative is better able to protect the safety of our public water supply and that it receives approval by the Environmental Protection Agency.

The city believes that the ozonation method better meets its water quality objectives. The ozonation treatment is more effective in neutralizing the pathogens especially cryptosporidium and giardia which are commonly found in surface water supplies. For Seattle, the filtration technology would inactivate 99.9 percent of cryptosporidium, but ozonation could be effectively designed to inactivate up to 99.999 percent, providing a higher level of public health protection. In addition, it is considerably less expensive than filtration and is believed to be the next up and coming technology for ensuring safe and clean drinking water.

In addition to giving local governments more flexibility, this bill will also accomplish some very important goals: First, focusing on the most serious risks to human health, second, requiring that an annual water quality report be sent to consumers, and third, speeding up the public notification process for violations.

Before closing today, I would like to thank Chairman BLILEY, Chairman BILIRAKAS, Mr. DINGELL, and Mr. WAXMAN for all their work to put together a bipartisan bill that will go a long way in protecting the water we all drink.

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this progressive and bipartisan bill, which will have an enormously beneficial effect on the health and environment of the American people. As a conferee on this landmark legislation, I can tell you that this conference report on the Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA) marks a major shift away from the regulatory status quo of placing undue value and emphasis on the regulation itself, toward what the practical effect of the regulation actually is on the public health and our natural resources. This is as it should be.

It is this kind of outcome-driven and science-based environmental policy setting that I have been proud to be a part of in this Congress. This is the kind of process in which I was used to operating during my time in local government, and the results of this cooperative and effective policy making which we see here today will allow us to better serve the public health needs of the American people.

It has been a privilege for me to have been able to play a close role in strengthening and improving such an important statute as the SDWA. These amendments will provide for sensible and much-needed reforms in how the SDWA is implemented.

H.R. 3604 will help to refocus EPA's priorities and resources toward those contaminants which present the greatest and most immediate threat to public health, provide EPA and local water authorities with greater flexibility in implementing the improved SDWA law, and place new emphasis on ensuring that public water systems have the necessary technical, managerial, and financial resources available to comply with the SDWA.

Mr. Speaker, this also marks a significant achievement in our ability to recognize and address flaws or gaps in our existing environmental or public health strategies. Laws such as the SDWA were clearly well-meant at the time of their inception in this case, the 1972-era SDWA has not been reauthorized since 1986.

However, the passage of time invariably exposes weaknesses or shortcomings in the strongest of our statutes, and we need to recognize and respond to this. In the past, it has often been easier to confront problems by simply blaming a law, instead of working together to determine whether the law in question is being properly implemented, or whether it is still effective in serving its intended purpose. These laws need to be as dynamic and flexible as the rapidly changing environments we intend for them to protect, and the people who live in them.

This means that occasionally such laws must be reexamined and renewed, in order to ensure that their original goals are still being achieved.

I have always believed that we ought not to cling to the conventional wisdom that our public health and environmental laws are set in stone, and incapable of being improved with the application of new knowledge. In order to maintain their effectiveness, we have the responsibility to see to it that when modern science and technology can be applied to improve these laws, we take the appropriate action to do so.

Many of our crown jewel environmental laws were written over 20 years ago, and it is incumbent upon us to make these needed improvements when necessary. With this comprehensive reauthorization, this Congress accomplishes a challenging but long-

unachievable task on behalf of all of our constituents nationwide. I want to commend my Chairmen, Mr. BILEY and Mr. BILIRAKIS, and my other colleagues who worked hard together, in a bipartisan manner, to help make this happen.

In addition to the sound science-based foundation of this bill, I am particularly proud of section 305 of the bill, which addresses health standards for bottled water. Section 305 is a refinement of legislation (H.R. 2601) which I introduced earlier in this Congress. My language will simply require that any EPA regulation which sets a maximum containment level for tap water, and any FDA regulation setting a standard of quality for bottled water for the same contaminant, take effect at the same time. If the FDA does not promulgate a regulation within a realistic time frame as established by section 305, the regulation established by the EPA for that element in tap water will be considered the applicable regulation for the same element in bottled water. This will provide consumers with the health assurances that the water they can purchase off the shelf meets at least the same standards as their tap water. I have a letter from the International Bottled Water Association which elaborates on the benefits of this provision, which I would like entered in the record.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to conclude with an observation. In my hometown of San Diego, my family and my constituents are very fortunate to already enjoy an extremely high standard of quality in our drinking water; in fact a recent study by a national environmental group found that water systems in the San Diego region reported zero health advisories over the last 3 years.

