

the Bay and its resources for all Americans. This is an open rule, we support it, and we urge its adoption.

1345

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILLMOR). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the resolution.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### THE CLEAN LAKES PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALDEN of Oregon). Pursuant to House Resolution 468 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2328.

##### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2328) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to reauthorize the Clean Lakes Program, with Mr. GILLMOR in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER).

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, first of all, perhaps most importantly, I want to commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY) for his leadership in being the principal architect and author of this legislation to reauthorize and improve the Clean Lakes Program.

This bill will help restore and protect our Nation's 41 million acres of fresh water lakes by reauthorizing the EPA Clean Lakes Program. The bill authorizes \$250 million of grants to help States clean up their lakes, and it increases to \$25 million the amount to help States mitigate against the harmful effects of acid mine drainage and acid rain.

The EPA no longer requests funding under the Clean Lakes Program, and has forced the States to stretch their limited nonpoint source funds to clean up their lakes. This legislation restores this important program and places a national focus and a priority on our lakes. It allows funds to solve the wide range of problems impairing our many

lakes. Very importantly, Mr. Chairman, it relies on locally-based solutions involving restoration, rather than new Federal regulations.

I certainly want to thank the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BORSKI), and the entire committee for their support in moving this environmental legislation forward. It passed the subcommittee and the full committee unanimously by voice vote. I know of no opposition to it.

I would certainly urge overwhelming support for this important environmental legislation.

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

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2328, to reauthorize the Clean Lakes Program. I want to express my appreciation to our chairman for his support of this initiative and for launching the hearings directing the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), to move ahead with this legislation, which is a derivative of and an extension of the monumental Clean Water Act of 1972.

That legislation, which I had the privilege to participate in as a member or administrator of the staff of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation at the time, was then, as it still is, one of the most far-reaching and successful environmental laws Congress has ever enacted.

We have made a lot of progress over the years with the Clean Water Act. It is going on 30 years. One of the reasons is the collaborative partnerships that the act established between the States and the Federal Government to restore and maintain, as the opening directive of that act provides, restore and maintain the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of the Nation's waters.

We have not quite reached the objective of swimmable and fishable in all of the Nation's waters, but we are moving in the right direction.

Section 314 of that act established the Clean Lakes Program. That program directs EPA to work with the States to identify and implement programs to control, reduce, and mitigate levels of pollution in the Nation's lakes.

It has been a valuable resource to reduce pollution. We have funded approximately \$145 million of grant activities since 1945 in 49 States and 18 Indian tribes, 700 individual site assessments, restoration, and implementation projects. But it is only a start.

The most recent national water quality inventory shows that States have reported that only 40 percent of lake acreage across this country has been assessed to determine whether the lakes meet the designated uses. Of that

number, 40 percent are still impaired in some fashion. That means that 30 million acres of lakes across this country have a significant likelihood that the waters are not safe for fishing, swimming, or to support aquatic life in the lake and in the surrounding basin.

Body contact sports was one of the principal objectives of the Clean Water Act of 1972, so people could indeed use the lakes: swim, fish, walk through the lake waters on the edge, as we do with small children in Minnesota and elsewhere across this country. But we have not attained that objective.

This bill will help move us in that direction. It reauthorizes the Clean Lakes Program through 2005. It increases significantly the level of funding to \$50 million a year. The funding would be directed to the States to diagnose the current condition of individual lakes and their watershed, to determine the extent and source of pollution, to develop lake restoration and protection plans that can actually be implemented, not just ideas and studies that remain on a shelf and gather dust, but plans that can actually be implemented.

Secondly, to address the concern of acidity in lake levels, in lakes across this country, we provide authorization for programs aimed at restoring lake water quality and mitigating the harmful effects of lake acidity. Canada actually was ahead of the United States in addressing the problem of acid rain.

Sweden was ahead of Canada. It was in the mid-1970s that Swedish scientists examined lakes that were in the early stages of death, death from acid rain coming from the Ruhr Valley in Germany, traveling over a thousand miles and being deposited on Swedish lakes that soon became clear, so clear you could see right to the bottom, no fish, no plant life. Dead lakes.

We were slow to assess that problem and appreciate the United States. Canada caught on first because the prevailing winds carry acid depositions from the United States north into Canada. Canada mounted a massive counterattack on acid rain problems, and that led to the U.S.-Canada Air Quality Agreement, in addition to the U.S.-Canada Great Lakes Quality Agreement, that has resulted in restoration in lakes in Canada that were nearing the death levels of lakes in Sweden.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation will move us further along in the United States, in the direction of addressing the problems of the harmful effects of acid rain and high lake water acidity. This legislation also adds four lakes to the priority demonstration projects included in the Clean Lakes Program, one of which is Swan Lake, which is in my district, which is of tremendous regional significance for the people living in the iron ore mining country; a 100-square-mile lake in Itasca County that includes the City of Nashwauk, northeast of that lake, there are a wide

range of recreational activities very popular there in the 5 months or 6 months that we can actually enjoy lake activities when they are not frozen over in Minnesota, boating, fishing; significant economic benefit to the entire region.

