THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. PEASE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

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

Mr. PEASE. 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. 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 253, nays 46, not voting 134, as follows:

[Roll No. 593]

YEAS—253

Abercrombie
Andrews
Armey
Baca
Bachus
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Bass
Bereuter
Berkley
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Buyer
Callahan
Camp
Canady
Cannon
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth-Hage
Coble
Coburn
Combest
Cooksey
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (FL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Doggett
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehrlich
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Fletcher
Foley
Fossella
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hilleary
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Hooley
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kildee
Kind (WI)
Kingston
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaHood
Lampson
Largent
Larson
LaTourette
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Manzullo
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Ortiz
Oxley
Packard
Paul
Payne
Pease
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pitts
Portman
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Reynolds
Rivers
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Sununu
Tanner
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Toomey
Traficant
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Weiner
Weldon (PA)
Wilson
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (FL)

NAYS—46

Aderholt
Berry
Blagojevich
Borski
Brady (PA)
Capuano
Condit
Costello
Crane
Crowley
DeFazio
English
Hilliard
Holt
Hulshof
Jefferson
LaFalce
Latham
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Markey
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Moore
Moran (KS)
Obey
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Peterson (MN)
Ramstad
Rothman
Sabo
Stenholm
Strickland
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Udall (CO)
Weller
Wicker

NOT VOTING—134

Ackerman
Allen
Archer
Baird
Ballenger
Barton
Becerra
Bentsen
Berman
Bilbray
Bishop
Blumenauer
Boswell
Boucher
Brown (FL)
Burton
Calvert
Campbell
Capps
Carson
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Collins
Conyers
Cook
Danner
Davis (IL)
DeGette
Delahunt
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Doolittle
Dunn
Ehlers
Emerson
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Granger
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hefley
Hill (MT)
Hinchey
Hostettler
Hutchinson
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson, Sam
Kasich
Kennedy
Kilpatrick
King (NY)
Klink
Lantos
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Lofgren
Maloney (NY)
Martinez
McCarthy (MO)
McCollum
McIntosh
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Neal
Nethercutt
Oberstar
Ose
Owens
Pelosi
Peterson (PA)
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Reyes
Riley
Rodriguez
Rush
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Schaffer
Serrano
Shays
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stupak
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Visclosky
Waters
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wise
Wolf
Young (AK)

0923

Mr. HALL of Texas changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea''.

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 593, on November 3, 2000 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 593, I was in my congressional district on official business. Had I been present, I would have voted ''nay.''

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Will the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCNULTY) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. MCNULTY led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 2796, WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2000

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 665 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 665

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (S. 2796) to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, 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. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST); pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only on this resolution.

H. Res. 656 provides for consideration of S. 2796, the Water Resources Development Act of 2000. The rule waives all points of order against the conference report and against its consideration. In addition, the rule provides that the conference report shall be considered as read. This is the standard rule for this type of conference report, and it is without controversy as far as I know. I urge my colleagues to support this rule.

The Water Resources Development Act, more commonly known as WRDA, is a critically important vehicle for environmental restoration projects. This year's bill is particularly noteworthy because it includes a plan to restore the Nation's Everglades in Florida. This restoration effort is the largest,

most comprehensive restoration program ever attempted.

Not too long ago, most folks would have predicted it would be impossible to craft a restoration plan that gets it right and also wins the support of every major stakeholder involved in the Everglades. But that is exactly what this Congress has done. It is precisely the model for how we should deal with all of our environmental issues.

We drop the posturing. We quit using the trite catch phrases. We bring people together, and we actually sit down at the table and rationally discuss the issues and work in good faith for the greater good based on science-based principles.

I am not entirely naive, and I understand that the reason it worked with the Everglades is that the parties realized that this was too important to let go further amuck. But this precisely is my point.

All environmental issues are important and should deserve the same attention and the same approach. We should not sacrifice the environment anywhere for short-term gain. I hope that the folks out there who make a living doing so will learn the lesson of the Everglades.

Mr. Speaker, folks on the other side of the aisle talk a lot about a do-nothing Congress. I note that President Clinton asserted recently that this has been one of the most productive sessions ever, which I think is a real tribute to our Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), frankly a direct disavowal of the statements of the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), Minority Leader, that we are a do-nothing Congress.

But today's action is yet another in a very, very long list of examples that prove the Republican Congress delivers on Americans priorities. The challenge this Congress faced was to craft the plan that truly improves the hydrology and the hydroperiods and restores the unique natural environment of the Everglades, along with the other partners involved, the state of Florida and the interests that are involved in the areas of the Everglades.

The costs of doing nothing were far too great. The magnificent Everglades have suffered through years of neglect and misunderstanding. Doing nothing would have ensured disaster. Disaster, incidentally, had begun spreading to Florida Bay and even to the nearby coral reefs, which are unique in themselves.

Even so, as is often the case, the impulse to do something can often lead to unintended consequences. So, technically, we faced an incredible challenge. As daunting as the engineering problems are, even more so is the challenge of getting various stakeholders who often would not even speak to each other to find common ground. That is the snapshot of the immense challenge that we faced at the beginning of this process.

Well, here we are with a conference report, a final agreement. So it bears asking how we have tackled what Florida Governor Jeb Bush has now termed ''perhaps the defining environmental issue of this new century''. I think it is the defining issue. The Everglades bill is simply at the top of a very long list of environmental achievement for this Congress.

A lot of folks deserve our thanks for getting us here. The State of Florida and Governor Jeb Bush have demonstrated an unmistakable commitment to this effort and led at every point in the process. The Clinton administration also deserves our praise.

In terms of steering the proposal through Congress, our two Senators deserve an inordinate amount of praise and recognition. In the House, the entire delegation supported the effort. But the House efforts were kept on track by the patience, perseverance and able leadership of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW), our delegation chairman.

0930

I do not believe it is an understatement to say that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) was the key to our efforts here in the House. Anyone who cares about the Everglades should extend their gratitude to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW). I think he has done an extraordinary job.

It goes without saying that the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman SHUSTER) did an impressive job of stewardship on the Everglades, as well. This is, after all, where the bill comes from. And I want to commend them for their leadership in this regard.

Mr. Speaker, all these folks and many more deserve our thanks for making this historic achievement possible. This is a noncontroversial rule. It is an historic environmental restoration bill. As far as I know, it has bipartisan support.

I encourage my colleagues to support both the rule and the bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, this rule is the standard rule for consideration of a conference report in the House and is of no controversy. This conference report for the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 has been a matter of little controversy over the past few days, as the Chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure has sought assurances from his leadership that funding for additional environmental infrastructure spending would be included in the Labor, HHS appropriations conference report.

I am supposing, Mr. Speaker, given the fact that we are now considering this rule, that the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) has received these assurances and whenever the Congress actually considers the Labor, HHS conference report, next week, Thanksgiving, Christmas, whenever that might be, the funding he has sought will be provided for in it.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very good bill in large part because of the funding in it for the restoration of the Florida Everglades. This project is one that has long been sought by environmentalists and Floridians of all stripes, Republicans and Democrats alike.

This project is not a partisan project and no one should assume that it has come about because of the influence of any one Member of Congress. Rather, this is a project that has been a long time in the making on a bipartisan basis and should receive bipartisan support here today.

Mr. Speaker, I support this conference report; and I support the efforts of the Chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. I only hope he enjoys the same kind of support from the Republican leadership and the assurances he has received will be fulfilled when we return after the election.

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), my friend, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and the dean of the Florida delegation and the person who is most responsible for crafting the mechanics that have brought this legislation to the floor today.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in extremely strong support of this rule and this legislation to finally address the critical needs of the Florida Everglades, the most unique ecosystem anywhere on the face of this planet that is in danger of being lost for eternity.

We are at a critical mass in the issue of the Everglades, but today I think is going to be one of the better days in the House. On a very strong bipartisan basis, we are going to make an overt effort to begin to recover and protect the Florida Everglades.

The Everglades is home to some 68 endangered species of wildlife and plant life. Not only that, the issue of water in our part of Florida is extremely critical, water for people, water for agriculture, water for industry, water that today is running off at a billion gallons a day into the Gulf of Mexico, water that we are losing that is essential to the preservation of the Everglades and to the use of the people in Florida.

We have been appropriating money for the Everglades ever since 1993. We have appropriated over $1.3 billion for the Everglades, but there has not been a real plan. There has not been real management. Today we create legislation that will bring about a real plan that will bring about real management. We have already appropriated for this fiscal year $218.2 million. The Congress has already expressed its determination to save the Everglades, but we

needed this plan along with the funding. And so, today we have the plan. I am satisfied that it will pass with a large vote.

I want to compliment my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in this House and our colleagues in the other body and, as the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) said, the administration. Because it has been a total cooperative work effort.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say just in a few closing comments thanks to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) for the strong leadership that he has provided on this historic legislation to preserve and protect the Everglades and to echo his comment about the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW), who is the chairman of the Florida Delegation. He has been just outstanding in his leadership in keeping the delegation together and keeping this issue alive as we worked through the trials and tribulations of this Congress. He has been a dynamic leader. And I will say that, if anybody gets a lot of credit today, it should be the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW). But so should all the members of our delegation, Republicans and Democrats, who have worked together as a solid team to make this happen.

The Governor of Florida, Governor Jeb Bush, has walked the halls of the Congress trying to create and to sustain support for this Everglades project. The Governor of Florida and the legislature in Florida all deserve tremendous credit for where we are arriving today. And, of course, the State of Florida will pay 50 percent of all of the costs involved in this project. It is a 50–50 deal despite the fact that the Florida Everglades is unique to the entire world.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I am extremely happy to be where we are, that we are going to pass this rule, and that we are going to pass this legislation and we are going to take a major important step toward the preservation of the Florida Everglades, the most unique ecosystem anywhere on the face of this planet.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to strongly support this historic legislation to restore one of our nation's greatest environmental and ecological treasures, the Florida Everglades.

The Florida Everglades is unlike any other ecosystem in the world. It is comprised of more than 18,000 square miles of fresh water marshes spanning from Lake Okeechobee in the north to the Florida Keys in the south. Larger in land mass than Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island and Delaware combined, it is home to more than 60 individual endangered or threatened species of plants and animals, most or all of which will be come extinct without action.

Unfortunately, the Florida Everglades are dying. In response to flood concerns threatening the southern half of the state, a flood control plan was developed in the 1940s. The plan would soon establish hundreds of miles of canals and levees to ensure proper drainage. It worked too well. Fifty years later, almost half of the Everglades have been lost. Life-giving fresh water has been diverted out to sea, and the delicate balance of fresh and salt water that is unique to the Everglades has been upset. Without immediate action, the ecosystem as we know it will be unrecoverable. Furthermore, the Florida Aquifer faces the threat of saltwater intrusion, compromising the already scarce supply of potable water to the residents of South Florida.

However, with the action of the Congress today, we can begin to reverse the damage and restore this pristine ecosystem. The restoration plan developed to address this crisis is the culmination of years of research by state and federal scientists, private environmental and agricultural experts and the United States Army Corps of Engineers. The restoration plan is comprised of 68 individual projects to be completed by the Corps of Engineers over the next 30 years at a total cost of over $7 billion, to be divided equally with the state of Florida. The bill we approve today is the first step toward implementation of the restoration plan. It authorizes $1.2 billion for 10 initial projects and four pilot projects to test new technology critical to the restoration. Once completed, the plan will restore more than 1.7 billion gallons of fresh water per day, replicating the original sheet flow of water through the natural system. This massive undertaking is the largest environmental restoration plan in history and comes at a cost not to be dismissed. However, the fact remains that without this plan, the Everglades will die.

