

Irvin Hardy, Rupert ID., (pop. 5,200), water superintendent.

Bob Paffile, CDA, board member/vice president.

Robert Smith, New Meadows, (pop. 600), water superintendent.

Buzz Hardy, Rapid River water and sewer, (pop. 42), district president.

Paul Stokes, Solmon, Idaho, (pop. 3,000), water treatment.

Steve Kimberling, Orofino ID, (pop. 2,500), water maintenance.

Richard Whiting, City of Victor ID., (pop. 600), water superintendent.

Jim Condit, City of Spirit Lake, (pop. 1,500), water waste water.

Rhonda Wilcox, City of Harrison, (pop. 226), water maintenance.

Phil Tschida, City of Horseshoe Bend, (pop. 720), water maintenance superintendent.

Ed Miller, CSC water district Kellogg, (pop. 3,000), water operator.

Virgil W. Leedy, City of Weiser, (pop. 4,500), water superintendent.

Dan Waldo, Kingston water, (pop. 180), manager.

Todd Zimmermann, Avondale Irrigation District, (pop. 1,700), manager.

Joe Podrabsky, City of Lewiston, (pop. 5,500), water operator.

Ken Rawson, City of Lewiston, (pop. 5,500), water operator.

Mike Curtiss, City of Grangeville, (pop. 3,300), water superintendent.

John Shields, Kootenai county water district, (pop. 170), manager.

Dave Owsley, Dworshak N.F.H., engineer.

Ray Crawford, Winchester, (pop. 380), maintenance.

Rodney Cook, Juliaetta, (pop. 480), maintenance.

Jack Fuest, Culdesac, (pop. 420), maintenance.

Brian Ellison, Troy, (pop. 800), maintenance.

David C. Shears Sr., Cottonwood, (pop. 850), maintenance.

Dave Fuzzell, Cottonwood, (pop. 850), maintenance.

Robert Jones, Lewiston, (pop. 28,000), maintenance.

Renee McMillen, Lewiston, (pop. 28,000), water operator.

Bob Faling, Lewiston, (pop. 28,000), water maintenance.

Lonnie Woodbridge, Arco, (pop. 1,000), maintenance.

Dale W. Anderson, Harwood, (pop. 80), maintenance.

Eugene J. Pfoff, Fort Hall (townsite), maintenance.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. I remember, Mr. President, on one occasion at a particular meeting somebody who was part of the Federal establishment saying, "Well, if we do not have the Federal Government absolutely through regulation watch out for everything dealing with safe drinking water, who in the world will?" It is because of that same Federal mentality—somehow somebody thinks only the Federal Government can be the guardian of the well-being of this country—I remind all of us we are the United States. We are not the Federal Government of America. There are 50 sovereign States that comprise this Union, and those Governors and those legislators and, within those States, those county commissioners and those mayors, they care about their people. If you had a situation in a community where there would be an outbreak of water contamination that would be life threatening, those

elected officials would have a serious problem, not only the serious problem of immediately dealing with the life-threatening situation but they also probably would have a political problem because their constituents are not going to allow someone to somehow jeopardize the safety of that water which the children of that community are going to drink.

We have talked about cryptosporidium, the fact that it was not regulated in 1993 when there was an outbreak and 104 people died from that particular outbreak, and yet today cryptosporidium is still not regulated. We are going to change that, and this legislation allows us to improve, therefore, public safety and public health, and we are going to do it at less cost. We are going to provide flexibility to States and local communities, but we are going to then be able to target life-threatening contaminants such as cryptosporidium and go after those contaminants instead of contaminants that pose absolutely no health risk and yet require these communities to spend their finite dollars on expensive monitoring systems. If this is not in keeping with what this Congress is trying to do, I do know what is.

So I am pleased that we do have S. 1316 before us. I am pleased that in the Environment and Public Works Committee all 16 members of that committee, bipartisan, support this legislation, as well as the fact the leadership on both sides of the aisle, the majority leader and the Democratic leader, supports this legislation. We are currently working with some Senators who have proposals, amendments that they are suggesting would improve this particular legislation. We will work with them. I believe that we can resolve that. But again this is another significant step forward in our role as partners with State and local governments, working on behalf of the people of the United States of America.