By comparison, the same study found that an alarmingly high percentage of water systems in some regions of the country, including Washington DC had reported health advisories or compliance failures during the same time period. The Safe Drinking Water Act amendments we will pass today, and which will soon be signed into law, will strengthen and improve the weak links in the existing statute, and in so doing will help bring these high levels of health and environmental quality which we appreciate in San Diego to other communities nationwide.

Again, and I can't emphasize it enough, this is a progressive step forward, away from a 1970's-era process which places higher value on process and regulation itself, towards a more responsible and outcome-based approach which focuses on the product that is generated.

This will help us reinforce our common goals of better serving the public health needs of the American people, and providing us with a cleaner and safer overall environment, which is something we ought to be ever mindful of, and never not take for granted.

INTERNATIONAL BOTTLED WATER ASSOCIATION, Alexandria, VA, June 25, 1996.

Hon. BRIAN BILBRAY, Longworth House Office Building, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR REP. BILBRAY: The International Bottled Water Association, which represents over 85 percent of all bottled water sold in the United States, would like to thank you for your help in drafting the bottled water provision of the Safe Drinking Water Act legislation. We are also grateful to the committee staff who developed this improved

version of the Senate bottled water provision in cooperation with your legislative director, Dave Schroeder.

Our industry strongly supports the principal objective of this provision, i.e., to require that any EPA regulation setting a maximum contaminant level for tap water and any FDA regulation setting a standard of quality for bottled water for the same contaminant take effect at the same time.

One in six households relies on bottled water as their source of drinking water. There are 430 companies producing bottled water in the United States with annual sales estimated at \$3.4 billion, making bottled water one of the fastest growing segments of the beverage industry.

Bottled water is regulated by the FDA, the states and through IBWA's own model code. The bottled water provision will ensure that a FDA standard for a contaminant in bottled water is set in a timely manner and is no less protective of the public health than the EPA regulation for the same contaminant in tap water.

We look forward to seeing the Safe Drinking Water Act legislation signed into law this year. Thank you.

Sincerely,

SYLVIA E. SWANSON, Executive Vice President.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina). The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. DINGELL. 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. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 392, nays 30, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 399]

YEAS—392

Ackerman  
Allard  
Andrews  
Archer  
Armedy  
Bachus  
Baesler  
Baker (CA)  
Baker (LA)  
Baldacci  
Ballenger  
Barcia  
Barr  
Barrett (NE)  
Barrett (WI)  
Bartlett  
Barton  
Bass  
Bateman  
Becerra  
Bentsen  
Bereuter  
Bevill  
Bilbray  
Bilirakis  
Billey  
Blumenauer  
Blute  
Boehkert  
Boehner  
Bonilla

Bonior  
Bono  
Borski  
Boucher  
Brewster  
Browder  
Brown (CA)  
Brown (FL)  
Brown (OH)  
Bryant (TN)  
Bryant (TX)  
Bunn  
Bunning  
Burr  
Burton  
Buyer  
Callahan  
Calvert  
Camp  
Campbell  
Canady  
Cardin  
Castle  
Chabot  
Chambliss  
Chapman  
Christensen  
Chrysler  
Clay  
Clayton  
Clement

Clinger  
Coble  
Coburn  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (IL)  
Combust  
Condit  
Cooley  
Costello  
Cox  
Coyne  
Cramer  
Crane  
Crapo  
Creameans  
Cubin  
Cummings  
Cunningham  
Danner  
Davis  
de la Garza  
Deal  
DeFazio  
DeLauro  
DeLay  
Diaz-Balart  
Dicks  
Doggett  
Dooley  
Doolittle  
Dorman