As Chairman of the Appropriations Committee, I have worked hard to protect the Florida Everglades. My committee has included, to date, $730,000,000 in Department of Interior funding for the Everglades and $142,360,000 in the Energy and Water Appropriation for Everglades related projects. These funds have gone toward land acquisition and critical projects that began the journey toward recovery of this ecosystem. The State of Florida has matched every dollar with water reuse and recovery projects and the most ambitious land acquisition agenda of any State in history.

Mr. Speaker, the Everglades restoration plan enjoys the support of the entire Florida Congressional delegation, the Governor of Florida, the Administration, and nearly every major environmental and agricultural organization in Florida, as well as the Seminole Tribe and the Miccosukee Tribe of Florida. Without this plan and without action by this Congress, we threaten the existence of one of our greatest national treasures. Let's do the right thing and restore the Everglades so that future generations of Americans can know and enjoy this natural wonder.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Texas for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I wish I could rise today and offer my unqualified support for the conference WRDA bill that is before us today. But I want to be clear that the version that came out of the House I thought had a lot of good provisions in it that have been watered down now. Changes were made on the Senate side, however, that I think set us back in two major areas of concern.

One is the much needed comprehensive Corps reform that I think is desperately needed for that embattled agency.

Earlier this year, I, along with a few other of my colleagues, introduced comprehensive Corps reform, H.R. 4879. This was not an anti-Corps reform bill that we introduced. It merely reflected the need for some change for the embattled agency to lift the cloud that currently hangs over it.

The original WRDA coming out of the House contained some pilot projects for important independent peer reviews that I think is needed in order to let the sun shine in on the Corps' water resource projects.

Unfortunately, instead of adopting the pilot language in the conference report, they instead stripped it out of the language and, in fact, ordered another couple of studies for the National Academy of Sciences to conduct over the next couple of years, one involving independent peer review mind you.

The problem I have with that, however, is that the National Academy of Science has already devoted years of study to this and, in fact, last year already released a comprehensive review and recommendations for Corps reform in the ''New Directions and Water Resources Planning'' for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

It was this study that came out last year that provided the basis of much of what was contained in my comprehensive Corps reform bill. I do not think it is necessary for us to be allocating a few million more dollars for the National Academy of Sciences to continue their study on Corps reform when, in fact, they have already done it in depth with great analysis and with a lot of fine recommendations that we need to move forward on.

There are, however, some good provisions in this bill regarding Corps reform. One provision requires enhanced public participation in the review of feasibility studies and Corps projects and also one that directs the Secretary to design mitigation projects using contemporary understanding of science and mitigating adverse environmental effects, which was, language that was included in the Corps reform bill that we had introduced earlier this year.

So I think we still need to do more work. I do not think now is the time to conduct more studies with the National Academy of Sciences.

But the other provision of this, Mr. Speaker, relates to how we can better preserve and protect another vitally important natural resource in this country, the Mississippi River Basin. And with that, we are very pleased that we were able to keep in the conference report a scientific modeling program on sedimentation and nutrient flows for the Mississippi River Basin.

Any expert on the river will tell you that problem is the number one danger facing that important ecosystem. In fact, it is North America's largest migratory route, as well as providing incredibly important functions relating to commercial navigation, tourism, and recreation activities.

I think having the scientific modelling program in place is an important first step in being able to direct targeted resources in a more cost-effective manner in order to preserve this important natural resource.

Unfortunately, again the language on the House was not adopted. The Senate, in fact, included a 50–50 cost share with States, which many of us think is going to put the modeling program in danger. Hopefully, the States will recognize the need to participate. But many of the people who we got feedback from at the State level were concerned about the 50–50 cost-share that is ultimately included in this bill. We are just going to have to wait and see how that plays out.

But finally this WRDA bill has good language in regards to a lower Mississippi River resource assessment, basically directing an assessment on information needed for river-related management, habitat needs, the need for river-related recreation and access in the lower part of the Mississippi River Basin.

We have a very successful Environmental Management Program that affects the Upper Mississippi River with habitat restoration, and long-term resource monitoring. Now is the time to start treating the Mississippi as the continuous ecosystem that it is and take a holistic approach. I believe this Lower Mississippi River resources assessment is the first step to extend EMP to lower regions of the River so we have a comprehensive and holistic approach to river management.

Finally, I want to commend the leadership on the House, the chair and the ranking members of the appropriate committees for the work they have put into this important bill and especially the attention that has been given on the House side in regards to steps we can take for Corps reform and how we can better manage and preserve and protect the Mississippi River Basin.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from the west coast of Florida (Mr. MILLER) my close colleague and distinguished friend.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from the west coast of Florida for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, as we conclude the 106th Congress, it is really a pleasure to have such a significant piece of legislation that has very wide bipartisan support. This is a bill that is especially concerned about the Everglades issue that has the support of the administration and Democrats and Republicans in the House and the Senate.

When our Founding Fathers wrote the Constitution, it made it very difficult to pass legislation, because the way it is set up we go to subcommittee and full committee and the floor of the House, and we have to get a conference where the House and the Senate agree and get an agreement with the agencies of the Federal Government. It is indeed a very complex challenge. But we are here today with final passage of a very, very significant piece of legislation, the most significant environmental bill I think in many a year to reverse a half century of environmental damages done to the Florida Everglades.

I want to give compliments and thanks to the leadership that has brought this forward, Senators MACK and GRAHAM on the Senate side and Senator BOB SMITH, the chairman of that committee.

On the House side, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BORSKI) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), the ranking member, and the chairman of the subcommittee on the House side. And within the Florida Delegation, again all the Republicans and Democrats have come together, but the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW), who is the chairman of the Florida delegation, has really led the effort to make sure that it is being pushed forward, pushing the Senate leadership, pushing our leadership, pushing the committee chairman to get to this bill. It is too important to not let die. We need it. Thank goodness we are going to end the 106th Congress or come close to ending it with such a significant piece of legislation.

To my conservative colleagues, there is a concern because of the total cost of it because it is billions of dollars over several decades. But, first of all, it is a split. The Federal Government will pick up about 50 percent. The State and local government will pick up about 50 percent.

0945

There were safeguards built in so that the money will not get totally out of control.

The reason we are doing this is the Federal government, through the Corps of Engineers some 50 years ago, started digging these dikes and canals and environmentally caused the problem.

Since they caused the problem, they have to be part of the solution. That is the reason we are here today, is they are going to have to remove some 240 miles of levees and canals that were built over the past decades that have now diverted 2 billion gallons of water that should flow to the Everglades that now is pushed through the Caloosahatchee River or the Saint Lucie Inlet, pushing the water into the Atlantic Ocean, the Gulf of Mexico.

We need to allow that to flow into the Everglades, just as Marjory Stoneman Douglas wrote in her classic book 50 years ago, River of Grass. We need to make sure that fresh water flows through there.

We are never going to get total restoration, because a lot of it is now in agricultural use, a lot is already developed. But we can at least bring it back as best we can to how a century ago it was that river of grass.

I am pleased to have this before us, and I complement the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW). I hope we have a unanimous vote on this bill.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT).

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend everybody involved, and the powerful leaders, the gentlemen from Florida, Mr. YOUNG and Mr. GOSS.

I serve on the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, formerly known as the Committee on Public Works. I can remember the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) as a member of the Committee on Public Works bringing forth the idea of cleaning up the Everglades and cleaning up those systems that contribute, ultimately, to the destination points where the accumulation of these things happened.

I have also watched in the Congress the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTSCH), and I think he has done a good job in bringing the Everglades program forward. I want to compliment those two gentlemen for the bipartisanship that happened here.

Back when the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) was talking about the Everglades, I was talking about the upper Ohio Valley and the Pennsylvania steel mills, the Gary, Indiana, and Chicago area, and all of those rivers polluted by the steel industry that ultimately led that contaminant downstream into points where the impact of contamination made it now so terrible that the gentlemen from Florida, Mr. SHAW and Mr. DEUTSCH, and everybody else had to deal with that issue in their home State.

Mr. Speaker, I was able to get the Mahoning River in Youngstown, Ohio, designated and authorized as one of only five rivers in America eligible for environmental dredging.

Here is the problem we face: Florida can evidently afford this 50 percent match to clean up the Everglades, but the city of Youngstown in the Mahoning Valley, depressed, cannot afford the 50 percent match.

Here is the dilemma. While we continue to have the upper river system contaminants continuing to flow, cleaning up the ultimate depositories do not ultimately serve the best interests of America.

I want to compliment the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BORSKI), and the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT). They have been great leaders on this issue.

But I am appealing that we must reduce and if necessary eliminate the matching monies necessary for economically depressed communities who have contaminated rivers who will continue to contaminate the Everglades and the depositories of our great Nation.

That issue, I say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), must be addressed. My local community cannot meet the match. I have been getting all the monies for the studies, everything the Army Corps of Engineers has done. But I think we need relief to those upper systems who are continuing to contaminate those systems we clean up.

I say to the gentlemen from Florida, Mr. SHAW and Mr. DEUTSCH, congratulations, and I hope they will help me in the future to eliminate or reduce the local match for impacted areas like ours that cannot afford to clean up those contaminated rivers.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW), the distinguished chairman of the Florida delegation, a man to whom many nice and well-deserved compliments have been paid in getting us to this point.

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

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me, and I very much appreciate the work of this great body.

Mr. Speaker, as extraordinary as it has been to see traditional adversaries come together this year on comprehensive Everglades restoration legislation contained in the Water Resources Development Act, something else is going on here which I think is very special and I think is very worthwhile noting.

Skeptics have been saying, and they have been at our heels in recent weeks, we will not get it done. To them I say, we will. Some have gone around the country saying a Republican Congress cannot work with a Democrat administration to produce good policy for the American people. We have and we will. Others have lost patience and doubted our ability to lead and get this done in this short span of time. Well, we have proven them wrong, also.

The fact is this: When both parties come to the table with sincere good-faith efforts to get something done without hidden agendas and with eyes towards the next generation and not just the next election, building upon relationships of good will, not destroying them, we can do good things for our country and for the entire globe.

We all recognize the importance of this legacy, not only on the land and water, but on the people who live in Florida and visit this national treasure, and want to make sure that it is there for future generations.

My colleagues know, I have worked my entire career and will continue to work to build bridges across the aisle. There is no better example of doing that, as I am looking at my colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTSCH) and looking at my colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS), whose congressional districts share the Everglades, to say that this is certainly a very fine moment.

I have offered several bills on the environment, but none makes me prouder to have my name on it than the comprehensive Everglades restoration bill, because I have been looking after this piece of my backyard for my entire life.

I am eager to see this legislation pass, not because the base Everglades bill has my name on it, but because it is the right thing to do and because a broad cross-section of Americans have put their support and their hard work into getting us to this day.

I urge the passage of this resolution, this rule, and also push for the passage of the underlying bill.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to another distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY), my friend and colleague from the east coast, who also has been very instrumental in pulling all the parties together in an amicable way to reach this solution.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me, and I thank the gentleman for bringing this rule to the floor. Of course, I urge all Members to support this very important landmark legislation. It is one of the proudest moments that I will probably have here on the floor is to see the Florida delegation unanimous on an issue of importance to our State and to our Nation.

Many people look at the Everglades and say it is Florida's issue, it is Florida's problem. But it is America's crown jewel. It is something we share not only with ourselves as natives of Florida, but also those 45-plus million visitors who come to Florida for the pristine wonderment of whether it be our oceans, our Everglades, our Keys, or our panhandle.