With that, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INHOFE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to proceed as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### ONE MARINE'S WILL TO SURVIVE

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Mr. President, Lance Cpl. Zachary Mayo, from Osburn, ID, population 2,000, is a marine aboard the U.S.S. *America*. In the early morning hours of November 25, just a couple days ago, he was swept

overboard from his assignment on the U.S.S. *America*. The Navy conducted 3 extensive days of searching, utilizing different ships and helicopters to locate Lance Cpl. Mayo. His mother and father had been notified that their son was missing at sea.

I just got off the phone with Mr. Stanley Mayo, the father, who received a call at 4 a.m. this morning that his son is OK. In fact, he spoke with his son. After 36 hours in the water, Zachary was picked up by a Pakistani fishing boat. He has been taken to Pakistan and is now in transit to the United States Embassy and will be returned shortly.

In speaking with his father and learning a little bit about what it must have been like to be swept over and spend 36 hours without a flotation device, he described the survival technique utilized by this tough marine of utilizing the clothing and tying knots in both the sleeves of the uniform jacket, as well as the pants, and creating an air chamber. I think this, again, shows the quality of the people that we have, and this is a testament to a young man's determination to survive—which he did, after 36 hours in I believe the Arabian Sea. Also, it demonstrates the faith of a family that never gave up hope, and all in the Silver Valley were determined that they would receive that good news.

Stanley Mayo told me moments ago that he went to bed last night with the prayer that in the morning he would hear from his son, and that prayer was answered. So I know that all of us rejoice in what will be an outstanding reunion. Stan Mayo said that he cannot remember when he ever had such news that brought him such joy, except perhaps when it was the birth of Zachary. So now to have the news that his son will be returned is something we can all rejoice in.

Again, this is a testament to the ability of our U.S. military personnel and their dedication to survival and carrying out their assignments. Again, I think it is something that we need to make note of. I say to the Mayo family, God bless all of them.

With that, I yield the floor.

Mr. COHEN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

#### A TRIBUTE TO OUR ARMED SERVICES

Mr. COHEN. Mr. President, first let me congratulate my colleague for his very poignant recitation of what took place and join him in congratulating the men and women who serve in the armed services for the kind of dedication and creativity and ingenuity that is involved in preparing themselves for the ultimate conflict they must always be prepared for.

I think his recitation only adds greater credence and compliments the leadership being shown in the armed services and the kinds of people being

recruited day in and day out. The American people—not to mention this particular father—have a great deal to be proud of. So I commend him for his statement.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. I thank the Senator.

#### SAFE DRINKING WATER ACT AMENDMENTS

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. President, I want to commend Senator KEMPTHORNE along with Senators CHAFEE, REID, and others, for their efforts to bring to the floor this important safe drinking water legislation, which I was pleased to cosponsor. The changes that would be made by this bill—reducing unnecessary burdens and costs to communities and ratepayers while guaranteeing reliable drinking water—have been sought by cities and towns in my State for many years now.

The Safe Drinking Water Act is perceived at the local level to be one of the most expensive and onerous Federal environmental requirements that we have. Reform of drinking water regulations has been a top priority of local officials across the country as they expressed increasing frustration with unfunded Federal mandates. As a former mayor, I understand the difficulties local officials encounter when they are faced with an enormous number of requirements and little money to pay for them.

I was pleased to be an initial cosponsor of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 which was the first step taken by Congress to reduce the impact of unfunded mandates. That was enacted into law last March under the leadership of Senator KEMPTHORNE. It is going to make it much more difficult to enact new unfunded mandates.

The second step toward reducing the burden on communities is to directly address the unfunded mandates that currently exist on the books. The bill before us today represents a very thoughtful and prudent approach to this critical second step.

The purpose of the bill is to maintain a safe drinking water supply while reducing the cost to communities and ratepayers. We need to remind ourselves that while cutting costs is very important, it is also critical that we do not lose sight of the fundamental goal of providing citizens with clean drinking water. People expect the water coming out of the tap to be safe, and we must not do anything that would jeopardize public health.