Mr. Chairman, the water quality has deteriorated over the years, poor soil surrounding the lake and poor lake edge protection and watershed protection, as well as sewage into that lake. We will be able to address this problem and learn from it and apply its lessons elsewhere across the country and across, of course, my own State of 10,000 lakes, which really is about 15,000, actually more than that. We do not really count lakes under 200 acres.

Mr. Chairman, I am really delighted; and I wanted to compliment the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman SHUSTER) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), our subcommittee chairman, for their support and also the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BORSKI), who does not have as many lakes in his district, but who has been very generous in giving his strong support for this legislation.

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment.

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

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 2328 reauthorizes the Clean Lakes Program, and we have one person in this Chamber to thank most for that action and that is our colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY). The gentleman deserves to be commended for the leadership he provided.

This is an example of how the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure serves this institution and this Nation so well. We worked out any differences we had in a bipartisan way and are marching forward together.

Mr. Chairman, let me point out that the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure under the leadership of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman SHUSTER) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), the ranking member, are responsible for more legislation, more successful legislation in this Congress than in the preceding Congress, of greater significance than any other committee of this institution. I am very proud to identify with the committee.

Let me say, unfortunately, that the Environmental Protection Agency has not requested funding for the Clean Lakes Program and the program has not received separate appropriations in recent years. Instead, States have been encouraged to fund clean lakes activities by using funds provided under section 319 of the Clean Water Act for already underfunded nonpoint source programs.

Mr. Chairman, acting to reauthorize this program will send a clear message that we care about restoring and protecting our Nation's 41 million acres of fresh-water lakes for our children and their children. Congress is not the only voice calling for this program. Various public and private organizations involved in lake water quality management had been seeking an increase in funding for the Clean Lakes Program.

This program is seen as an important component of meeting the Clean Water Act's objective of having all our Nation's waters fishable and swimmable. In addition, there is growing concern about the damaging effects of acid rain and acid mine drainage on the Nation's lake. Separate, adequate and consistent funding for the Clean Lakes Program is necessary to meet the needs of the States' lake program.

The Clean Lake Program offers an excellent opportunity for watershed-based community-driven projects, as well as needed partnerships among Federal, State, and local entities. It is a good program. It deserves our enthusiastic support for all the right reasons.

Let me once again commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY) for the leadership he has provided, and let me once again proudly associate with my colleagues on the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure for doing the deed today.

Let me leave with this thought from Henry David Thoreau who said in *Walden* back in 1854: "A lake is the landscape's most beautiful and expressive feature. It is earth's eye: looking into which the beholder measures the depth of his own nature."

1400

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BORSKI), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment.

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) for yielding me this time and also to thank him for his leadership on this issue and so many issues that come before the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

I also want to commend our subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), and our full committee chairman, my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), for working with us in a bipartisan manner which is, of course, the way this committee always works; and again I would add that is why we are so successful.

I also want to commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY), the author of this bill, for pushing and shoving and making sure this piece of legislation comes before us.

Mr. Chairman, I want to rise in strong support of H.R. 2328, a bill to reauthorize the Environmental Protection Agency's Clean Lakes program. The Clean Lakes program was enacted

in 1972 with the passage of the Clean Water Act, to provide additional funding to assess and control pollution levels in our Nation's lakes.

This program has served as a valuable resource for States to identify the sources of pollution, as well as to develop and implement programs aimed at reducing pollution levels in and restoring the quality of lake systems.

The bill we are considering would reauthorize the Clean Lakes program, providing up to \$50 million annually through 2005.

In addition, in order to address the persistent problems of high acidity in our Nation's lakes, this legislation would increase the authorization for programs aimed at reducing the levels of toxins present in these water bodies.

Funding under this program could be used in developing new and innovative methods of neutralizing and restoring the natural buffering capacity of lakes, as well as other methods for removing toxic metals and other substances mobilized by high acidity.

Finally, H.R. 2328 would add four additional lakes to the list of priority demonstration projects authorized under the Clean Lakes program.

These lakes have been identified by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure as regionally significant and deserving of additional attention under this program.

Mr. Chairman, I urge an aye vote on this legislation. I again want to thank the distinguished ranking member, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), for yielding me this time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY), the principal author of this legislation.

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

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, I first want to start by thanking my chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman SHUSTER), from the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure for providing the great leadership, the great management skills and guidance throughout all of the dealings in the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure; as well as the ranking member, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR); the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BORSKI), the ranking member on the subcommittee.

When I came to Congress a year and a half ago, a lot of people said that Republicans and Democrats could not work together; we could not get the people's business done. I think if the American people were to look at the work being done by this Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, they would be incredibly impressed. As a freshman Member of Congress, I know I am and I am thankful. I am thankful because this piece of legislation is being passed today at a very important time.

Recently, Mr. Chairman, the GAO released a study that I had requested on the problem of acid rain in the Adirondack Mountains, which is a region that is consumed by the 22nd Congressional District, which I represent. The results were striking. Many of our lakes in the Adirondacks are increasingly at risk from acid rain, much more than the EPA had originally forecast.

Despite power plant emissions reductions under the 1990 Clean Air Act amendments, nearly half of our lakes have shown an increase in nitrogen levels.