Marjory Stoneman Douglas penned a novel, the River of Grass, about the wonders of the Everglades. Back in the thirties when candidates were running for office, one notably Mr. Broward, who became Governor, used to say the slogan, elect me Governor and I will drain that swamp, known as the Everglades, so we will have development.

How wrong they were then, how right we are today, to reverse decades of abuse and neglect of our national park; to start paving the way, if you will, and maybe that is not the correct expression, paving the way, but creating the dynamics by which we can reengineer Florida's multitude of plumbing projects in order to make the Everglades once again the clean and pristine waterway and natural habitat that it is and should be.

The delegation has been led by so many champions, too many to mention, back in the days of the governorship of BOB GRAHAM, now Senator, CONNIE MACK, and others.

We are truly a bipartisan State as it relates to the Everglades. Lawton Chiles, in his memory, would be so proud today to know after the years he served as our chief executive that one of his greatest efforts is now coming to fruition.

The chairman of Florida's delegation was mentioned. There is a lot to be said for seniority in this process. The 20 years of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) of service to Floridians, to those in Dade, Broward, and Palm Beach County, the hallmark of his 20-year tenure here, results in this bill being brought to the floor because he pleaded with the Speaker and all parties at the table, with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) and others, to make sure that this bill became the final act of this final hour of the 106th Congress.

What a tribute and what a legacy to his grandchildren, 13 I believe now in number, maybe 11, two to come, 13 soon will know that their grandpoppy made possible this historic day on a Friday before we adjourn and return to our constituencies in Florida.

So I salute every Member, Democrat and Republican, in our delegation, every person who will vote for this bill, and I urge, I hope, a unanimous acceptance of the fact that we take on the national responsibility of our national park, the Everglades, by signalling to the world we are prepared to lead, we are prepared to clean up our act, and we are prepared to make it the great park that it truly is.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I urge adoption of this rule.

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

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to point out, I see my friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTSCH), who did not speak on this. I have been privileged to have worked with him for a number of years on this, back and forth. The gentleman from Florida has the front door, I have the back door. Most people prefer to go in the front door, but the back door is equally good. We have gotten along very, very well over the years.

I think of the number of days I have actually been in the Everglades with BOB GRAHAM. I remember an occasion where I stood on the banks of the then straight Kissimmee Channel, and he said, we are going to put some wrinkles back in this. He got a truck, and we started pouring dirt back into the channel. I thought, this has got to be against the law. We are all going to end up in deep trouble.

All of these programs that have taken so many people so much vision to work out the formula to get all of the interested parties going in the same direction have been referred to in this discussion. It is an extraordinary story, and I hope some day somebody will write the book. It will be a wonderful book about what Americans can do in this country when they work together.

I am very pleased to express my strong support for this good piece of bipartisan legislation, and I urge support for the rule.

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. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 665, I call up the conference report on the Senate bill (S. 2796) to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of October 31, 2000, at page H11624.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BORSKI) each will control 30 minutes.

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

1000

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

Mr. Speaker, it is particularly fitting, I believe, that the last major piece of legislation that is brought before the Congress before we return home for the election next Tuesday is the water resources bill, which includes the largest environmental restoration project in the history of the world, the restoration of the Everglades.

As the chairman of that conference, I can say with absolute certainty that we would not be here today doing this, if it were not for the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW). The gentleman has been the ultimate driving force.

When we were negotiating and thought that we had our hands tied in our negotiations with the other body, looked like we were not going to get anywhere, it was the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) who insisted that we stay at the table. And while there are many people on both sides of the aisle who deserve credit for this legislation, we would not be here today if it were not for the gentleman from Florida.

The conference report includes water resource development projects for America. It responds to the Nation's water infrastructure and environmental restoration needs. It includes important authorizations, modifications and improvements to the Army Corps of Engineers water resources programs and projects as well.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisles for working so hard for this environmental restoration and water resources bill. With its estimated total costs of $7 billion, it invests in America's future by authorizing new projects for navigation, flood control, shore protection, environmental restoration, water supply, and recreation.

It fosters partnerships between Federal and non-Federal agencies. It authorizes 30 new water resource projects that have received or will receive favorable review from the Corps. It modifies over 50 existing water resources projects. It authorizes 58 new studies.

It includes the various policy and procedural reforms to improve public participation. It authorizes the environmental restoration projects and programs that address several national needs throughout the country, including, Illinois, Missouri, Mississippi, the Ohio rivers and the Lower Columbia Estuary, including Pugent Sound and the Chesapeake Bay.

WRDA 2000 approves and authorizes the first increment of the comprehensive Everglades restoration plan, and it should be emphasized the text in this bill, which will become law, is the language that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) introduced in his bill, H.R. 5121, some time ago.

My colleagues should know, however, that the Senate conferees did not accept some of the critical, important provisions included in the bill that passed the House by a vote of 394–14.

While this is a good package on balance, it does fail to include environmental infrastructure projects under the Corps of Engineers jurisdiction. It also fails to include the text of the bill by the gentleman from California (Chairman DREIER) relating to cleanup of the San Gabriel and Central Basins and the text of the bill from the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTSCH) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW), H.R. 673, relating to water quality protection in the Florida Keys.

It was with great reluctance, but with a desire to ensure enactment of this legislation that the House conferees ultimately agreed to the Senate's request to delete these provisions. However, as part of that compromise, there was also an agreement that these projects could or should be considered in the context of proposed legislation yet to move through the Congress if the so-called environmental infrastructure package also included important legislation addressing combined sewer overflow and sanitary overflows.

House conferees have lived up to that commitment submitting to the Committee on Appropriations a package of environmental infrastructure projects that passed the House overwhelmingly on October 19, as well as the broadly supported text of the bill offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BARCIA), the Wet Weather Water Quality Act which was reported by our committee on October the 6.

Mr. Speaker, this environmental infrastructure legislation provides needed assistance to help communities throughout the Nation to keep raw sewage out of citizens' basements and backyards. It protects streams and rivers and bays, the Florida Keys, and the drinking water supply for over 1.3 million residents in California.

It is regrettable that we could not retain these provisions in this legislation today, but I am pleased with the assurances we received that they will be included as we wrap up our appropriations bill when we come back after the election.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues not only to support this landmark legislation on the floor, but to work with our friends and the appropriators and the House and Senate leadership to ensure that the rest of the environmental infrastructure provisions in the conference are enacted before the end of the 106th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would note that the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the Congress is the most productive committee of the Congress, the most bipartisan committee of the Congress. This Congress has passed 109 pieces of legislation through the House and 42 pieces of legislation which are becoming law. So I want to thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle and our committee for their tremendous efforts so that our committee could, indeed, do the people's business in this Congress.

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

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

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

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report. This conference report reflects the bipartisanship that is the hallmark of our success on the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. We invest in America's future by providing critical infrastructure, while working to restore, enhance and protect the environment.

Mr. Speaker, I particularly want to pay tribute to our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, (Mr. SHUSTER). It seems appropriate that the last major authorization bill to pass this Congress would be under his leadership. His success in leading this committee on a bipartisan basis is well known.

He has earned a great reputation for that bipartisanship; and because of his great efforts and success throughout the past 6 years, certainly the people of our Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and people throughout the United States of America are benefiting from the improved infrastructure. He has been a great chairman. He is one who I take great pride in serving.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to say a word, if I may, about the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), my subcommittee chairman, my good friend. There is, I think, very few people in this whole Congress, Mr. Speaker, who stand so firmly for the environment as the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT); and no one I know in the entire Congress who is more willing to cross the aisle and do the people's business.

Mr. Speaker, the projects included in the conference report form the water-based infrastructure that is a key component of the Nation's transportation system. Projects in the water resources bill also protect lives and property from floods and hurricanes, and they provide drinking water and electricity to our cities and factories.

Projects are the more visible aspect of the conference report, but there are also provisions that will improve the way in which the Corps implements its programs. I am disappointed that the conference report does not include the House-passed provisions concerning mitigation.

We should be requiring the Corps to be more aware earlier of possible adverse environmental impacts. I intend to revisit this issue in the next Congress.

The agreement also deletes House language that required the Secretary to establish a 3-year program of independent peer review of up to five projects.

While some have argued for a permanent peer review program, I believe that a pilot program would have allowed the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure to evaluate its effectiveness.

Next Congress, those who advocate permanent peer review may prevail.

I strongly support the requirement to monitor the performance of up to five projects for 12 years. Today we authorize and construct projects, but we do not adequately follow up on whether the expected benefits are ever realized.

This monitoring will be an important tool in helping the Corps and the Congress produce a more effective Corps civil works program.

The conference report approves the Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan as a framework for modification and operational changes to the Central and South Florida project to restore, preserve, and protect the Everglades ecosytem. It also authorizes the first installment of the plan for $1.4 billion. The total plan will cost at least $7.8 billion and take 36 years to construct.

Since 1986, Mr. Speaker, Congress has tried to maintain a 2-year cycle to enact water resources legislation. Such a cycle is important to providing certainty and stability to the program. This conference report is a continuation of that process and should receive strong bipartisan support today in the House.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting the conference report.

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), the distinguished chairman of our Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment.

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

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, this comprehensive, bipartisan legislation will help save the Everglades, restore rivers and watersheds throughout the country, keep communities safe from floods and hurricanes, and repair and improve America's water transportation infrastructure, which is the lifeblood of our domestic and global economy.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment, I can tell my colleagues that this legislation has been long in the making.

Our subcommittee held hearings throughout the year, as well as last year, on the bill's key issues and provisions. We have, on a bipartisan basis, reviewed hundreds of project requests and scores of important and timely water policy issues.

I think the committee leadership and the conferees have done a good job of balancing competing interest and treating Members and their constituents fairly.

Mr. Speaker, this is landmark legislation. It is our best hope to save the Everglades and to restore the balance between the human environment and the natural system in South Florida. The world is watching, and I am proud of what this institution has produced at this critical moment.

There are many players in this exciting drama. We owe a debt of gratitude to Governor Jeb Bush of Florida, the entire Florida legislature and the bipartisan Florida congressional delegation led by the tenaciousness of our colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW). He is the prime motivator behind this legislation, and he is due a round of thanks.

Through their efforts, we are able to move forward with a consensus package that gives overall approval to the 36 year, $7.8 billion plan and specifically authorizes $1.4 billion in projects to get the water right.

I want to emphasize, as this legislation does itself, that the primary purpose of this landmark, unprecedented activity in the Everglades is to restore the natural system. We must continue to be reminded of that fundamental truth, and people like Bob Semple will be watching, as they should.

We are going to have to monitor this project closely and continue to review the science to ensure that it accomplishes this fundamental goal. Indeed, as the project moves forward, we may need more legislative safeguards, such as requiring explicitly that 50 percent of the restoration benefits be achieved by the time that 50 percent of the funds are spent. For now, this legislation sets us on the right path.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report does not include everything one would have hoped for as is to be expected with difficult compromises. For example, the Senate prevailed in deleting important provisions on environmental infrastructure for the Nation and regional environmental restoration for areas such as the Missouri River, the San Gabriel Basin in California, and the Florida Keys. Make no mistake about it, though, on balance, this conference report is a good, solid compromise that will advance ecosystem restoration and protection throughout the country.

Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss in not thanking all the staff of the House, Senate, and administration for their efforts to make this happen. In particular, I want to thank Sara Gray, a staff member in my office and then on the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for her efforts relating to WRDA 2000. Sara, if you are taking a break now from your studying for law school exams and watching these proceedings, thanks for all you did to help the committee keep track of and review the many requests for projects and provisions.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report on S. 2796 is landmark environmental legislation. It did not come about by accident. It is by design by a painstaking bipartisan process.