It is a sorry comment indeed that you read in the local paper in this community that people need to boil their drinking water. Here we are in the Nation's Capital where people have to be alerted that the water they are drinking is not safe, that it contains harmful bacteria. Therefore, local residents are told to be sure to boil their water. That does not say very much for the

state of affairs in this community, to say the least. But it is a warning, perhaps, to all of us that we cannot simply engage in looking at the costs without taking into account what the major and central goal has to be: protecting the health and welfare of our people.

This bill would amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to increase the role of risk assessment and cost-benefit analysis in standard setting. It would also provide waivers from various requirements for small drinking water systems, and would authorize a revolving loan fund to provide funding for drinking water infrastructure projects. This legislation goes a long way toward providing flexibility for States and municipalities to develop drinking water programs that make sense for particular communities instead of the current one-size-fits-all approach.

One of the most critical aspects of this legislation is its recognition of the unique problems expensive Safe Drinking Water Act requirements pose to small communities. A recent CBO study found that the Safe Drinking Water Act has resulted in fairly modest costs for a majority of the households in this country. Approximately 80 percent of the households are expected to incur costs of \$20 annually. However, the CBO noted that "the household served by small water systems are particularly likely to face high costs," some well in excess of \$100 per year. Additionally, that study found that costs to ratepayers tend to be higher for surface water systems than for groundwater systems.

In Maine, the majority of households get their water from municipal systems, all but a handful of which serve fewer than 10,000 users, and most of which serve less than 4,000 users. Maine has a relatively high percentage of water systems that rely on surface water as their source. Because this water has historically been very clean, few towns had filtration facilities. As a result, Maine water systems now have spent over \$150 million in the past few years to comply with the surface water treatment rule, which has been particularly hard for these small community systems.

One example of this would be Southport, ME. It is an island town of about 650 year-round residents, where the voters recently rejected—overwhelmingly, I should point out—a \$300,000 plan to bring the town into compliance with the Safe Drinking Water Act. The town's 70-year-old system relies on surface water since there is little potable ground water on the island. Providing water that meets the law's standards would raise the annual water rates for seasonal residents from \$136 to \$306.

In Searsport, ME, the water district is currently proposing a 66-percent rate increase due to the need to convert from surface to ground water. As a result, the water costs of one Searsport company would increase by \$48,000 a year. The company, understandably, is

considering other water sources, although the implication for other users are going to be enormous if that company left the town system.

Finally, I would like to share just one more example of the need to reform the Safe Drinking Water Act. Among the many letters I have received from Mainers expressing concern about the law's impact is a very thoughtful letter from Mrs. Audrey Stone of Bucksport. Mrs. Stone wrote:

As I rely totally on my Social Security check and therefore am restricted to a fixed income, as are many other residents in this community, you can readily see that the impact of a water rate increase in excess of \$200 per year poses grave threats to my ability to maintain my residence. Additionally, those residents who have another source of water supply may choose to shut off the water company at the street, returning to their own source of water and defeating the purpose of this previously enumerated act. Further, this leaves less ratepayers to absorb the cost of the mandated improvements.

Mr. President, I strongly believe we have to preserve public confidence in the safety of our drinking water, but current Federal laws seek to achieve the goal of clean drinking water in a very expensive and sometimes very wasteful manner.

This bill will maintain a safe drinking water supply and reduce unnecessary costs and burdens to communities and utilities that provide the water. By reducing unnecessary costs and providing additional Federal funding, communities will be better able to maintain reasonable rates and address other public works concerns and priorities such as law enforcement and education.

Mr. President, there was a former city official from Lewiston, ME, who said, as a result of the costs of water regulations to communities, "We will have the cleanest water in the State and the dumbest kids."

It was a provocative statement, but it certainly hit home because he indicated that he was faced with a Hobson's choice of either obeying Federal environmental mandates or spending money on educating the community's children. He could not do both.

I think this legislation will help solve that Hobson's choice and allow some flexibility to small communities so they may meet the goal of protecting our people while not forcing them to cut education and other high-priority items.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation. I yield the floor.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I rise today to support final passage of Senate bill 1316, the Safe Drinking Water Act Amendments of 1995. I am proud to be an original cosponsor of this important bill.

Montana is an extremely rural State. In fact, we don't have a drinking water system that serves more than 100,000 people. Most of our water systems don't serve more than 10,000 people. Meeting the requirements under the