In fact, last year a similar EPA study showed an expansion of the effects of acid rain throughout. However, acid rain is not the only problem that our Nation's lakes are facing. They are facing problems such as invasive species, degraded shorelines, mercury contamination, wetland loss, lake-use conflicts, fisheries imbalances, and nonpoint source pollution, are all threatening our 41 million acres of freshwater lakes.

This is part of the reason why I introduced H.R. 2328, and the other is because my district, as in many parts of the Nation, the lakes are a way of life. They provide a quality of life for the citizens who live near them. Whether it is tourism, drinking water, the natural habitat for many species of birds, fish and other animals, or simply recreation, many communities derive their livelihood from freshwater sources.

Additionally, Mr. Chairman, I should point out that I have been disappointed in the EPA's attempt to shift funding requests under this program to section 319, which deals with nonpoint source pollution management. Our lakes are important enough to qualify and compete with other programs for Federal funding, and that is why we need this reauthorization program today.

I believe this program is something we can all agree on. During its heyday in the 1970s and the 1980s, this program was popular with grass-roots organizations and citizens because it offered them the opportunity to work with Federal, State, and local entities on both prevention and remediation of pollution.

Fundamentally, this program focuses on restoration, not regulation. Some of the past successes included what happened in the State of Florida, when they did an assessment of the 7,000 freshwater lakes to set up a lake management priority system. The grant helped the State prioritize its lakes and their watershed for remedial management programs.

In New York and Vermont they used a grant and teamed up to assess phosphorus pollution in Lake Champlain and set up a plan to monitor the phosphorous load in the lake.

North Dakota used a clean lakes grant to seek correlations between micro-invertebrate communities and the trophic status of lakes.

The results of these grants can help other States that might face similar

problems, and without this program States and their communities will probably not have the resources or technical expertise to conduct studies for themselves.

Mr. Chairman, this is a positive environmental initiative that I think a broad group of philosophies in this House can agree upon. It will provide resources to the most local levels of government to address environmental challenges in our lakes.

Previously, the Clean Lakes program was a uniquely effective, cost-efficient environmental program that provided seed money to State lake programs to projects on public lakes.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all of my colleagues to support this important legislation, and again I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman SHUSTER) for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN).

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) for yielding me this time; and the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY) for his leadership; the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) for his leadership.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2328, a bill to reauthorize the Clean Lakes program. This program recognizes the beauty and value of our lakes and the need to protect and restore these wonderful resources. It is high time we reauthorize and fund the Clean Lakes program.

As we know, the Clean Lakes program was established in 1972 as part of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, commonly referred to as the Clean Water Act. The authorization expired in 1990, and the program has not been funded since 1995 when the EPA stopped requesting money to run it.

While the EPA may have stopped requesting money for clean lakes, I have not, since New Jersey has many lakes that need attention and immediate attention. As a member of the Subcommittee on VA, HUD and Independent Agencies, I have consistently supported a separate appropriation for the section 314 program. Perhaps with the passage of this bill, a clean lakes earmark will now be possible at the appropriations level.

As we know, section 319 deals with watershed restoration issues. Section 314 deals with lake monitoring and protection and management issues. Although related, these two issues are different and should not have to compete for limited dollars.

Mr. Chairman, we have had a sad experience in New Jersey where the lumping together of section 314 and section 319 simply has not worked. This bill would move us towards correcting that problem, and I strongly support it.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the very great significance of this legislation is underscored in many of the lakes and the communities throughout Minnesota. We are blessed, as other less fortunate communities across the country would like to be, in that many of our towns have a lake right in the town. Over the years, before the 1960s, before we had a clean water program, many towns just allowed their storm sewers to discharge into the lakes. Many even allowed their sanitary sewers, after primary treatment, to discharge into lakes. Then they began to realize what an important resource the lake is and diverted sewage away from it and diverted street runoff away from the lakes, although many in the northern tier continued to pile up snow from winter storms on the lake. Where else? It seemed sensible. Let it melt, add to the lake's waters. Now we know that there is pollution in winter as well as in summer. Cities now avoid that tragedy inflicted upon the Nation's lakes.

So what we have is many lakes that should be great resources for swimming, for tourism, for boating, for fishing, that have substantial amounts of pollution embedded in the lake bottom. In the sediment under those waters, plants grow up, transmit the pollutants to the fish who feed on the plant life, and then humans consume the fish and in turn find embedded in their body cells the pollutants that we all know are so harmful.

Why is this legislation so important? Because cities can have access to funds to develop plans to clean up those lakes, restore them perhaps not to their pristine original condition created by the glaciers when they retreated 10,000 years ago, but at least to be swimmable, to be fishable, to be usable, to be a community attraction rather than a point of shame for a community.

This legislation will provide States, through States to communities, the resources, financial resources, they need to make their lakes the great treasures that they should be. As the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) so poetically described in the closing words of his remarks on the House Floor, lakes should be the eye through which a community sees itself and sees its treasures.

So I have great hopes for this legislation; and I want to take this opportunity to urge the administration to, in the future, include funding for the Clean Lakes program, which they have not done for several years, and to urge our colleagues on the Committee on Appropriations, it was very encouraging to have the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) address the issue rather directly, that enactment of this legislation will give the Committee on Appropriations an opportunity to provide funding for the Clean Lakes program. That will be the ultimate success of this legislation.