Let me say also that the Everglades are a treasure not just for Florida, but for America; and we are preserving and enhancing that magnificent resource.

Finally, let me say as we come to the end of 6 years of bipartisanship on the subcommittee what a pleasure it has been to work with my colleague, the gentleman from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania (Mr. BORSKI), to fashion responsible legislation in a responsible way. It was a give and take, always with the best interest of America at heart.

It has been a rare privilege for me to chair this subcommittee and to work with such a distinguished man as the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BORSKI).

I say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), you have been the best. And from this Member and all our colleagues, we owe a debt of gratitude to the chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure for his outstanding leadership.

1015

ANOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAW). All Members are reminded that their remarks should be directed to the Chair.

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation. Let me begin by congratulating the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), the chairman, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BORSKI), ranking members, for a fine job on this legislation, as on so many pieces of legislation that have come out of the generally bipartisan work of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

Mr. Speaker, I confess, I know very little about the Everglades. I am not

going to speak about the Everglades. But I know a fair amount about the Port of New York and New Jersey. In this bill is some absolutely essential provisions for the Port of New York and New Jersey.

This bill authorizes funding to deepen the channels to Newark and Elizabeth and Howland Hook and Bayonne and, for the first time, to Brooklyn to 50 feet, so that we can accommodate the deeper superships that are coming in.

Mr. Speaker, the shipping companies are following the airlines and going to a hub and feeder port system. But there is going to be, in 15 years, one major port on the Eastern Seaboard, and that should be in the United States. We are in competition with Halifax as to which is going to be the major hub port on the Eastern Seaboard.

The provisions in this bill enabling us to get to 50 feet in the Port of New York and New Jersey will go a long way to making sure that we have the hub port on the American coast in New York and not in Halifax. That will be instrumental in hundreds of thousands of jobs and a great deal of maritime commerce in the United States, which is very important to us, obviously.

This bill is particularly important because it recognizes, confirms the report of the chief engineer for the Army Corps which, for the first time, recognizes the necessity or the possibility, even, of a major container shipping port in Brooklyn on the east side of the harbor instead of having the ports only on the west side.

If we are going to be the hub port and we are going to be able to take 14 million or 15 million TEUs or 16 million TEUs, if we are going to be able to go up to the forecast 15 million or 16 million or 17 million TEUs, twenty-foot equivalent units, in the next 20 or 30 years, as is forecast, we are going to need all the land available for ports on both sides of the harbor, in New York, and New Jersey and Bayonne and Howland Hook and Elizabeth and Newark and Brooklyn. This bill, for the first time, makes that possible.

We will need to do a lot of additional work and probably additional appropriations to make that happen, but this bill makes it possible. It is a very far-sighted piece of legislation. I am very appreciative of it. I rise in full support of it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair notes that the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) has 18 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BORSKI) has 23½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON).

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, let me begin by commending the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman SHUSTER), and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure for expeditiously bringing us this bill today.

I would also like to commend the gentleman from Florida (Chairman SHAW) for his dogged determination in bringing this bill to the floor. We all love the Everglades. Without the gentleman's hard work and dedication, we would not be here today addressing this subject. I think the world should know that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) had a lot to do with making this possible.

It is also important to my district, Mr. Speaker, Congress recognizes the importance of preserving and protecting our beaches from further erosion. This bill does that for the beaches on Long Beach Island.

New Jersey is the most densely populated State in the Nation with the coastal communities continuing to grow at a rapid pace. In addition, tourists double and sometimes triple the local population in the summer as people flock to the shore.

The continued economic health of the coastal communities depend on a sustainable shoreline that will protect existing homes and businesses from continued erosion and storm damage. The narrowing and lowering of beaches and dunes along Long Beach Island has reduced the storm protection that would otherwise have been available.

Major storms which occurred in March of 1984, October of 1991, January of 1992 and December of 1992 have taken their toll on our beaches. This continued storm damage has eroded the beaches completely in some areas where the water is actually washing under homes.

The storms of 1992 qualified for disaster assistance from the Federal Emergency Management Agency, and many areas of the shoreline have not fully recovered even today.

We have been working on this project for 8 years with the cooperation of the Corps of Engineers. It is designed to repair Long Beach Island's beaches, to protect them for the next 50 years. Therefore, I would like to urge my colleagues to vote in support of the Water Resources Development Act, WRDA, because of its vital importance in funding projects that will protect coastal communities from future storm damage throughout the country.

Mr. Speaker, again, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) for the important part that he played in bringing this bill to the floor.

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased now to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the distinguished vice chairman of our caucus.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I also want to congratulate the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman SHUSTER), to congratulate the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), our ranking Democrat, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BORSKI) for working together to bring this bill in the late stages of this Congress. It is an incredibly important piece of legislation which has been crafted which has been critical to help our country's waterways.

The country needs this legislation to improve our ports, our channels, our waterways and our environment. We also need it to reduce flooding, increase our competitiveness, and create more jobs. That is why it is critical to pass this Water Resources Development Act.

Now, this legislation could not arrive at a more critical time for the Port of New York and New Jersey, which generates 180,000 jobs and $20 billion of economic activity. That is because right now in my own home district where the Port of Elizabeth and Newark, which is really where the greatest activity within the port region resides, our port is beginning to handle more traffic and cargo. It is creating more jobs.

But without the authorization for deeper channels contained in this bill, all of this recent growth is in jeopardy. Deepening the port means more trade and commerce with a better environment. Not deepening the port means commerce, goods and, most importantly, jobs generated by the port all being shipped to Canada. Consumers in the New Jersey, New York metropolitan area would have to pay more to get goods to their shelves.

Now, I am concerned the conference report does not include a provision giving the local sponsor of the Port Jersey Channel deepening credit for the work it has done and will do prior to the signing of its final agreement. But I plan to work with my colleagues to pass this provision before we adjourn.

In the past, WRDA has contained important provisions on sediment decontamination, the beneficial use of dredge material, and environmental dredging. That is because we know that commerce and the environment are not mutually exclusive issues. They are interdependent concerns that determine the quality of life for our constituents. So we can deepen the port of New York and New Jersey in an environmentally responsible way.

I look forward to continuing to work with the committee to make sure that growth takes place in the days ahead.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), my good friend and classmate.

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of the conference report for S. 2796, the Water Resources Development Act, and would like to emphasize my support specifically for the Everglades language.

As many of my colleagues have already stated during this debate, the

Everglades provisions represent a major step toward restoration of this unique ecosystem. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Interior of the Committee on Appropriations, I have become involved in this restoration effort as it directly impacts the natural areas in Federal ownership, including Everglades National Park, Big Cyprus Natural Preserve and several national wildlife refuges. Their future and that of the numerous species who make the Everglades their home depend upon the success of this effort. Only if the Corps of Engineers carries out their restoration initiative properly will they survive.

I might say that, in our committee, we have appropriated $738 million as our share of this project with a total of about a $1.35 billion thus far for the Federal Government.

I commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), chairman of the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for recognizing that the environment must be the primary beneficiary of the water made available through the comprehensive plan for the restoration.

The object of the plan is to restore, preserve, and protect the natural system while also meeting the water supply, flood protection and agriculture needs of the region. I might emphasize I think this is very commendable that the point of protecting the water supply for the Everglades is a primary objective here.

As we make our way through this massive ecosystem restoration, I intend to work with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to ensure that we remain focused on the restoration of the natural areas.

I commend the Members on their bipartisan work in bringing this legislation to the floor today and urge the Members of the House to support and pass it.

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT), senior member of the committee.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I am going to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman SHUSTER) for a colloquy so if he can hang around a minute. But I want to start out by saying that I am not surprised.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I am at the gentleman's beck and call.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I am not surprised that the leadership of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) has basically been unparalleled. The reason for that is he is a brilliant Pitt man. The University of Pittsburgh almost whacked out Virginia Tech last week, and they are on the rise. But I want to pay special tribute to a Pittsburgh alum who has distinguished himself head and shoulders above most.

I want to also thank the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BORSKI), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTSCH), and everyone involved here.

But as I talked on the rule, I talked about a problem that I think must be addressed by this committee. No matter how many ultimate depositories of water that are impacted upon by contaminated flow from upstream upriver contaminated points and sources of points, there will never be a cleanup of our environment.

Now, here is the trick bag I am in, Mr. Speaker. I have been able to get over a couple million dollars to start the cleanup of the Mahoning River that runs right through the middle of the third largest steel producing region in the world at one time, and the contaminants are 4 and 5 feet deep. They must be cleaned.

Now we are at the point where we need a 50 percent match. My depressed community cannot afford that match. So as a result, while we are cleaning up these down-river depositories, we continue to have the overflow from the contaminant source point contamination situation.

With that in mind, in the colloquy, I want to know if the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman SHUSTER) is willing, even though he will not be chairman, he will be one of the most powerful Members in this body, be willing to work with me next year to reduce and, when necessary because of such a depression, if necessary, to eliminate that match so as we could stop the continuing contamination of the Everglades and other points downstream?

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman SHUSTER).

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, it is always my pleasure to work with the former Pitt quarterback. I will be happy to do so.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER). I take that as a yes answer. I will hold him to that.

I compliment everybody for this great bill. I support it.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD), a distinguished member of our committee.

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

1030

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I also want to compliment the chairman for getting this bill to the floor and also our leadership for having this bill on the floor today and having a vote on it.

I represent a district that has 200 miles of the Illinois River all along my district. This bill includes an authorization to really begin to clean up and fix up and stop the siltation that has occurred on the Illinois River that is inhibiting transportation, inhibiting recreation, and inhibiting the great ascetic value that the Illinois River provides from Chicago all the way to Alton.

This is a very good project, and it is a project that has brought together a lot of agricultural interests, a lot of business interests, a lot of transportation interests, a lot of conservation interests. The Nature Conservancy has done a great job on the Illinois River. We have a great CREP program that sets aside land along the Illinois River. This really brings it all together.

I want to thank the Lieutenant Governor of our State, the Governor of our State, and all Members of our delegation who have supported this every effort. I appreciate again the opportunity to have this included in this important bill.

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am now pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), a valuable member from our committee.

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

Mr. Speaker, this is unprecedented legislation in an unprecedented session. I want to congratulate the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman SHUSTER). I want to congratulate the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BORSKI) on a great job well done. They have set the pace in this session.

I rise in strong support of the Water Resources Development Act, this conference report. As a member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, I was pleased to work with my colleagues on a bipartisan basis to construct legislation to amend the Clean Water Act to establish a nationally consistent wet weather control standard for combined sewer and overflows.

This bill was drafted by the committee and is a combination of two bills that were introduced in the 106th Congress. I am pleased that language from a bill that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) and I introduced, the Combined Sewer Overflow Control and Partnership Act of 1999, is included.

I say to the chairman, the ranking member, those involved, this legislation is not the sexy material which we in the legislature like to talk about many times, but there are not too many communities throughout the land that have the wherewithal or the resources to deal with the problem of combined sewer overflows. They just do not have the dollars and yet they are supposed to comply with EPA regulations and standards. Some of those communities have already been fined.

This is going to go a long way in cleaning up our water system in the United States.

The language that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) and I wrote authorizes $1.5 billion for grant to municipalities and States for these projects. It authorizes $45 million in grants for demonstration projects on the use of watershed management for wet weather control in urban areas and to determine the most effective management practices for wet weather flows. This is a tremendous victory for towns all over America.

