deadline for beginning construction on the project.

My understanding is that granting FERC the authority to extend the deadline for such projects has become a routine matter, and that FERC has indicated that it has no objection to the extension called for by H.R. 2165.

Granting the extension authorized by this legislation would help ensure a responsible review of the project's economic viability. It would also enable the environmental impact of the project to remain under review in order to help ensure that the project's impact on the ecology of the Mississippi River is benign.

Again, I would like to thank the members of the Commerce Committee and its staff for their support of H.R. 2165 and urge its support by my colleagues in the House.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. CRAPO] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2165.

The question was taken.

Mr. CONDIT. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5, rule I, and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2165, the bill just considered.

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

There was no objection.

COASTAL POLLUTION REDUCTION ACT OF 1997

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2207) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act concerning a proposal to construct a deep ocean outfall off the coast of Mayaguez, Puerto Rico, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2207

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Coastal Pollution Reduction Act of 1997''.

SEC. 2. MAYAGUEZ, PUERTO RICO.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The existing discharge from the Mayaguez publicly owned treatment works is to the stressed waters of Mayaguez Bay, an area containing severely degraded coral reefs, and relocation of that discharge to unstressed ocean waters could benefit the marine environment.

(2) The Federal Water Pollution Control Act should, consistent with the environmental goals of the Act, be administered with sufficient flexibility to take into consideration the unique characteristics of Mayaguez, Puerto Rico.

(3) Some deep ocean areas off the coastline of Mayaguez, Puerto Rico, might be able to receive a less-than-secondary sewage discharge while still maintaining healthy and diverse marine life.

(4) A properly designed and operated deep ocean outfall off the coast of Mayaguez, Puerto Rico, coupled with other pollution reduction activities in the Mayaguez Watershed could facilitate compliance with the requirements and purposes of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act without the need for more costly treatment.

(5) The owner or operator of the Mayaguez publicly owned treatment works should be afforded an opportunity to make the necessary scientific studies and submit an application proposing use of a deep ocean outfall for review by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency under section 301(h) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

(b) APPLICATION FOR SECONDARY TREATMENT WAIVER FOR MAYAGUEZ, PUERTO RICO, DEEP OCEAN OUTFALL.—Section 301 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1311) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(q) APPLICATION FOR WAIVER.—

''(1) STUDY.—In order to be eligible to apply for a waiver under this section, the owner or operator of the Mayaguez, Puerto Rico, publicly owned treatment works shall transmit to the Administrator a report on the results of a study of the marine environment of coastal areas in the Mayaguez area to determine the feasibility of constructing a deep ocean outfall for the Mayaguez treatment works. In conducting the study, the owner or operator shall consider variations in the currents, tidal movement, and other hydrological and geological characteristics at any proposed outfall location. Such study may recommend one or more technically feasible and environmentally acceptable locations for a deep ocean outfall intended to meet the requirements of subsection (h). Such study may be initiated, expanded, or continued not later than 3 months after the date of the enactment of this subsection.

''(2) SECTION 301(h) APPLICATION FOR MAYAGUEZ, PUERTO RICO.—Notwithstanding subsection (j)(1)(A), not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this subsection, an application may be submitted for a modification pursuant to subsection (h) of the requirements of subsection (b)(1)(B) by the owner or operator of the Mayaguez, Puerto Rico, publicly owned treatment works at a location recommended in a study conducted pursuant to paragraph (1). Such application shall not be subject to the application revision procedures of section 125.59(d) of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations. No such application may be filed unless and until the applicant has entered into a binding consent decree with the United States that includes, at a minimum, the following:

''(A) A schedule and milestones to ensure expeditious compliance with the requirements of subsection (b)(1)(B) in the event the requested modification is denied, including interim effluent limits and design activities to be undertaken while the application is pending.

''(B) A schedule and interim milestones to ensure expeditious compliance with the requirements of any modification of subsection (b)(1)(B) in the event the requested modification is approved.

''(C) A commitment by the applicant to contribute not less than $400,000 to the Mayaguez Watershed Initiative in accordance with such schedules as may be specified in the consent decree.

''(3) INITIAL DETERMINATION.—On or before the 270th day after the date of submittal of an application under paragraph (2) that has been deemed complete by the Administrator, the Administrator shall issue to the applicant a tentative determination regarding the requested modification.