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I urge an aye vote on H.R. 2328, the Clean Lakes program, because it helps restore and protect our Nation's 41 million acres of freshwater lakes. It helps States clean up their lakes, and it mitigates the harmful effects of high acidity like acid rain.

Now, one may ask why is this particular bill, H.R. 2328, needed? It is because of the pollution or habitat degradation that impairs 39 percent of the 17 million acres which have already been surveyed. EPA currently requires States to stretch their limited nonpoint source funds to clean up their lakes. H.R. 2328 restores a national focus and priority on our lakes.

I think it was very instructive, as the distinguished ranking member pointed out, the problem of such things as acid rain and how in Europe acid rain from the Ruhr Valley caused problems all the way up in Sweden.

1415

Certainly here in the United States, acid rain knows no State boundaries. Indeed, that is one of the reasons why we need to have a national program, because certainly acid rain is something that crosses State lines, and the acid rain from one State can very seriously damage the lakes of another State, as has, in fact, been the case.

Now, the background to this program, which was established under section 314 of the Clean Water Act, provides for financial and technical assistance to States in restoring publicly owned lakes. In recognition of the unique water quality challenges, facing our Nation's lakes, Congress included the Clean Lakes Program as part of the original 1972 Clean Water Act.

Section 314 contains various State assessment and reporting requirements, a national demonstration program, and an EPA grant program for assistance to States in carrying out projects and program responsibilities.

On June 23, 1999, the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY) introduced H.R. 2328. This was referred solely to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 2328 would reauthorize funding for the Clean Lakes Program for fiscal years 2000 through 2005, and would increase the authorized annual funding levels from \$30 million to \$100 million.

On October 18, 1999, the Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment held a hearing on Clean Lakes and Water Quality Management and on H.R. 2328. On March 8, 2000, the Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment marked up H.R. 2328.

The subcommittee adopted an amendment in the nature of a substitute. This amendment, A, reduced the funding authorization from \$100 million annually to \$50 million annually; and, B, added additional lakes to the list of lakes to receive priority con-

sideration for demonstration projects; and, C, increased the special authorization of financial assistance to States to mitigate harmful effects of high acidity from acid deposition or acid mine drainage from \$15 million to \$25 million; and, D, prevented the report to Congress on the Clean Lakes Demonstration Program from expiring under the Federal Reports Elimination and Sunset Act of 1995.

The subcommittee reported H.R. 2328, as amended, favorably to the full committee. On March 16, 2000, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure reported the bill as amended by the subcommittee by unanimous voice vote.

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

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire of the Chair how much time remains on each side.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) has 16½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) has 14½ minutes remaining.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN).

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I am very interested in working with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman SHUSTER) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), the ranking member, concerning Lake Apopka in Florida.

Florida, as my colleagues know, is one of the third largest States, and Lake Apopka is the second most polluted lake in the State of Florida.

We have been harmed by many years of agricultural storm water discharges, as well as historical discharges of both domestic and industrial waste water. Because of this, this particular lake has been in the news. Many Federal officials have come down, and there is a lot of concern as to how this relates to the community.

I am hoping that the committee will look into Lake Apopka as we move this bill through the process and consider adding this to the list.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, could the gentlewoman from Florida describe for us the size of the lake in acres. Does the gentlewoman from Florida have that information available?

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I do not have it, but I will have that information for the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentlewoman from Florida, are boating activities prevalent on the lake? I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Yes, sir. Mr. Chairman, in fact, I have been in touch with the Water Management District, and they will forward that information.

In reviewing the bill, I was very concerned that Florida was not represented in the bill. Of course this lake is crucial to the State of Florida.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentlewoman from Florida, is it a lake that is used considerably for fishing as well?

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN).

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Fishing, Mr. Chairman. But, as I said, there has been a shift in the usage because of the contamination of the lake.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, but because the lake waters are contaminated, the fish are probably not fit for sustainable human consumption.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will further yield, that is correct. Also, there has been a shift in the vegetation and wildlife in communities around the lake because of the polluted facility.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, this certainly is the type of lake and these are the conditions that this legislation seeks to address. The authority provided in the legislation for grants to States and through States to municipalities is the appropriate venue for the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN) to pursue this matter.

We will certainly, on the committee, be very happy to support the gentlewoman's interest in seeing that there are adequate resources when appropriations are made. There are no appropriations available now. The point of this legislation is to authorize expanded funding through a program from EPA of grants to States and through States to municipalities or other lesser units of government that then will undertake cleanup plans.

It would be useful if the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN) could provide us with any restoration plan that either the city or county or joint powers agreement authority may have developed for the cleanup of this lake and any other supporting information, as the gentlewoman has already indicated. I am sure the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman SHUSTER) will support us in the initiative of appealing to EPA at the appropriate time for consideration of this project.

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

Mr. OBERSTAR. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I certainly concur with the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN) and will be very happy to work on this with them to find an adequate and acceptable solution.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield such time as he may

consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY), the principal author of this legislation.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding me the time. I echo the thoughts of the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN) and hope that we can work together in finding a solution.