The grant programs established in this legislation will finally give these towns, large and small, resources they need to clean up their sewer systems and to comply with the Clean Water Act.

Urban wet weather pollution affects every community in this Nation. Discharges from urban areas and sewer systems during wet weather occur in either one or a combination of forms, including combined sewer overflows and sanitary sewer overflows.

These discharges constitute the most pervasive, most costly municipal challenge to achieving the goals of the Clean Water Act. In other words, without this legislation, this is not going to get done. The problems are extremely evasive, very broadly due to the intermittent and temporary nature of storm events that caused it.

The bill that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) and I introduced strengthens the Clean Water Act to address the highest priority municipal water quality issues by including targeted reforms that redirect the Environmental Protection Agency's wet weather program in hopes of yielding greater success.

I encourage all my colleagues to support this conference report. I again thank the chairman and thank the ranking member.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA), a member of our committee.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I especially want to thank the chair of the full committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), for his leadership. And I wanted to reach across the aisle and thank the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) and others who have worked so hard in making certain that today we saw this legislation before the Congress.

I particularly, as an observer of this process, want to pay thanks to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW). We have 435 Members, but to get something to final passage takes the perseverance and the dedication and commitment. I was in the legislature in Florida back some 20-some years ago, and they talked about saving the Everglades. I have been in the Congress for nearly 8 years, and they have talked about saving the Everglades. This today shows and demonstrates what the persistence of one individual can do and has done.

So I salute the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) for his tremendous efforts. I think as we grow older we see how important it is that we preserve the natural treasures around us and certainly the Everglades is a national treasure. So today is an important day, an historic day. But one individual has helped make that possible. So I come to the floor to salute my colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW), again for making what others have talked about a reality.

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of this WRDA conference report. This bill has two very important authorization projects for the residents of Marin and Sonoma counties in my district in California.

Along with the committee's majority leadership, I would like to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BORSKI) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) and their staffs for all the work they have done, as well as my Bay Area colleague on the subcommittee, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TAUSCHER) for her assistance. It has taken some hard work of each of them and for the Petaluma community, but I am delighted that this conference report is a home run for my city. On behalf of the city government and my neighbors in Petaluma, I greatly appreciate the effort of the committee to work through a complex situation.

This new authorization for the Petaluma River Control Project will keep residents and businesses safe. It will also make affordable the protection that residents need without putting an unfair financial burden on the city.

I realize this authorization is not, however, all about me and about my city. This authorization is about the blueprint for restoring the Florida Everglades. The people I represent are very supportive of this restoration of such an important ecosystem, and we are looking forward to it being restored to its natural glory.

Mr. Speaker, it is going to be fun to work together and vote together on a bipartisan issue. I thank my colleagues for my gift, and I thank them for making this possible for our Nation.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) who has been tenacious in his efforts to protect the Great Lakes.

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

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure for his leadership on this legislation. Without his efforts, this bipartisan bill would not be on the floor today.

Water scarcity is becoming a worldwide problem. Over 166 million people in 18 countries are suffering from water shortages, and almost 270 million in 11 additional countries are considered water stressed. Experts predict that by 2025, one-fourth of the world will suffer from lack of water. Given the pressures of dropping water tables, present-day water usage cannot be sustained. Some are trying to change fresh water from a resource to a commodity.

Given these statistics, it is not surprising that there are now proposals to withdraw bulk quantities of water in the Great Lakes Basin. After all, the Great Lakes comprise one-fifth of the Earth's fresh water resources and contain over six quadrillion gallons of water.

This year, lake levels are at an all-time low, which is especially concerning after the wet summer we have had. The Detroit News reported that Lake Superior is seven inches below its long-term average, near lows not seen since 1920; Lake Michigan and Huron are six inches below average. Now is the time to work on this matter. Prudent management of our natural resources means looking ahead and planning for the future. We must be responsible stewards of our environment to ensure that our children are not denied the resources that we are able to enjoy today.

For the past 15 years, the governors of the Great Lakes States, in consultation with the Canadian premiers, have effectively managed the Great Lakes Basin. Today we have the opportunity to protect regional control of the basin and ensure its long-term stability.

I have worked very diligently with the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) and Senator ABRAHAM in the other body to include language in this conference report which ensures that control of Great Lakes water remains in the hands of the Great Lakes governors. The language in this bill is the culmination of a great deal of work to assure that these waters are effectively protected.

I urge Members of the Great Lakes States and all Members of Congress to join me in supporting this legislation.

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU).

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman SHUSTER) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), the ranking member, for their hard work on this bill.

I would like to especially recognize the landmark legislation with respect to the Everglades on which my colleague from school and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTSCH) has been working on for a very long time. Hopefully, some day the Columbia River

Gorge in the Pacific Northwest would receive some similar treatment as the Everglades are receiving today because the Columbia Gorge combines natural beauty along with being a commercially crucial transportation corridor. The major cities and towns of the Northwest depend on the Columbia River and that gorge. And yet the gorge is also an ecological singularity. It is truly unique and deserves special consideration. But that is in the future.

There are small parts of this bill which are absolutely vital to the Pacific Northwest. I cite, in particular, the work which is going to be done on the Astoria, Oregon East Mooring Basin. There is a causeway there which needs to be moved so that the breakwater which protects the east basin, the restoration work can continue. In this bill there is authorization to move that causeway so that the Corps of Engineers can continue to work on restoring the Mooring Basin's breakwater and that will preserve that Mooring Basin as an economic resource for the fishing families of the Pacific Northwest.

I thank the committee for its work.

1045

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER).

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

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this bipartisan legislation. I want to salute the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) and the members of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and particularly the Speaker of the House for bringing this important legislation to the floor. I also want to take a moment and salute my colleague on the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW). We know it was because of the gentleman from Florida's leadership that this legislation to restore the Everglades is on the House floor today. I want to salute the gentleman from Florida and thank him for his leadership.

It is the little things that mean a lot for a lot of communities. I want to thank the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure under the gentleman from Pennsylvania as well as this House for their bipartisan support for three things that matter a lot to the folks back home in Illinois, three projects that mean a lot to the communities that I represent.

I want to thank this House for their support in our efforts to restore the channel adjacent to Ballard's Island outside of Marseilles on the Illinois River. We, of course, recognize that in this legislation. You have also provided the opportunity for the Ottowa YMCA and its effort to serve thousands of Illinois Valley residents by allowing it to have an easement on property currently owned by the Army Corps of Engineers.

Last, I want to thank this body for transferring property currently owned by the Army Corps of Engineers to the Joliet Park District for a new headquarters. I urge bipartisan support for this legislation.

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the commitment that this bill represents today to a partnership that started many, many years ago in the State of Florida, the commitment to begin to return the Everglades to its natural splendor. Amid all the rancor and strife that has overwhelmed this House the last few days, I think it is important to stop and appreciate how we got to where we are in the Everglades. This is the product of years of cooperation between not just Republicans and Democrats but Floridians. Our Senator BOB GRAHAM, then Governor, started this effort. He and CONNIE MACK have represented a wonderful bipartisan commitment to get this done. And now the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTSCH) in the House together with our delegation as Floridians have worked together to produce this product. This is an excellent example of the partnership, and it is an excellent example of what happens when we come together as Floridians and now as Americans to protect a national treasure and begin a very difficult and long-term commitment towards restoring the splendor of the Everglades.

This is an important issue not just as far as preserving a natural resource, it is also a very important issue to Florida as far as water quality. The southern part of our State heavily depends upon the Everglades as an important source of drinking water and public health, and the country has come together to help us preserve that. We are very grateful.

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTSCH) and note that he is the Congressman who represents the National Park of the Everglades and has been a tenacious fighter for the Everglades in his 8 years here.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, today we are witnessing Congress at its best. In fact, we are really witnessing government at its best and I think in many ways even America at its best. There has been a lot of praise that has been given on this House floor, and I want to add to that. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), I think, has worked harder in his committee in terms of really trying to improve the lives of Americans in terms of infrastructure which is really what creates jobs and hopefully is what we do as Members of Congress. I really praise him for his work. I particularly also praise him for his insistence in terms of the other projects that he has been fighting for and not just in terms of the Everglades but in terms of other projects that are needed.

But in particular in terms of the Everglades, what I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania stated previously and understands is that as important as this authorization is, and this truly is historic legislation, there is more that needs to be done. The Keys wastewater treatment bill which is part of the package that the gentleman from Pennsylvania mentioned previously is part of the restoration efforts that we need to continue not just in the Everglades but in Florida Bay and throughout the area. The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) as well has been a leader in terms of infrastructure on this bill and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BORSKI) as the ranking member, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) as the chairman have also been incredibly helpful. Praise has also I think been given and well deserved to the chairman of our delegation, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW). The gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) really has taken an incredible leadership role on this issue. It is the base of the legislation, his bill. He has worked well with all of us and has been a leader through many troubled times in terms of this bill's trouble but finally literally as we pass it in hopefully a few minutes, maybe even unanimously, it will happen.

Let me also mention, and again it has been mentioned on this floor, the administration. President Clinton and Vice President GORE have made Everglades restoration their number one environmental infrastructure proposal. I cannot imagine how we would be here today without that commitment from the President and the Vice President. In the last 8 years, in the 8 years I have been in Congress, we have actually appropriated over $1.2 billion during that period of time. The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, obviously we could not have done that without his help, but this entire Congress deserves praise in terms of our efforts.

It has also been mentioned again just the bipartisan nature of this, and I think praise also goes to the last five Governors of the State of Florida, Governor GRAHAM, Governor Martinez, Governor Chiles, Governor McKay and Governor Bush, all of whom have been instrumental in terms of Everglades restoration. This is the largest environmental restoration project in the history of the world, $7.8 billion. It authorizes immediately $1.2 billion; it authorizes immediately 10 specific projects, including the C–14 basin storage reserve, reservoirs and Everglades agricultural area, four pilot projects as well. It is done in a design build concept which is really the state of the art in terms of these types of infrastructure projects. Congress will continue to be engaged throughout this entire

process, which literally is a 36- to 38-year process.

This bill is really about the future. I doubt, although it is possible that some Members of this Chamber will still be serving in Congress 38 years from now. Hopefully each of us will still be alive 38 years from now and we will be able to see the fruits of our labor in terms of an ecosystem that has been restored. There is only one Everglades on the planet Earth. This is it. This is the Everglades. Everglades is an Indian word for river of grass. It is a 100-mile wide river, only about a foot deep, and flows into Florida Bay. That is why I was really saying America at its best, because we are really restoring an ecosystem. That is exactly what we are doing. We have made the turn already over the last 8 years; but now this plan in place, a really well thought out government at its best, policymaking at its best, has set a road map for us to actually come to that complete restoration which hopefully will occur over that period of time.

Many people have mentioned some personal things in terms of the Everglades. I live close to the Everglades, at my back door. As has been mentioned, all of Everglades National Park is in my district. I represent probably a majority of the Everglades as well. But I have spent time in the Everglades. I have taken my children to the Everglades. I have camped in the Everglades. I wish that each of my colleagues would have that experience as well. Because this is legislation that is not really for us, it is for our children and for our grandchildren as well. I urge its passage.

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

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

It is fitting that the last major vote that occurs in this Congress prior to the election will be this vote which comes from the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. Indeed our committee, this means that this will be the 42nd law which has been generated from our committee and sent to the President for his signature, and I am told that the President will sign it.

This committee, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, has been the most productive committee of the Congress and the most bipartisan. I thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for doing that.