''(4) FINAL DETERMINATION.—On or before the 270th day after the date of issuance of the tentative determination under paragraph (3), the Administrator shall issue a final determination regarding the modification.

''(5) ADDITIONAL CONDITION.—The Administrator may not grant a modification pursuant to an application submitted under this subsection unless the Administrator determines that the new deep water ocean outfall will use a well-designed and operated diffuser that discharges into unstressed ocean waters and is situated so as to avoid discharge (or transport of discharged pollutants) to coral reefs, other sensitive marine resources or recreational areas, and shorelines.

''(6) EFFECTIVENESS.—If a modification is granted pursuant to an application submitted under this subsection, such modification shall be effective only if the new deepwater ocean outfall is operational on or before the date that is 4½ years after the date of the Administrator's initial tentative determination on the application.''.

SEC. 3. NATIONAL ESTUARY PROGRAM.

(a) GRANTS FOR COMPREHENSIVE CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT PLANS.—Section 320(g)(2) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1330(g)(2)) is amended by inserting ''and implementation'' after ''development''.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 320(i) of such Act (33 U.S.C. 1330(i)) is amended by striking ''1987'' and all that follows through ''1991'' and inserting the following: ''1987 through 1991, such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 1992 through 1997, and $20,000,000 for fiscal year 1998''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BORSKI] each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT].

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

Mr. Speaker, the bill would amend the Clean Water Act to allow a community in Puerto Rico to apply to EPA for an alternative to secondary treatment requirements. Any alternative approved by EPA would be, and this is important, would be subject to requirements and conditions necessary to assure the adequate protection of coastal resources. Mr. Speaker, this bill could help save the community up to $65 million by avoiding the construction of more costly facilities while including appropriate environmental safeguards.

Another provision in the bill, added in committee, modifies the Clean Water Act's national estuary program. The bill allows the use of Federal funds for implementation, as opposed to just development, of comprehensive conservation and management plans. This is a widely supported approach to protecting America's estuaries.

Allowing Federal funds to be used for implementing the national estuary program is an initiative strongly supported by State, local, and regional interests, including the environmental community. Many States have completed their comprehensive conservation and management plans required under the national estuary program, and it is time to help put their plans to work.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure members should be congratulated for their efforts in developing the Coastal Pollution Reduction Act. I would particularly like to recognize the efforts of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER], the chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR], the ranking Democrat of the committee, and my colleague and good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BORSKI], the ranking Democrat of the Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment.

In addition, I would be remiss if I did not thank the gentleman from Puerto Rico [Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ] the primary sponsor of the bill. His efforts to address this matter and promote greater flexibility in the Clean Water Act have been thoughtful and persistent.

I would also like to thank the gentleman from Alaska, Mr. DON YOUNG, our colleague, the chairman of the Committee on Resources, for his role in supporting the bill and helping to clarify that the intent of the national estuaries program amendment is not to provide any new or expanded authority to regulate land use.

Finally, I want to thank representatives of the Environmental Protection Agency and the environmental community, particularly in Puerto Rico, for their input. The final text of the bill and the detailed committee report largely reflect their comments and concerns.

Throughout the development of this bill, our intent has been to fashion a responsible approach to meet a site-specific need for flexibility under the Clean Water Act and to strengthen the national estuaries program. I think we have succeeded.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2207, and I reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

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 today in support of H.R. 2207, the Coastal Pollution Reduction Act of 1997. This bill, which would amend the Clean Water Act, provides an opportunity for Mayàguez, Puerto Rico, to apply for a waiver of secondary treatment requirements in an effort to protect its coral reef. While I urge my colleagues to support this bill for the environmental protection it should provide, as the ranking Democrat of the Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment, I feel compelled to raise some of my concerns about this type of legislation.

The protection of ocean water quality has long been a responsibility and priority of our subcommittee through its jurisdiction over the Clean Water Act, the Ocean Dumping Act, and the Oil Pollution Act. For far too long our oceans were viewed as a convenient dumping ground for the wastes associated with human development.

As we have learned, those earlier practices were a mistake which we find ourselves continuing to correct to this day. With the Ocean Dumping Ban Act, the dumping of sewage sludge came to an end. Yet, our inadequate control of pollution associated with point and nonpoint sources, now largely controlled through the Clean Water Act, left us a legacy of contaminated sediments in our harbors, estuaries, and lakes.