The beauty of this legislation really is that it provides an opportunity for localities and people in communities to really interact and do some positive proactive work.

I have got a letter here from a Robert Mac Millan, who is the chairman of the Saratoga Lake Protection and Improvement District. I would like to read it because it will give people the sense of the kinds of things and kinds of people that are interested in this.

Dear Congressman SWEENEY:

I am writing to you in support of your Clean Lakes Bill which will be the subject of a legislative hearing.

I am the Chairman of the Saratoga Lake Protection and Improvement District (SLPID). The SLPID was created as political subdivision of New York State in 1986 to supervise, manage, and control Saratoga Lake. Our primary responsibilities are to enhance recreational use of Saratoga Lake, protect real property values, conserve fish and wildlife and enhance the scenic beauty of the Lake. We are funded primarily by a special tax assessment placed by lakefront property owners. This tax assessment was increased 65.9 percent for the tax year 2000 and will still fall short of funding necessary to control all of the actions we need on the Lake.

Saratoga Lake is experiencing a major increase in aquatic weed growth and zebra mussels which adversely affects all aspects of our Lake. One of the most invasive weeds is Eurasian Water Milfoil, a plant not native to North America. Our primary method of weed control has been mechanical harvesting, but we find that harvesting is not accomplishing control of the aquatic weed problem. We have applied for a permit from New York State Department of Environmental Conservation to treat two of the problem areas in the Lake with aquatic herbicide. This treatment will be closely monitored for effectiveness and incorporated in a lake watershed and management plan which is presently ongoing.

I am aware of the Federal Non-indigenous Aquatic Nuisance Prevention and Control Act of 1990 which was to mitigate the financial impact of non-indigenous aquatic species such as Eurasian Water Milfoil and zebra mussels on local governments. Our current effort to control the weed in Saratoga Lake through the use of an EPA and New York State approved herbicide may be an excellent demonstration project which could be useful to other lakes experiencing similar problems with non-native aquatic species. Providing our treatment efforts are successful this year we hope to obtain funding to accomplish a whole lake treatment during 2001.

Mr. Chairman, I read this letter and bring this letter to the floor to point out this will be the norm. This will be the norm that occurs throughout this Nation as we fight to preserve our clean water sources.

This bill being passed today is coming at a crucial time, as I stated before, especially since we have taken many significant steps in the last decade to

reduce the effects of pollutants, especially nitrates and sulfur dioxide throughout. But in some respects, we are losing that battle.

This will provide us a ground-up approach to that effort. This will give us the opportunity for people in the local communities to fight for these valuable resources. I am very proud to be the sponsor of this bill, and I look forward to its implementation.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for a general debate has expired.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the bill shall be considered by sections as an original bill for the purpose of amendment, and pursuant to the rule, each section is considered read.

During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chair may accord priority in recognition to a Member offering an amendment that he has printed in the designated place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Those amendments will be considered read.

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone a request for a recorded vote on any amendment and may reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the time for voting on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote, provided that the time for voting on the first question shall be a minimum of 15 minutes.

The Clerk will designate section 1.

The text of section 1 is as follows:

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

#### SECTION 1. GRANTS TO STATES

*Section 314(c)(2) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1324(c)(2)) is amended by striking "\$50,000,000" the first place it appears and all that follows through "1990" and inserting "\$50,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2001 through 2005".*

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 1?

There being no amendments to section 1, the Clerk will designate section 2.

The text of section 2 is as follows:

#### SEC. 2. DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.

*Section 314(d) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1324(d)) is amended—*

*(1) in paragraph (2) by inserting "Otsego Lake, New York; Oneida Lake, New York; Raystown Lake, Pennsylvania; Swan Lake, Itasca County, Minnesota;" after Sauk Lake, Minnesota;"*

*(2) in paragraph (3) by striking "By" and inserting "Notwithstanding section 3003 of the Federal Reports Elimination and Sunset Act of 1995 (31 U.S.C. 1113 note; 109 Stat. 734-736), by"; and*

*(3) in paragraph (4)(B)(i) by striking "\$15,000,000" and inserting "\$25,000,000".*

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 2?

There being no amendments to section 2, are there further amendments to the bill?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STUPAK

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STUPAK:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

#### SEC. 3. PROHIBITION OF BULK FRESH WATER SALES FROM GREAT LAKES.

Section 314 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1324) is amended by adding at the end the following:

*"(e) PROHIBITION OF BULK FRESH WATER SALES FROM GREAT LAKES.—*

*"(1) IN GENERAL.—As a condition of the receipt of grant assistance under this section in a fiscal year, the Administrator shall require a State to provide assurances satisfactory to the Administrator that the State will prohibit in such fiscal year the sale of bulk fresh water from any of the Great Lakes.*

*"(2) BULK FRESH WATER DEFINED.—The term 'bulk fresh water' means fresh water extracted from any of the Great Lakes in amounts intended for transportation by tanker or similar form of mass transportation, without further processing. The term does not include drinking water in containers intended for personal consumption."*

Mr. STUPAK (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment which is very important to the residents in my district and many congressional districts throughout the Great Lakes region.

My amendment would prevent the sale of fresh water from our Great Lakes. Our precious water resources should not be sold to the highest bidder, and we must ensure that this cannot happen.