When this bill passes today, it will be sent over to the enrolling clerk, it will take several days for the final document to be enrolled, and then will be sent to the President for his signature. Certainly many people deserve credit; but I emphasize that, as the chairman of the conference, I can tell you with absolute certainty we would not be here today doing this if it were not for the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW), who has been the driving force behind this historic legislation, the largest environmental restoration legislation in the history of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) so he may close this historic debate.

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

Mr. SHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I simply want to congratulate the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BORSKI), the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) for this outstanding piece of legislation. It helps Illinois and Chicago tremendously. I want to salute the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) for the fantastic leadership that he has displayed with this committee over the course of the past 6 years. No matter what happens on November 7, I sincerely look forward to working with him as closely as I have in the past 6 years, in fact, in the past 18 years that I have been on this committee. I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) for yielding to me.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I come to the Democrat side of the aisle this morning to close this argument, not to get in anybody's face but to demonstrate the solidarity of this great body and what we are experiencing today. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTSCH); all of the Florida delegation; the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAVIS); of course the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), the chairman of the committee; the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BORSKI); the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT); the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR); of course the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), who has been absolutely there for us the entire way. There are just so many. The entire Florida delegation, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER), there are just so many that have worked so hard to see that we got here this day. But we also have our heroes in Florida, many of them not with us.

I want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTSCH) in ticking off the Members, former Members of this body as well as the former Governors who have worked so hard, Senator GRAHAM as Governor and as a Senator, Senator CONNIE MACK, former Senator and Governor Chiles, who really had a sensitivity toward the Everglades and to saving the Everglades, and, of course, Governor Jeb Bush who has been absolutely tireless in his efforts to pull together this legislation and communicating with the Speaker and the majority leader and other people to see that we got where we are today.

I have been confident the whole time that I have been working on this bill that we would be able to get to this day, and I have had that confidence because I have seen the bipartisan support that we have been able to generate; and the locomotive on this entire bill, of course, is the largest restoration, environmental restoration project in the history of the world. It started with the destruction of the Everglades. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY) spoke of it earlier this morning during the debate on the rule, where Governor Broward, for whom my home county is named, ran on the platform that he was going to drain that swamp, the Everglades. We almost got there. Thank God we stopped it. We have had great cooperation from the Army Corps of Engineers through this whole project. Mr. Westfahl has been absolutely tireless in working with us. Secretary of Interior Mr. Babbitt has been tremendously helpful and sensitive to the needs of Florida and to the needs of the Everglades. This destruction is not just down in the Everglades itself. It starts out up just south of Orlando, and it stretches down all the way through Florida Bay and off the Keys, the Florida Keys. The water has been rerouted in so many ways that the sheath flow has been almost completely destroyed. The salinity of Florida Bay goes up and down so that the natural grasses that are on the floor of the Florida Bay are in deep trouble. This makes all of the fish life, the shellfish and other fisheries that are in that area, puts them in grave danger and that could affect the whole fishing industry for the entire State of Florida. It is fitting and proper that the Federal Government at least pay half of the cost of the restoration of this great natural resource. But I think one of the great miracles of pulling this thing together is that all of the interests came together. The agricultural interest which was at complete odds with the environmental interest of the Everglades have come together with the environmentalists, the developers have come together as the municipalities. The Indian tribes that are there have signed on. It was just a tremendous job that has been done in bringing these people together.

This is a historic day. November 3 is the day that we took the first step in really restoring this great national treasure.

Mr. Speaker, this is really a great day for this country; it is a great day for Florida. I urge a ''yes'' vote.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I stand in strong support for the Water Resource Development Act Conference Report. The conference report authorizes various types of water resource development projects, including the Florida Everglades restoration project.

I am particularly pleased that the bill includes a project to create a riparian and pedestrian corridor from Lake Merritt to the Oakland Estuary. Lake Merritt is home to the nation's oldest nationally registered wildlife refuge and is the jewel of Oakland. This project will allow for natural tidal flows into the lake and channel area that will significantly improve water quality, support wetlands habitat and

provide for more environmentally sensitive flood control in the Lake Merritt watershed. The proposed project is intended to result in a restoration of the area into a new urban greenbelt corridor, comparable to such places as San Antonio's Riverwalk.

I want to thank my colleague, Representative ELLEN TAUSCHER, her staff and the committee for their help in securing this project. I am confident that this important project will restore wildlife habitat, allow for natural tidal flows, but will also provide for a new significant recreational attraction and create jobs in small businesses surrounding the lake area.

Mr. FOSSELLA. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that we are adopting today the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (WRDA). This important bill includes authorization of 50-foot deepening projects for all of the major channels in the Port of New York and New Jersey (the ''Port'')—including the Arthur Kill Channel. These deepening projects are critical to the port's ability to handle the larger ships that are now calling on ports throughout the world. This deepening will enable the Port to remain competitive with other ports already equipped with deeper drafts and help to maintain and enhance our region as a hub for international trade.

The Port is the largest container port on the east coast, moving more than 2.3 million TEU's of containers annually and directly serving over 35 percent of the U.S. population. As a result of its strategic location in the middle of one of the nation's largest and most affluent consumer markets, the Port provides same day delivery of goods to more than 18 million people. Over the next 10 years, cargo volumes in the Port are expected to double and over the next 40 years, quadruple. The new generation of cargo ships will require greater depths to accommodate their enormous size and container capacity. Some portions of the Port are currently too shallow to accommodate most modern container and military ships. Given the increased competition from other ports, especially Halifax which has depths of 60 to 70 feet, this comprehensive deepening of the Port is imperative.

This project has enjoyed the support of the New York and New Jersey delegations as well as the Governors of both states. I'd like to thank Chairman SHUSTER, Subcommittee Chairman BOEHLERT and Ranking Member OBERSTAR for all of their hard work on this crucial bill. I commend all of my colleagues for coming together to pass this bill important not only to Staten Island and Brooklyn, but to our Nation as a whole.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks. I rise today in support of the Water Resources Development Act Conference Report, in particular, the section on the restoration of the Everglades. We are on the verge of passing historic legislation to restore America's Everglades.

Mr. Speaker, the Everglades are dying. All of us know that we must act now or we lose what is left of the Everglades within a few years. No one disputes that the Federal Government is largely responsible for the damage that was done to the Everglades. Fifty years ago, the Federal Government established the Everglades National Park but simultaneously, a series of canals, levees and other flood control structures constructed by the Southern and Central Florida Project disrupted the lifeblood of the Everglades—the flow of clean fresh water.

As a result of these 50 years of neglect and abuse, the State of Florida has lost 46 percent of its wetlands and 50 percent of its historic Everglades ecosystem. Sixty-eight plant and animal species have become threatened or endangered with extinction while urban and agricultural runoff have produced extensive water quality degradation throughout the region.

The Federal Government has a clear interest in restoring this ecosystem since a large portion of the lands owned or managed by the Federal Government will receive the benefits of the restoration—4 national parks and 16 national wildlife refuges which make up half of the remaining Everglades. The need for action is clear. That is why I am so pleased that we are coming together to solve this problem. The legislation before us today represents an unprecedented compromise supported by the administration, the State of Florida, environmental groups, farmers, home builders, water utilities, Indian tribes and industry. These diverse groups represent every major constituency involved in the Everglades restoration. And they are all on board. Not because they all got what they wanted, but because they all understood the urgency of passing this legislation to save America's Everglades.

Mr. Speaker, America desperately needs this bill. I urge all my colleagues to join me to preserve America's Everglades and to ensure that one of the world's most endangered ecosystems is not lost.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful that the Senate has recognized the need to protect the Great Lakes water from diversion and export. Yesterday, the other body passed legislation that focuses on protecting this precious resource from foreign companies and countries who target the Great Lakes for their fresh, drinking water.

The Great Lakes is the largest body of fresh water, containing more than 20 percent of the planet's fresh water, and is the primary source of drinking water for millions of people. These lakes, however, are being targeted outside the continent because the global water demand is doubling every 21 years. The World Bank predicts that by the year 2025, more than 3 billion people in 52 countries will suffer water shortages for drinking or sanitation.

Unfortunately, this legislation does not go far enough to ensure a federal role in protecting the Great Lakes from such threats. The language passed by the Senate is nonbinding and thus does not ensure a role for the Secretary of State or any other federal official or agency in devising and approving water conservation standards for the region.

Despite opposing arguments, water diversion from the Great Lakes must involve the federal government. Notably, only the federal government may enter into treaties with the Canadian government. Only the federal government may devise a uniform national policy on diversions. And, only the federal government may set and enforce policies on international waters that apply to four of the five Great Lakes. The federal government's role in this issue is clearly delineated and it must maintain a strong involvement to prevent future diversions.

This entire issue was spurred in 1998 when a Canadian company planned to ship 3 billion liters of water from Lake Superior over 5 years and sell it to Asia. That same year I authored legislation, that the House of Representatives passed, urging the United States government to oppose this action. While the permit was subsequently withdrawn, the House passage of my resolution could not stop future requests. In fact, the United States cannot stop diversions and withdrawals in Great Lakes water that is under the control of Canada.

Obviously, the federal governments of Canada and the United States must be involved to ensure that diversions from the Great Lakes do not occur. The legislation that passed the Senate yesterday fails to include such a protection. It encourages the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec to be included in developing conservation standards. But even if they are present during such discussions, their contribution is made only to existing United States federal law, not to that of Canadian federal law. Without similar restrictions in Canadian federal law, we may be confronting another company's request to remove Great Lakes water in the next few years. We cannot risk this real threat.

I thank the Senate for its consideration of this serious issue and hope that the next Congress may better protect the Great Lakes and the 35 million people who live within its basin.

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Water Resource Development Act, which includes a provision to help restore Lake Mead and the Las Vegas Wash and Wetlands in southern Nevada.

The Las Vegas Wash and Wetlands is the only major drainage channel for the entire 1,600-square-mile Las Vegas Valley. On average, 153 million gallons of water, including harmful pollutants, flow each day through the Las Vegas Wash, then through the Las Vegas Wetlands eventually draining into Lake Mead, which is Las Vegas Valley's primary source of drinking water. Fortunately, the Las Vegas Wetlands filter out harmful pollutants before they enter into Lake Mead.

In 1972, the Las Vegas Valley had 135,552 people and 2,000 acres of wetlands. Today, the Valley has over 1.2 million people and only 200 acres of wetlands left. The Valley's tremendous growth has severely eroded the Las Vegas Wash and Wetlands. If left alone the wetlands will disappear, and Lake Mead will become badly polluted resulting in an environment disaster threatening local fish and wildlife species and the health of area residents.

The future of Lake Mead and the Las Vegas Wash is the future of our community, so this is hugely important to southern Nevada.

I've grown up with Lake Mead and the Wash and I've seen over the years how they've become more and more polluted. Not only do we rely on Lake Mead and the Wash for clean drinking water, but they provide one of our greatest recreational and scenic areas. If we want our children to continue to have access to this tremendous asset, we have to come together now to save the Lake and restore the fragile Wash.

This important legislation authorizes $10 million in funding for the implementation of a water resources plan adopted by the Las Vegas Wash Coordinating Committee. The plan directs federal, state, and local officials to work together to restore the wetlands at the Las Vegas Wash and to improve water quality at the Lake.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is crucial to the continued growth and environmental

sustainment of southern Nevada. I praise the bipartisan efforts that created this bill, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to lend my strong support to S. 2796, the Water Resources Development Act of 2000. I also would like to thank Chairman SHUSTER and ranking member OBERSTAR as well as the Chairman of the Water Resources and the Environment Committee, Mr. BOEHLERT, and the subcommittee's ranking member, Mr. BORSKI, for their willingness to work with me on a title of this bill of great importance to my state of South Dakota and to the future of the Missouri River.