Doyle  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Dunn  
Durbin  
Edwards  
Ehlers  
Ehrlich  
Engel  
English  
Ensign  
Everett  
Ewing  
Farr  
Fattah  
Fawell  
Fazio  
Fields (LA)  
Fields (TX)  
Filner  
Flake  
Flanagan  
Foglietta  
Foley  
Forbes  
Fowler  
Fox  
Frank (MA)  
Franks (CT)  
Franks (NJ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Frisa  
Frost  
Funderburk  
Furse  
Gallegly  
Ganske  
Gejdenson  
Gekas  
Gephardt  
Geren  
Gibbons  
Gilchrest  
Gillmor  
Gilman  
Gonzalez  
Goodlatte  
Goodling  
Gordon  
Goss  
Graham  
Green (TX)  
Greene (UT)  
Greenwood  
Gunderson  
Gutierrez  
Gutknecht  
Hall (OH)  
Hall (TX)  
Hamilton  
Hancock  
Hansen  
Harman  
Hastert  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayes  
Hayworth  
Hefley  
Hefner  
Heineman  
Herger  
Hilleary  
Hinchee  
Hobson  
Hoekstra  
Hoke  
Holden  
Horn  
Hostettler  
Houghton  
Hoyer  
Hunter  
Hutchinson  
Hyde  
Inglis  
Istook  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson-Lee  
(TX)  
Jacobs  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson (SD)  
Johnson, Sam  
Johnston  
Jones  
Kanjorski  
Kasich  
Kelly  
Kennedy (MA)

Kennedy (RI)  
Kennelly  
Kildee  
Kim  
King  
Kingston  
Kleczka  
Klug  
Knollenberg  
Kolbe  
LaFalce  
LaHood  
Lantos  
Largent  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Laughlin  
Lazio  
Leach  
Levin  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Lightfoot  
Linder  
Lipinski  
Livingston  
LoBiondo  
Lofgren  
Longley  
Lowey  
Lucas  
Luther  
Maloney  
Manton  
Manzullo  
Martinez  
Martini  
Mascara  
Matsui  
McCarthy  
McCollum  
McCrery  
McHale  
McHugh  
McInnis  
McIntosh  
McKeon  
McNulty  
Meehan  
Menendez  
Metcalf  
Meyers  
Mica  
Millender  
McDonald  
Miller (FL)  
Minge  
Mink  
Moakley  
Molinari  
Mollohan  
Montgomery  
Moorhead  
Moran  
Morella  
Murtha  
Myers  
Myrick  
Nadler  
Neal  
Nethercutt  
Neumann  
Ney  
Norwood  
Nussle  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Olver  
Ortiz  
Orton  
Owens  
Oxley  
Packard  
Pallone  
Parker  
Pastor  
Paxon  
Payne (VA)  
Peterson (FL)  
Peterson (MN)  
Petri  
Pickett  
Pombo  
Pomeroy  
Porter  
Portman  
Poshard  
Pryce  
Quillen

Quinn  
Radanovich  
Rahall  
Ramstad  
Rangel  
Reed  
Regula  
Richardson  
Riggs  
Rivers  
Roberts  
Roemer  
Rogers  
Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Rose  
Roth  
Roukema  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce  
Rush  
Sabo  
Salmon  
Sanders  
Sanford  
Sawyer  
Saxton  
Scarborough  
Schaefer  
Schiff  
Schroeder  
Scott  
Seastrand  
Sensenbrenner  
Serrano  
Shadegg  
Shaw  
Shays  
Shuster  
Sisisky  
Skaggs  
Skeen  
Skelton  
Slaughter  
Smith (MI)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Solomon  
Souder  
Spence  
Spratt  
Stark  
Stearns  
Stenholm  
Stockman  
Stokes  
Studds  
Stump  
Talent  
Tanner  
Tate  
Tauzin  
Taylor (MS)  
Taylor (NC)  
Tejeda  
Thomas  
Thompson  
Neal  
Thornberry  
Thornton  
Thurman  
Tiahrt  
Torkildsen  
Torres  
Torrice  
Towns  
Traficant  
Upton  
Vento  
Visclosky  
Volkmer  
Vucanovich  
Walker  
Walsh  
Wamp  
Ward  
Watt (NC)  
Watts (OK)  
Weldon (FL)  
Weldon (PA)  
Weller  
White  
Whitfield  
Wicker  
Williams  
Wilson  
Wise