Our Great Lakes are a tremendous recreational resource. They provide boating, water skiing, fishing, and swimming opportunities. Our lakes are also a tremendous source of drinking water. Most notably, of course, are the Great Lakes, which contain 20 percent of the world's fresh water supply.

The 35 million people residing near the Great Lakes have always appreciated the lakes' beauty, vastness, cleanliness, and now they must appreciate that it is also a targeted commodity.

1430

In 1998, a Canadian company planned to ship 3 billion liters of water from Lake Superior over 5 years and sell it to Asia. I offered legislation that was passed by the House of Representatives that called on the United States Government to oppose this action. The permit was subsequently withdrawn. The demand for water continues, however, as freshwater supplies dwindle throughout the world.

In the United States, each person consumes 100 gallons of water each day. The global demand meanwhile doubles every 21 years. Think about it. The world water demand doubles every 21 years. The World Bank predicts that by 2025 more than 3 billion people in 52 countries will suffer water shortages

for drinking or sanitation. Where, I ask, will countries find clean, fresh water? They will look to alternative sources, sources which are outside their area and, more likely, outside their borders.

It is understandable, therefore, that the pristine water of our Great Lakes will be targeted. The method is real. The threat is real. To those who say the bulk shift of fresh water is not economically feasible, I say, look around us. From Newfoundland in Canada, to Lake Superior in Michigan, to Alaska, several companies are competing to ship our precious freshwater resources overseas.

For those who take a short-term view of protecting this resource, bulk sales of fresh water must seem irresistible. Throw a hose in the water, hook up a pump, and fill an ocean tanker. Maximum profits with minimum overhead. A windfall if a State wanted to license this kind of operation.

Yes, our Great Lakes are renewable; but they are not replaceable. I am very concerned that shortsighted policies could allow for large-scale diversions of Great Lakes water, threatening the environment, the economy, and the welfare of the Great Lakes region.

We are not merely citizens of the Great Lakes. We are their guardians. We are their stewards. We are their protectors. We encourage conservation, and we return 95 percent of all the water taken from the Great Lakes.

Setting aside global water use and trade policies, I ask Members to consider how bulk diversion of Great Lakes water could jeopardize our efforts to be good stewards. In terms of water quality, if we permit bulk diversions to further lower water levels, we increase the concentration of runoff contaminants, of fuel pollution. As lake levels drop, which they are now, we increase the need for dredging to maintain our vital waterways, further compounding the problem with toxic sediments.

We must consider all threats posed to our Great Lakes. We must be conscious of the threat posed by the sale or diversion of Great Lakes water just as carefully as we weigh the impact of the invasive species or drilling for gas and oil in the Great Lakes. None of these concerns are truly independent of one another in terms of their potential impact on the 35 million people who depend on our most vital natural resource, the Great Lakes, our great treasures.

My amendment would withhold grant assistance from Great Lakes States which allow the sale of bulk fresh water from the Great Lakes. This restriction would apply to water extracted from a lake for mass transportation without further processing and does not apply to bottled water used for consumption.

The cleanup of our lakes will preserve their beauty for generations to come. The ban on water sales from our Great Lakes will also preserve their

beauty and our greatest natural resource for generations to come.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I rise not so much in opposition to the concept. In fact, not at all in opposition to the concept. I support very vigorously the idea that the gentleman is trying to advance, but I do not support the vehicle that he has chosen to approach this subject.

The matter of diversion of water from the Great Lakes is an issue of very great concern to those of us who live in this heartland of the United States. The Great Lakes represent 20 percent of all the fresh water on the face of the Earth. Lake Superior represents half of that water. Lake Superior is equal to all the water of the other four Great Lakes. It is a vast resource. The only other lake in the world that approaches the volume and the enormity of Lake Superior is Lake Baikal in Russia.

We have been vigilant, on both the U.S. and the Canadian side, about the water quality, about the volume of water, through the international joint commission; about the rising or falling levels of water in the Great Lakes. We have also been concerned that there may be attempts by water-short areas of the North American continent and water-short areas of other places on the face of the Earth that may have their eyes fixed on the Great Lakes.

Beginning with the coal slurry pipeline in 1970, the eyes of the western States were fixed on the Great Lakes, admittedly under the guise of selling low sulfur coal in an economical transport means of pipeline to the lakehead in Duluth, where then it could be transferred to tankers for lower lake port power plants. But those of us who maintain vigil on the shores of Gitche Gumee said this also has the capacity of draining the water out of the lakes. They could reverse those pumps. Once they are that close to Lake Superior, they could just drop a pump in the lake and start shipping the water westward. We vigorously opposed and ultimately stopped the coal slurry pipeline.

In 1986, in furtherance of this concern, I offered an amendment in committee in the Water Resources Development Act, in cooperation with Democrats and Republicans throughout the Great Lakes States, to require, before any water could be diverted out of any of the Great Lakes, unanimous consent of the governors of the Great Lakes States and, though we could not bind, the province of Ontario. That province is so vast it covers all five of the Great Lakes. And we succeeded in getting that language enacted. It has been successful until very recently in scaring off potential diverters.