Title IX of the bill creates the Missouri River Restoration Program. The program takes a very thoughtful and practical approach to the vexing and growing problem of sediment accumulation in the Missouri River in South Dakota.

As my colleagues may be aware, the Flood Control Act of 1944 authorized the construction of six dams on the Missouri in Montana, North Dakota, and South Dakota. These dams, a part of the Pick-Sloan program, have brought a number of benefits to the people in my state and to the states upstream and downstream from South Dakota.

However, the creations of these dams and vast reservoirs also dramatically changed the course of the river, and consequently, how the river interacts with the land and all things living along the river. One of the negative impacts has been the deposition of millions of tons of silt into the reservoirs. Prior to the construction of the dams, the sediment would have flowed down the river, eventually settling as the water approached the Gulf of Mexico. That is no longer the case; instead, the sediment is dropping out of suspension and accumulating in new areas.

That accumulation now is causing flooding in residential and commercial areas in places like Pierre and Fort Pierre, South Dakota. And the new shape of the river has caused increased erosion throughout the river system in South Dakota.

Places like Springfield and Yankton, located on or near Lewis and Clark Lake, have benefited greatly the recreational opportunities of the river since the construction of Gavins Point Dam. But the problem I described above threatens those benefits. And those threats have been well documented in a number of studies by independent groups and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. The latest study was authorized in WRDA in 1999 at my request. Those studies have been instrumental in the development of this legislation.

Title IX will give power and resources the state, tribal, and local governments need to work with the Corps and other federal agencies to tackle these problems head-on. The restoration program creates a governing board made up of local interests as well as state and federal officials to develop a plan to reduce sedimentation at the source, develop ways to reduce the sediment, and preserve the health and viability of the river. The program is authorized at $10 million per year for each of the next 5 years. Even though some of the identified solutions exceed this authorization level by almost twofold, the $50 million total will allow for significant and important work to move forward.

I am confident that positive results will become obvious once this group goes to work. And as those results reveal themselves, I am hopeful that this body will be willing to consider changes in the legislation to ensure maximum local control and adequate resources.

I have introduced H.R. 5527, the Missouri River Restoration Act of 2000. That bill has served as a model for title IX of this bill and will continue to serve as a framework for future amendments to title IX if necessary.

Again, I want to thank Chairman SHUSTER and Chairman BOEHLERT for their support of my request on this issue and a number of other issues throughout my service in the House.

I look forward to WRDA 2000 being signed into law and for improvements to begin on the Missouri River in South Dakota, ensuring this great treasure is available for generations to come.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Speaker, the conference report on Water Resources Development Act of 2000 has my full support. I commend Chairman SHUSTER and Mr. OBERSTAR for their considerable efforts to bring this legislation before the House of Representatives for final consideration.

Section 338 of the conference agreement concerns a project at Sandbridge Beach in the city of Virginia Beach, Virginia. I am particularly grateful to Chairman SHUSTER for his personal commitment to favorably resolving this issue. The project was authorized for construction by Section 101(22) of WRDA 1992. Due to severe conditions at Sandbridge in 1998, the City of Virginia Beach entered into a Project Cooperation Agreement with the Corps of Engineers to complete construction of the hurricane and storm protection project. The City expended $7.8 million to complete construction that was executed by the Corps of Engineers. Section 338 will assist the City of Virginia Beach in maintaining this hurricane and storm protection project. Project maintenance is critical to the future protection of public and private property in the area. I thank the Chairman for the considerable time, patience and effort he expended on this issue. I urge my colleagues to support this conference report.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member rises today in strong support of the S. 2796, the Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) conference report. This Member commends the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SHUSTER), Chairman of the Transportation Committee, the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), Ranking Member on the Transportation Committee, the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), Chairman of the Water Resources and Environment Subcommittee, and the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BORSKI), the Ranking Member on the Subcommittee for all their hard work in bringing this important conference report to the Floor. This Member is especially appreciative that he has had the opportunity in the 106th Congress to serve on the Transportation Committee and the Water Resources and Environment Subcommittee. Clearly, it has been a highlight of the 106th Congress for this Member.

This important legislation presents a tremendous opportunity to improve flood control, navigation, shore protection and environmental protection. This Member is pleased that the conference report we are considering today includes contingent approval for the sand Creek watershed project in Saunders County, Nebraska. This proposed project, which is a result of the Lower Platte River and Tributaries Flood Control Study, is designed to meet Federal environmental restoration goals, help provide state recreation needs, solve local flooding problems and preserve water quality. It is sponsored jointly by the Lower Platte North NRD, the City of Wahoo and Saunders County.

The plans for the project include a nearly 640-acre reservoir, known as Lake Wanahoo, wetlands restoration and seven upstream sediment nutrient traps. The Sand Creek watershed project would result in important environmental and recreational benefits for the area and has attracted widespread support. It is especially crucial that the Sand Creek project is included in WRDA this year as the Nebraska Department of Roads is ready to begin design of an expressway in that area that will be routed across the top of a dam if the project is approved. If the Sand Creek project is not included in WRDA, a new bridge will have to be planned and built, which probably would make the project not economically feasible.

This Member is also very pleased that contingent authorization of the Antelope Creek flood control project is included in WRDA 2000. Antelope Creek runs through the heart of Nebraska's capital city of Lincoln. The purpose of the project is to solve multi-faceted problems involving the flood control and drainage problems in Antelope Creek as well as existing transportation and safety problems all within the context of broad land use issues. This Member continues to have a strong interest in this project since he was responsible for stimulating the City of Lincoln, the Lower Platte South Natural Resources District, and the University of Nebraska-Lincoln to work jointly and cooperatively with the Army Corps of Engineers to identify an effective flood control system for Antelope Creek in the downtown area of Lincoln.

Antelope Creek, which was originally a small meandering stream, became a straightened urban drainage channel as Lincoln grew and urbanized. Resulting erosion has deepened and widened the channel and created an unstable situation. A ten-foot by twenty-foot (height and width) closed underground conduit that was constructed between 1911 and 1916 now requires significant maintenance and major rehabilitation. A dangerous flood threat to adjacent public and private facilities exists.

The goals of the project are to construct a flood overflow conveyance channel which would narrow the flood plain from up to seven blocks wide to the 150-foot wide channel. The project will include trails and bridges and improve bikeway and pedestrian systems.

Another Nebraska project was included on the contingent authorization list for Western Sarpy and Clear Creek for flood damage reduction. Frankly, this Member must say he has reservations about the Clear Creek project in light of comments from his constituents in adjacent Saunders County.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, this Member urges his colleagues to support this important conference report. In the short time left in the 106th Congress, we must work to ensure WRDA becomes law this year.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, when we considered this bill last month I had some serious reservations about it, especially those parts dealing with oceanfront development, dredging, and other projects to be carried out by the Corps of Engineers.

I thought the House should have had the chance to consider amendments that would have improved the bill and regretted that it was considered under procedures that did not permit that.

However, I voted for the bill because I strongly support authorizing the important program of environmental restoration for the Everglades.

The bill then went to conference with the Senate, and today we are considering a revised version that was produced in that conference.

Compared with the original bill, the conference report is much improved and deserves to be passed and sent to the President for signing into law.

As has been noted already, the conference report not only authorizes restoration work for the Everglades, it also includes important provisions to improve the way the Corps of Engineers carries out its work. I do not think they fully address all the changes that need to be made, but they are an improvement and deserve support.

So I will vote for the conference report, and urge its approval by the House.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in full support of the WRDA Conference Report. Let me begin by commending the Chairman of the full committee Chairman SHUSTER and ranking member OBERSTAR. Subcommittee Chairman BOEHLERT and ranking member Mr. BORSKI also deserve special commendation. This important piece of legislation is necessary to improve our ports, waterways and environment. I am especially pleased that the restoration of the Everglades is included in this WRDA package. Though this precious natural resource is located in my home state of Florida, let there be no mistake this is America's Everglades and the bipartisan nature of the restoration effort reflects this.

In addition, it is widely known that I have serious concerns regarding the participation and inclusion of socially and economically disadvantaged businesses in the Everglades Restoration Plan, the largest environmental restoration project in the history of this nation. The Ranking Member, Mr. OBERSTAR and the administration has been extremely sensitive to this concern and I appreciate his efforts to address the issue. I have received numerous correspondences from residents of my district and across my state, urging that we pass this measure before we adjourn. I urge strong support for this Conference Report and again thank the Chairman and Ranking member for their usual fine work.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Conference Report on S. 2790, the Water Resources Development Act of 2000, the biennial authorization bill for programs and projects of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

Since the landmark water resources legislation of 1986, the former Public Works and Transportation Committee, now renamed the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, has worked to maintain a consistent two-year authorization schedule for the Corps. It is critical to maintain this two-year cycle to provide continuity to the program and certainly to the non-federal, local sponsors who support Corps projects. This biennial cycle also affords Congress the opportunity to monitor and, if necessary, amend the workings of the Corps program.

This Conference Report authorizes projects for the entirety of the Corps civil works program. It includes navigation, flood control, shoreline protection, and environmental restoration and protection.

This bill both builds and rebuilds the Nation's infrastructure. It will allow us to expand international trade through projects to improve our coastal ports and inland navigation system. Through flood control and hurricane and storm damage reduction measures, it will help to meet critical needs to protect lives and property.

It is no secret that one of the issues that delayed House consideration of this bill until last month was the applicability of the Davis-Bacon Act to non-federal contributions to federal projects of the Corps. I have always believed that Davis-Bacon applies to all aspects of a federal public works project, regardless of whether the Corps is performing the work, or a non-federal sponsor is contributing the work. The key element is that these have always been federal public works projects, and Davis-Bacon should apply.

I was surprised that the Corps was not consistently applying the Davis-Bacon wage protection provisions to the non-federal contribution for Corps projects. I was prepared to offer legislative language to the bill to rectify this situation—ensuring that the Corps would apply Davis-Bacon Act protections to all aspects of its program.

I am pleased to say that such legislative action is no longer necessary. Following numerous meetings with the Corps, the Department of the Army, and the Department of Labor, there is agreement within the Administration that my view of the applicability of the Davis-Bacon Act is the correct one. The Davis-Bacon Act wage provisions apply to non-federal contributions to federal Corps of Engineers projects. It applies regardless of whether the non-federal contribution is in cash, or in-kind work for which credit or reimbursement is sought.

I appreciate the Administration working with me to make sure that the protections of the Davis-Bacon statute are provided to all workers on all federal public works.

Mr. Speaker, this bill contains an important tribute to our late colleague, and my friend, Bruce Vento. This bill will rename a portion of the Boundary Water Canoe Area Wilderness in my district as the Bruce Vento Unit of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness.

Bruce served people of his district nobly, with dignity, with passion, and with purpose. He did the same for the Nation, particularly in preserving and enhancing its parks and wilderness areas. Bruce has been credited with championing hundreds of bills into law that protect and preserve our precious natural resources. I believe that it is most appropriate that one of those precious resources in our home state of Minnesota bears his name in perpetuity, and I am proud that this tribute will be in my Congressional district.

Mr. Speaker, local newspapers have devoted a lot of time and effort over the past nine months to criticizing the Corps. But, the Corps is a proud institution with a long history. It deserves our praise and respect. Let me share some of its history with my colleagues.

