

REVISED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES TO H. CON. RES. 67, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 1996

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Public Law 104-121, the Contract

With America Advancement Act of 1996, I hereby submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD revised allocations and aggregates to House Concurrent Resolution 67, the Concurrent Resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1996. Section 103(e)(1) of Public Law 104-121 requires that upon enactment "the Chairmen of the Committees on the Budget of the Senate and

House of Representatives shall make adjustments * * * (to the Appropriations Committee 602(a) allocations) * * * to reflect \$15,000,000 in additional new budget authority and \$60,000,000 in additional outlays for continuing disability reviews * * *"

The required adjustments are as follows:

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

[Dollar in millions]

	Current allocation		Change		Revised allocation	
	BA	O	BA	O	BA	O
General purpose discretionary	\$485,074	\$531,768	+\$15	+\$60	\$485,089	\$531,828
Violent crime reduction trust fund	4,087	2,227			4,087	2,227
Total	489,161	533,995	+15	+60	489,176	534,055

AGGREGATE LEVELS

[Dollar in millions]

	Budget resolution (H. Con. Res. 67)	Change	Revised level
Budget authority	\$1,285,500	+\$15	\$1,285,515
Outlays	1,288,100	+\$60	1,288,160

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. RIGGS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

REPUBLICANS' SAFE DRINKING WATER ACT MEANS DIRTIER TAP WATER IN GEORGIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Ms. MCKINNEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, we are also told that some of the slaves actually asked for and fought for a continuation of slavery. That did not make slavery right. America needs a raise.

Now, I came down here to talk about the Republican agenda with respect to the environment. I am not surprised that for his Earth Day stunt Speaker GINGRICH took young children to the zoo. If Speaker GINGRICH has his way on the Endangered Species Act, about the only place we will be able to find endangered species, or even nonendangered species, will be in the zoo.

Mr. Speaker, constituents have a particular problem, my constituents have a particular problem, with the health effects from chronic exposure to arsenic. In fact, I have constituents who now suffer from arsenical keratosis because of their exposure to arsenic. Yet, if the Republicans have their way, not only the communities of Hyde Park and Virginia subdivisions will be reeling from the effects of chronic exposure to arsenic, we all may be, because their version of the Safe Drinking Water Act means dirtier tap water in Georgia. They voted against an amendment that would have prohibited the introduction of arsenic into the water

supply. It is almost unbelievable, but it is true.

With respect to the Safe Drinking Water Act, that would result in dirtier tap water from my State of Georgia. The Republicans' draft legislation of the Safe Drinking Water Act would weaken the laws' basic health standard, delay health standards for highly hazardous contaminants, and reduce the public's right to know about health threats from contaminated drinking water.

In 1993 and 1994, over 150,000 Georgians drank tap water that failed to meet the EPA's basic health standards for bacterial toxic chemicals, fecal matter and other dangerous microbes. The House of Representatives would have cut \$15 million to help cities and towns upgrade drinking water plants.

With respect to the Clean Water Act, lakes, rivers and beaches in Georgia would have been fouled. If the Clean Water Act became law, it would have allowed untreated sewage to be discharged into coastal waters. It would have made the cleanup of toxic chemicals in the Great Lakes voluntary, it would have redefined most of the Nation's wetlands out of existence, and, of course, it would have gutted the EPA's efforts to control farm runoff, the single largest source of unregulated water pollution today.

In 1993 and 1994, over 140,000 Georgians drank tap water that was contaminated by fecal matter or other bacteria, in part because of sewage discharges into rivers and lakes at 31 locations throughout the State.

In terms of wetlands, the Clean Water Act creates a new definition of wetlands protection for 73 million acres of wetlands, or 71 percent of the remaining wetlands in 48 States. This would leave these lands to be developed with no Federal oversight or restrictions whatsoever. Of the 5.3 million acres of wetlands in Georgia, an estimated 4.7 million acres, 90 percent of the total wetlands remaining in the State, would no longer be considered wetlands under the proposed bill.

With respect to Superfund, the Republicans have introduced legislation that would bail out polluters and severely slow down cleanup of toxic dumps.

The most recent draft of the bill released by House Republicans would abolish all liability for polluters who generated and transported waste prior to 1987. Even giant corporations would get off the hook for all toxic waste they sent off site prior to 1987.

With respect to the toxics released inventory, their proposal would curtail reporting requirements for up to 90 percent of toxic chemical emissions that factories must report to the EPA.

Mr. Speaker, I would just conclude by saying that Kevin Phillips said that this may be the worst Congress in 50 years. The Republicans are well on their way to proving that.

□ 1845

WE MUST BALANCE THE BUDGET IN THE FAIREST POSSIBLE WAY FOR EVERY FAMILY IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, we have reached the critical juncture in this Congress, debating whether or not in fact we will deal with the critical issues that face our country, the issues that the families of this country want to see addressed, and whether we will do so in a reasonable and responsible fashion.

The Republican Party has argued that we should balance the Federal budget by the year 2002. The Democratic Party has responded that they, as well, want to balance the Federal budget by the year 2002. We will agree upon that. We are going to do that as a Congress and as a nation. The issue becomes how do we do it, how can it be done in the fairest possible fashion to every family in our country. How can the sacrifice be distributed that ensures that every family is treated fairly? That is the great debate going on in this Congress.

The Republican Party says that as part of balancing the budget, they must fulfill their commitment to ensure that their crown jewel in the Contract With America is given over to the