Then, in 1998, a Canadian company based in the Province of Ontario got up the idea of selling, in bulk means, water from Lake Ontario to overseas sources. An immediate outcry rose in

the Province and, of course, on the U.S. side of the Great Lakes that resulted in the Province of Ontario denying a permit to withdraw water. But the potential remains for withdrawing water from one of the Great Lakes and bottling it in little containers. And if it can be bottled in pint and quart and gallon and 5 gallon sizes, then what is to prevent someone from shipping it in larger containers of 5,000 or 10,000 gallons or more?

So the concern of my good friend, who maintains a watchful eye from his northern peninsula, upper peninsula, a Michigan outpost, on the lake is well placed and fully founded and justified.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. OBERSTAR was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. OBERSTAR. So I compliment the gentleman, Mr. Chairman, on his vigilance on this matter, but I feel that the vehicle is not appropriate. It has, first of all, not had widespread scrutiny in our committee. We have not had an opportunity until just now to review the approach the gentleman takes.

It has been my intention that, in cooperation with the gentleman from Michigan and others of our colleagues in the Great Lakes States, to approach this subject in the forthcoming Water Resources Development Act of 2000.

I would like to ask my colleague if he would consider withdrawing the amendment, preserving the option and, of course, protecting his right to come forth in the WRDA bill and to cooperate with us in a similar venture.

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

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

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member for yielding. If there is going to be a WRDA bill, that is the first if. Secondly, if we will be given an opportunity to offer the amendment.

We have a bill; it is 2595. As the gentleman knows, the International Joint Commission on February 22 put forth their recommendations on what should be done to not only stop vast transfers of water out of the Great Lakes region but also what should be in the meantime to make sure the States provide the necessary data and information so we can make intelligent decisions concerning our water resources. Not just for transfer or sale but also for the ecology of it, for the environment, and for the conservation.

So if we would have a WRDA bill, and if we were to be given the opportunity to appear before the committee to present H.R. 2595, my bill on the Great Lakes, or a modified version taking in the International Joint Commission's recommendations, I would be willing to entertain that.

I see we probably have a number of more speakers, so I would like to hear the other speakers before I withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) has once again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. OBERSTAR was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, if I might inquire of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) regarding the formulation. I think we may be at the end of hearings, or there may be an opportunity for further hearings on the WRDA bill, but it is my understanding that the chair of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure intends to proceed with a WRDA bill for 2000.

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

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, it is certainly our intention to move the WRDA bill this year, WRDA 2000. The administration just sent their bill up, so we will be dealing with it.

And I would say to my good friend from Michigan that we certainly want to work with him. I do not think this is the appropriate vehicle. The WRDA bill would seem to be more appropriate.

We just received this amendment, literally handed to us. So while we are aware of the basic issue the gentleman is attempting to address, which is complex and which is very important, we are quite happy to work with the gentleman to see if we cannot accommodate him on a more appropriate vehicle, such as the WRDA bill or another related piece of legislation.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, it does seem to me that WRDA is the appropriate vehicle, and I further yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. STUPAK. The few times I have done bills on Great Lakes to preserve and protect the Great Lakes, they have been bipartisan bills. I would like to remain in that bipartisan atmosphere. At times, it gets a little difficult, when we have people outside the Great Lakes coming into our region and our districts and making wild statements about our lack of protection of the Great Lakes. So we are always vigilant to look for opportunities to protect our Great Lakes and our Great Lakes resources.

As long as I am a Member of Congress, I will continue to work day in and day out to protect the Great Lakes. Based upon the assurances from the chairman and the ranking member, however, I will look forward to working with both the chairman and the ranking member to work to protect the Great Lakes in the WRDA bill, WRDA 2000.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for his leadership on this issue, for his vigilance, his concern, and for his statesmanship in making this unanimous consent request. And I want to assure the gen-

tleman that we will work very closely and very diligently toward his objective.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment is withdrawn.

Are there further amendments to the bill?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TRAFICANT

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TRAFICANT:

At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

**SEC. —. SENSE OF CONGRESS; REQUIREMENT REGARDING NOTICE.**

(a) PURCHASE OF AMERICAN-MADE EQUIPMENT AND PRODUCTS.—In the case of any equipment or products that may be authorized to be purchased with financial assistance provided under this Act, it is the sense of the Congress that entities receiving such assistance should, in expending the assistance, purchase only American-made equipment and products.

(b) NOTICE TO RECIPIENTS OF ASSISTANCE.—In providing financial assistance under this Act, the head of each Federal agency shall provide to each recipient of the assistance a notice describing the statement made in subsection (a) by the Congress.

(c) NOTICE OF REPORT.—Any entity which receives funds under this Act shall report any expenditures on foreign-made items to the Congress within 180 days of the expenditure.

Mr. TRAFICANT (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, we do not know what this amendment is, have not seen it or heard about it, have not smelled it. This is a surprise.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, this is a standard Buy American amendment that has been added to every transportation bill that we have offered.

1445

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) has an amendment to this bill at the desk.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Yes, I do, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object. May we have a copy of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will re-report the amendment.

The Clerk rereported the amendment.

Mr. TRAFICANT (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) has reserved a point of order.