First, I welcome the opportunity to pay tribute to the organization frequently mentioned in debate here but whose accomplishments are almost never discussed, the Corps of Engineers. The Corps celebrates its 225th birthday this year. During those years it has established itself as the Nation's oldest, largest, and most experienced government organization in the area of water and related land engineering matters. It has provided extraordinary, competent, lifesaving, economic development enhancing service to this country for two and a quarter centuries.

Few people today know that the Corps of Engineers, among its many responsibilities, once had jurisdiction over Yellowstone National Park. The Corps managed Yellowstone Park for 30 years. Lieutenant Dan Kingman of the Corps, who would later become the Chief Engineers, wrote:

''The plan of development which I have submitted is given upon the supposition and in the earnest hope that it will be preserved as nearly as may be as the hand of nature left it, a source of pleasure to all who visit and a source of wealth to no one.''

A few years later, John Muir, founder of the Sierra Club, said:

''The best service in forest protection, almost the only efficient service, is that rendered by the military. For many years, they have guarded the great Yellowstone Park, and now they are guarding Yosemite. They found it a desert as far as underbrush, grass and flowers are concerned. But, in two years, the skin of the mountains is healthy again, blessings on Uncle Sam's soldiers, as they have done the job well, and every pine tree is waving its arms for joy.''

Another great American said: ''The military engineers are taking upon their shoulders the job of making the Mississippi River over again, a job transcended in size only by the original job of creating it.'' That was Mark Twain.

Those statements together pay tribute to what the Corps of Engineers has done so admirably, and the great legacy they have left for all Americans protected in floods, enhanced with river navigation programs, and, of immense importance to me, by protecting the great resource of the Great Lakes—one-fifth of all the fresh water on the face of the Earth.

The Corps of Engineers deserves recognition for all of these works and the great contribution it makes to the economic well-being, and to the environmental enhancement of this country.

Mr. Speaker, I find it ironic that even while some criticize the Corps, the central piece of this legislation is a project to invest nearly $8 billion in federal, state, and local funds for the greatest environmental restoration project ever conceived. A project that has the support of the Administration, Members of Congress from both sides of the aisle, the environmental community, Florida, affected Indian Tribes, local governments, and the business community of South Florida. This critical project has not been entrusted to an agency incapable of carrying out its mission. No, the project has been entrusted to the only agency capable of carrying out the mission.

The Everglades are dying from years of population growth, and a Corps project that works all too well in draining them. While some criticize the existing Corps project for having harmed the Everglades, it should be recalled that the current system of canals, levees, and pumps that redirect water from the Everglades to the ocean was built with the support and encouragement of Florida and local residents.

The project has provided the desired flood and hurricane protection, as well as water supply for South Florida. Unfortunately, when the project was constructed, no one envisioned the dire consequences for the Everglades ecosystem.

The restoration project initiated in this bill will help restore the Everglades by changing the plumbing of South Florida to more closely resemble historical patterns and amounts. Today, the Everglades receive the wrong amount of water at the wrong times of the year. The Everglades restoration project, when fully implemented, will provide a more natural flow through the Everglades, and the Everglades National Park. It will do so without diminishing flood and hurricane protection for South Florida.

Mr. Speaker, scores of individuals worked for many years to develop the comprehensive plan to restore the Everglades. For many, their efforts have been acknowledged here and in the Senate. However, I will compliment one individual who has worked tirelessly toward the Everglades restoration project, and whose name has not been mentioned on this Floor.

Mr. Gary Hardesty of the Corps of Engineers headquarters office has given of himself above and beyond the call of duty to make the Everglades restoration happen. He coordinated the Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan, was responsible for drafting the Report of the Chief of Engineers, wrote Congressional testimony for numerous hearings, and provided detailed and accurate information to the House and Senate in the drafting of the bill. As Members of Congress know well, there are less visible individuals who make the work we do possible. For the Everglades, Mr. Hardesty is one of the individuals that made the Everglades restoration possible. He deserves the Nation's recognition and gratitude.

The Conference Report is not just the Everglades and other projects. It also includes a number of provisions to improve the operation of the Corps program. But, I am disappointed that more of the program improvements contained in the House amendment were not acceptable to the Senate. In particular, it is unfortunate that the Conference Report does not include House language to ensure that Corps' projects will successfully mitigate any adverse environmental impacts associated with its projects. I intend to revisit this issue next Congress.

The Conference Report expands the ability of non-governmental entities to participate as non-federal sponsors of projects. This is particularly important for environmental restoration and improvement projects where local organizations are anxious to work with the Corps to improve the environment.

Mr. Speaker, this water resources bill is worthy of strong bipartisan support. It is consistent wiht other Water Resources Acts that Congress has approved overwhelmingly over the past 15 years. We should give this Conference Report that same overwhelming support today.

I urge all Members to support the Conference Report on S. 2796, the Water Resources Development Act of 2000.

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Chairman SHUSTER, Mr. OBERSTAR, and my Subcommittee Chairman Mr. BOEHLERT, and Ranking member Mr. BORSKI for their support and dedication in moving this important legislation forward. Additionally, I would like to express my gratitude for their tireless efforts to move my bipartisan legislation, H.R. 828. While it is not part of this package, I am pleased that an agreement was reached that will result in the eventual passage of this important legislation.

I would also like to express appreciation to all those Members who played a key role including Congressman LATOURETTE who is a leader on this issue as well.

I am pleased that we will pass WRDA today, legislation that will have a positive impact on communities across the country and I look forward to continuing our work to provide clean water for the citizens of this great nation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). 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.

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 vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 312, nays 2, not voting 119, as follows:

[Roll No. 594]

YEAS—312

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Andrews
Armey
Baca
Bachus
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bereuter
Berkley
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Camp
Canady
Cannon
Capuano
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Coburn
Combest
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (FL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dixon
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehrlich
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Fletcher
Foley
Ford
Fossella
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kildee
Kind (WI)
Kingston
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Largent
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Minge
Moakley
Moore
Moran (KS)
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pease
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reynolds
Rivers
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Stabenow
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Toomey
Traficant
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Weiner
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—2

Chenoweth-Hage
Sanford

NOT VOTING—119

Ackerman
Allen
Archer
Baird
Ballenger
Becerra
Bentsen
Berman
Bilbray
Bishop
Blumenauer
Boswell
Boucher
Calvert
Campbell
Capps
Carson
Chambliss
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Collins
Conyers
Danner
Davis (IL)
DeGette
Delahunt
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dooley
Dunn
Ehlers
Emerson
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Forbes
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Granger
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hefley
Hill (MT)
Hutchinson
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jones (OH)
Kasich
Kennedy
Kilpatrick
King (NY)
Klink
Lantos
Lazio
Lee
Lofgren
Maloney (NY)
McCarthy (MO)
McCollum
McIntosh
McKinney
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mink
Mollohan
Moran (VA)
Morella
Neal
Nethercutt
Oberstar
Ose
Owens
Paul
Pelosi
Pickett
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Reyes
Riley
Rodriguez
Rush
Salmon
Sanchez
Schaffer
Serrano
Shays
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Talent
Tancredo
Taylor (NC)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Visclosky
Waters
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wise

1127

Mrs. CHENOWETH-HAGE changed her vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. DUNCAN 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.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 594, I was in my Congressional District on official business. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 594 on November 3, 2000, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. McCARTHY of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall votes Nos. 593 and 594, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be present for rollcall votes Nos. 593 and 594. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea'' on both rollcall votes Nos. 593 and 594.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to state for the RECORD how I would have voted if I had been present today. Rollcall 593, Approving the Journal, ''aye.'' Rollcall 594, Conference Report on WRDA, ''aye.''

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the Senate bill, S. 2796.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 2001, CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE, AND AUTHORIZING ORGANIZATIONAL CONFERENCES AND CAUCUSES

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House discharge the Committee on Appropriations from further consideration of, and hereby pass, House Joint Resolution 124; take from the Speaker's table House Joint Resolution 84, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in each of the Senate amendments; take from the Speaker's table Senate Concurrent Resolution 160 and agree to the same; and hereby adopt a resolution providing that any organizational caucus or conference in the House of Representatives for the 107th Congress may begin on or after November 13, 2000; that the texts of each measure be considered as read and printed in the RECORD, and that motions to reconsider each of these actions be laid on the table.

The Clerk read the titles of the resolutions.

The text of H.J. Res 124 is as follows:

H.J. RES. 124

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Public Law 106–275, is further amended by striking the date specified in section 106(c) and inserting ''November 4, 2000''.

The text of the Senate amendments to H. J. Res. 84 is as follows:

Senate amendments:

Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert: *That Public Law 106–275, is further amended by striking the date specified in section 106(c) and inserting ''November 14, 2000''.*

Amend the title so as to read: ''Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2001, and for other purposes.''.

The text of S. Con. Res. 160 is as follows:

S. CON. RES. 160

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That when the Senate recesses or adjourns at the close of business on Thursday, November 2, 2000, or on Monday, November 6, 2000, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand recessed or adjourned until noon on Tuesday, November 14, 2000, or until such time on that day as may be specified by its Majority Leader or his designee in the motion to recess or adjourn, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the House adjourns on the legislative day of Thursday, November 2, 2000, Friday, November 3, 2000, Saturday, November 4, 2000, Sunday, November 5, 2000, Monday, November 6, 2000, Tuesday, November 7, 2000, Wednesday, November 8, 2000, or Thursday, November 9, 2000, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand adjourned until 2:00 p.m. on Monday, November 13, 2000, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. The Majority Leader of the Senate and the Speaker of the House, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the Senate and the Minority Leader of the House, shall notify the Members of the Senate and House, respectively, to reassemble whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

The text of H. Res. 666 is as follows:

H. RES. 666

Resolved, That any organizational caucus or conference in the House of Representatives for the One Hundred Seventh Congress may begin on or after November 13, 2000.

SEC. 2. As used in this resolution, the term ''organizational caucus or conference'' means a party caucus or conference authorized to be called under section 202(a) of House Resolution 988, Ninety-third Congress, agreed to on October 8, 1974, and enacted into permanent law by chapter III of title I of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1975 (2 U.S.C. 29a(a)).

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

There was no objection.

CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 6 p.m. on Saturday, November 4, 2000, unless it sooner has been informed by the President of the enactment into law of House Joint Resolution 84, in which case the House shall stand adjourned pursuant to Senate concurrent resolution 160 until 2 p.m. Monday, November 13, 2000.

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

There was no objection.

CROMWELLIAN ADJOURNMENT

(Mr. OBEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I had originally intended to take about 15 minutes to recite my objections to our leaving with all of the unfinished business, but I have been persuaded by those with greater wisdom to simply remind the House of something the gentleman from Massachusetts said yesterday. He showed us the statement of Oliver Cromwell upon dismissing Parliament in 1653, which reads as follows: ''Ye who are grown intolerably odious to the whole Nation; you who are deputed here by the people to get grievances redress'd, are yourselves become the greatest grievance. Your country, therefore, calls upon me to cleanse this Augean stable, by putting a final period to your iniquitous proceedings in this House; and which, by God's help and the strength he has given me, I am now come to do; I command ye therefore, upon the peril of your lives, to depart immediately out of this place; go, get out! Make haste! Ye venal slaves be gone! So! Take away that shining bauble there, and lock the doors. In the name of God, go!''

1130

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman is a student of Oliver Cromwell, and I enjoy reading Cromwell's very famous statements as well.

I would like to respond to the gentleman's Cromwell quote by reading another one. These were Oliver's dying words.

He said, ''It is not my design to drink or to sleep, but my design is to make what haste I can to be gone.'' So goodbye, God bless you, see you in two weeks.