Wolf	Yates	Zeliff
Woolsey	Young (AK)	Zimmer

NAYS—30

Abercrombie	Eshoo	McKinney
Beilenson	Evans	Meek
Berman	Hastings (FL)	Miller (CA)
Clyburn	Hilliard	Payne (NJ)
Coleman	Jefferson	Pelosi
Collins (MI)	Johnson, E. B.	Stupak
Dellums	Klink	Velazquez
Deutsch	Lewis (GA)	Waters
Dingell	Markey	Waxman
Dixon	McDermott	Wynn

NOT VOTING—11

Bishop	Dickey	McDade
Brownback	Ford	Schumer
Chenoweth	Kaptur	Young (FL)
Conyers	Lincoln	

□ 1332

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia and Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. FATTAH, MEEHAN, BECERRA, SANFORD, LUTHER, Ms. RIVERS, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, and Mrs. MALONEY changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, today, I was unavoidably detained and missed rollcall vote 399. Had I been here, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall 399.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report on S. 1316.

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

There was no objection.

REPORT OF CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT

(Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to rule X of the Rules of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, and by agreement of the committee, I am authorized to report that the committee continues to work on the issues before it. I would like to say for myself that the committee has traditionally not come to the floor of the House for instruction, as that would undermine the bipartisan foundation of our decisionmaking process, which protects every Member of this body from partisanship.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF A CERTAIN MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 508 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 508

*Resolved*, That it shall be in order at any time on the calendar day of Friday, August 2, 1996, for the Speaker to entertain a motion offered by the majority leader or his designee that the House suspend the rules and pass a bill or joint resolution relating to the subject of combating terrorism.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] is recognized for 1 hour.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I would just inquire as to the legislation that is being addressed in the rule. Can the Chair inform us as to the bill which is being addressed by the rule?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is not fully aware. Under the pending rule it would be up to the majority leader to decide what bill will be called up, and the measure before the House now is House Resolution 508. The gentleman has been recognized for 1 hour for a debate on the rule.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, is this the same matter that was discussed before the Committee on Rules last night or is this a new bill that was just dropped in 5 minutes ago?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] may be explaining that during his debate.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, could the gentleman from Florida inform me?

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Florida will be very happy to, but I would prefer that we do this in an orderly way and get on with the customary beginning of the rule debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. MOAKLEY], pending which time I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purposes of debate only.

(Mr. GOSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous material in the RECORD.)

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], chairman of the Committee on Rules.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and the bill that will follow.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], for yielding. He deserves our commendation for all the work he has put into the effort to combat terrorism. His background working in the intelligence community and then serving on the Intelligence Committee makes him particularly well qualified in this area.

Terrorism is an on-going problem. It is not just the recent bomb incident in Atlanta, or the possibility that the crash of the TWA flight leaving New York was caused by a bomb.

We have had American citizens killed in the Oklahoma City bombing, the World Trade Center bombing, and the barracks blast in Saudi Arabia, among other places.

It is a problem which is not going to go away. This Congress, representing the need of the American people for security, is going to have to take additional action.

According to the testimony presented to the Rules Committee in the wee hours of this morning, there was an effort in the last few days to put together a package of antiterrorism measures which included representatives of the FBI, the Justice Department, the White House, the Senate and the House of Representatives—both Democrats and Republicans.

Those negotiations bogged down. And so last night the decision was made to proceed with a package of antiterrorism proposals which the great majority of the Members of this House can support.

This rule provides for the consideration of that package under suspension of the rules, which means that it will require a two-thirds vote to pass.

If this package is criticized, it will probably be because it does not include some particular provision that some of our colleagues desire. But many of those more controversial proposals would cause the discussion to drag on for months.

This package is something that is doable now. It is not going to solve the problem of terrorism for all time. But it is a step in the right direction, and it implements changes most of us agree need to be made.

For example, according to the testimony in the Rules Committee last night, it includes a series of aviation security measures, which include things like increased baggage and passenger screening, and explosive detection improvements.

It includes increased measures against international terrorists, such as reporting on cooperation in fighting international terrorists, and action plans to sanction terrorist states.

At the same time is includes privacy act amendments to strengthen protections and to prevent and punish abuses of individual privacy rights.

Mr. Speaker, there are other proposals for action which have been suggested. But some of them involve possible infringements to individual liberties which generate opposition on both sides of the aisle. Those controversial provisions have purposely been left out of the package to be brought before the House today.