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to notify the committee that I did bring this to the floor earlier this morning but I have been testifying before the Committee on Ways and Means and would have apprised the leadership of it. But it is an amendment that has been passed to every probation bill and every authorizing bill that involves the expenditures of funds. It has not been a controversial bill in the past. I do not believe it should be at this point.

In any event, it encourages the purchases of American-made products. Anyone who gets assistance under the bill shall get a notice of Congress intention to urge them, wherever possible, to buy American-made products.

Finally, anyone who is getting these funds give us a report back when they spend the money how they spend that money.

Now, we are running about a \$300 billion trade deficit. I think if we are going to go ahead and spend money for goods and services that those goods and services, wherever possible, should be American goods and services.

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

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to withdraw my point of order. Having had the opportunity now to see the amendment, it is a buy-American amendment, which I have vigorously supported in the past and am happy to support today.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comments of the gentleman, and I apologize to both gentleman from having not been here to explain it to them earlier.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRAFICANT. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT), of course we have had buy-American provisions in other legislation of this committee. But the Part B of the sense of Congress, does the notice to recipients in Part B flow from the sentence in the previous subsection (a), that is, the sense of Congress, so that Part B is also a sense of Congress and not a requirement in law that, in providing financial assistance, the head of each agency shall provide a notice?

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, section (b) states that, even though it is the sense of the Congress that they are not mandated to buy American, section (b) mandates that the agency shall at least make notice that the Congress encourages the purchase of American products.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield,

the sense of Congress language terminates with subsection (a) but subsection (b) is a requirement upon Federal agencies to provide notice.

Mr. Chairman, may I inquire of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), is that the understanding of the chairman?

Part B of the Buy-American provision is a requirement upon Federal agencies providing assistance to provide a notice and to report.

Mr. Chairman, is that consistent with the understanding of the chairman? I just want to make this clear.

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

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I guess that is what the language says. There might be a technical problem with some of the language which we would have to work out in conference here.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time to clarify the concern of the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), the Congress urges the recipients of this money to buy American, but the Congress also requires those agencies that give the money to give them a notice that Congress does encourage them to buy.

They are not compelled to buy, but what they are compelled to give is a notice and give us a report on the activity.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, is it his understanding that this applies only to the legislation before us today?

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, absolutely, to this specific bill and this bill alone. I will have another amendment for his next bill very similar.

Mr. Chairman, I urge an "aye" vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there other amendments?

If not, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CAMP) having assumed the chair, Mr. GILLMOR, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2328) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to reauthorize the Clean Lakes Program, pursuant to House Resolution 468, reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on the amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

#### CHESAPEAKE BAY RESTORATION ACT OF 1999

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 470 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 3039.

1454

#### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3039) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to assist in the restoration of the Chesapeake Bay, and for other purposes, with Mr. GILLMOR in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER).

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly want to commend the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BATEMAN) for his leadership on this legislation that is going to help protect one of our national treasures, the Chesapeake Bay.

The Bay has a 64,000 square mile watershed and is home to over 15 million people and more than 3,000 plant and animal species. Bay restoration efforts are working well. Striped bass, underwater grasses are back, toxic releases are down, more than 67 percent since 1988 in fact, and the nutrients have been reduced.

However, parts of the Bay remain impaired. This legislation will strengthen

cooperative efforts to address the remaining work to be done to restore and to protect the Bay.

I would emphasize that this legislation passed the subcommittee and the full committee unanimously by a voice vote, and I know of no controversy.

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

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly support H.R. 3039, the Chesapeake Bay Restoration Act. The Chesapeake Bay is one of the great estuaries of the world, perhaps the greatest, the meeting place of salt and fresh water where new forms of life are created.

Those forms of life, whether new forms or existing ones, are increasingly endangered in the world's estuaries by the pollution that we discharge into the waters and into the meeting places.

In 1983, the Federal Government and the States of Virginia, Maryland, Pennsylvania, as well as the District of Columbia, signed the first Chesapeake Bay Agreement. Four years later, the Federal Government and the Bay States and the communities within them reached agreement on the problems facing the Bay, the shared responsibility for deteriorating conditions, and on the joint actions that were needed to slow and reverse the destruction of this resource.

In the past 17 years, the hard work of all those involved is beginning to bear fruit. The Bay is showing signs of improvement. But the work is never over.

This legislation will take a further step toward improvement of water quality and improvement of the overall health of the Bay ecosystem.

The legislation will reauthorize the Environmental Protection Agency's successful Chesapeake Bay Program for an additional 6 years, giving stability and strength to this very important initiative. It will increase the program funding level. The Program Office of EPA has been very successful in working collaboratively with the States and the communities adjacent to the Bay in identifying causes of pollution, building partnerships to restore the health of that enormous resource.

Under this legislation, EPA will continue the cooperative collaborative approach of developing interstate management plans, control harmful nutrients, control the addition of toxins to improve water quality, and restore habitats to the ecosystem.

In addition, the legislation will incorporate into the Chesapeake Bay Agreement those improvements jointly recommended by the participating States, including recommendations for the administrator and authority for the administrator to approve small watershed grants to fund local governments and nonprofit organizations for local protection and restoration programs.

If we do not address the health of the Bay by including the watersheds that