Whether it is nonpoint source pollution, uncollected runoff from urban and rural areas, or collected runoff through storm sewers, we continue to allow sediments to enter our waterways and carry their pollution with them.

Too often when we discuss coastal and ocean issues we talk about treating the symptoms, but not the cause of the problems. Unless and until there are aggressive steps taken to address the pollution sources in our coastal areas, urban runoff, storm sewers, municipal sewage treatment plants, and agriculture, our coastal areas will continue to be under great stress.

Mr. Speaker, I must say, I feel strongly that, despite the necessity of this legislation I rise in support of today, our subcommittee's efforts are better directed toward advancing the cleanup of our Nation's waters. I am confident that the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT], the subcommittee chairman, shares my view, and that we will do so in this Congress by addressing the major sources of pollution in coastal areas.

However, while I sincerely hope the next time we are on the floor discussing the Clean Water Act it is with the intent of strengthening it, rather than to create waiver opportunities, I believe that the unique conditions at Mayàguez make H.R. 2207 an acceptable tradeoff. If the opportunity to apply for a permit under the deep ocean outfalls provision is needed to protect coral reef in Mayàguez, then that competing environmental concern is significant enough to warrant such action today.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I wish to assure my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, that I share his enthusiasm for moving with dispatch on reauthorization of the Clean Water Act. It is very important not just to our committee or to this Congress but to the Nation, and that is something that will have my undivided attention at the appropriate time. It looks like the appropriate time will be early in the next session of the House.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the hard work and dedication of our colleague, the gentleman from Puerto Rico [Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ]. He is working hard to improve the quality of the coastal environment and precious near shore reefs. This bill is the first step in protecting the coastal environment.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2207, the Coastal Pollution Reduction Act of 1997.

This bipartisan legislation, introduced by Representative ROMERO-BARCELO, amends the Clean Water Act to allow a community in Puerto Rico to apply to EPA for an alternative to secondary treatment requirements, subject to other requirements and conditions.

This bill could help save Mayaguez, PR up to $65 million by avoiding the construction of more costly facilities while including appropriate environmental safeguards. The flexibility to pursue reasonable alternatives makes economic and environmental sense.

Another provision, added in committee, modifies the Clean Water Act's National Estuary Program. The amendment would allow the use of Federal funds for implementation, as opposed to just development of comprehensive conservation and management plans [CCMP's]. This is a widely supported approach to protecting America's estuaries.

I want to assure my colleagues that nothing in this amendment in any way provides new authority or expands existing authority for land use regulation. The existing NEP has been successful to date, in part, because it avoids a Federal regulatory approach. This amendment simply allows the use of Federal funds and technical assistance under section 320 of the Clean Water Act so that State, local and regional interests can take CCMP's to the next step: implementation. I appreciate the assistance and cooperation of my friend and colleague, Representative DON YOUNG, who is also chairman of the House Resources Committee, for bringing to my attention the need to clarify this point.

I also want to commend the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR], the ranking Democrat of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee; the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT], the chairman of the Water Resources and Environment Subcommittee; and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BORSKI], the ranking Democrat of the Water Resources and Environment Subcommittee. They have been instrumental in moving this important legislation.

Finally, I would be remiss if I did not thank Representative ROMERO-BARCELO who is responsible for promoting this bill to address the needs of a particular community by increasing the flexibility of the Clean Water Act.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2207.

□ 1400

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. UPTON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2207, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. CONDIT. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2207, the bill just considered.

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

There was no objection.

MARTIN V. B. BOSTETTER, JR. UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE

Mr. KIM. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 819) to designate the United States courthouse at 200 South Washington Street in Alexandria, Virginia, as the ''Martin V. B. Bostetter, Jr. United States Courthouse.''

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 819

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

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION OF MARTIN V. B. BOSTETTER, JR. UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE.

The United States courthouse at 200 South Washington Street in Alexandria, Virginia, shall be known and designated as the ''Martin V. B. Bostetter, Jr. United States Courthouse''.

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the United States courthouse referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Martin V. B. Bostetter, Jr. United States Courthouse''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California [Mr. KIM] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. KIM].

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

Mr. Speaker, S. 819 designates the U.S. courthouse in Alexandria, VA, as the ''Martin V.B. Bostetter, Jr. United States Courthouse.''

Chief Judge Bostetter has served and continues to serve his country in many ways. Since 1952, Judge Bostetter's entire career has taken place within a radius of eight blocks in Old Town, Alexandria, VA. He served as the special assistant to the city attorney and associate judge of the municipal court.

In 1960, Judge Bostetter was appointed to the U.S. Bankruptcy Court and continues to serve as a judge for the U.S. Bankruptcy Court for the Eastern District of Virginia. He was appointed chief judge in February 1, 1985, and ranks among the longest sitting full-time bankruptcy judges in the United States.

This is a fitting tribute to such a distinguished jurist. I support this act and urge my colleagues to join in this support.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to join the gentleman from California [Mr. KIM] in supporting S. 819, a bill to designate the courthouse on South Washington Street in Alexandria, VA, in honor of Judge Martin Bostetter, Jr. He certainly deserves it.

I would also like to state that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN], one of my Democratic colleagues, has also introduced companion legislation, H.R. 1851, also a bill naming this courthouse in honor of Judge Martin Bostetter, Jr. I will include his written statement immediately after my remarks.

Judge Bostetter served the people of Virginia for over 40 years. He ranks among the longest sitting full-time bankruptcy judges in these United States. He has long been associated with and active in many civic and community organizations, including the Chamber of Commerce in Alexandria, the Alexandria Hospital, and the Alexandria Boys Club, to show the diversity of his involvement and his caring of the people whom he has served for so many years.

I am proud to join the gentleman from Virginia, [Mr. MORAN], Senator WARNER, and the gentleman from California, [Mr. KIM] in this legislation. I want to commend the gentleman from California [Mr. KIM] for the fine, expeditious job to bring this and other legislation forward.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today in support of S. 819. This legislation is identical to the bill I introduced June 10, 1997, naming the United States Court House on South Washington Street in Alexandria, Virginia the Chief Bankruptcy Judge Martin V. B. Bostetter, Jr. Court House. The Bostetter Court House will be a lasting reminder of the distinguished career of Judge Bostetter and commemorates his numerous contributions to bankruptcy law in Northern Virginia.

Judge Bostetter's distinguished legal career began in 1952 and took place entirely within an eight block radius of Old Town, Alexandria. He served as Special Assistant to the City Attorney of Alexandria in 1953 in the capacity of City Prosecutor. In 1957, he became an Associate Judge of Alexandria's Municipal court system. Judge Bostetter was then appointed to the United States Bankruptcy Court in 1959 and presently serves as a United States Bankruptcy Judge for the Eastern District of Virginia. In 1985, he was appointed Chief Judge and now ranks among the longest sitting full-time bankruptcy judges in the United States.

In 1959, Judge Bostetter established the First Bankruptcy Court in Alexandria, in the former Federal District Courthouse—38 years later he resides in the same building as the Chief Judge of the Bankruptcy Court for the Eastern District of Virginia. He has taken a special interest and great pride in the ongoing renovation of this historic building.

During his service on the bench, Chief Judge Bostetter has seen the Bankruptcy Court for the Eastern District of Virginia grow to three divisions with five full-time judges and staff, 90 employees in its Clerk's Office and an average of more than 2,600 bankruptcy filings per month. The Alexandria Division has two full-time judges, 22 employees and averages approximately 790 bankruptcy filings per month.

When Judge Bostetter began his career on the bench with approximately nine bankruptcy filings per month and one employee. He remained the only full time bankruptcy judge in Alexandria from July 1959 until December 1994. During the 1980's and early 1990's his case load swelled to about two times the volume expected for a single judge to preside over.

Chief Judge Bostetter has been a dedicated and loyal public servant, serving the people of Virginia faithfully with honor, integrity and distinction during his tenure as a bankruptcy judge. He has fulfilled his duties with a strong sense of fairness and pragmatism, while adhering to the constraints imposed by the Bankruptcy Code and related case law. Moreover, he has set very high standards for the lawyers who practice before him, thereby making those lawyers better prepared and more effective advocates for their respective client's interest.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to thank Transportation and Infrastructure Committee Chairman SHUSTER, Subcommittee Chairman JAY KIM and ranking members JIM OBERSTAR and JIM TRAFICANT, along with the committee and subcommittee staff for their efforts to bring this legislation to the floor. I truly appreciate their cooperation.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. KIM] that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 819.

The question was taken.

Mr. KIM. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KIM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may