

(The above nominations were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 894. A bill to establish a California Ocean Protection Zone, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. BOND:

S. 895. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to reduce the level of participation by the Small Business Administration in certain loans guaranteed by the Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. CHAFEE (for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. INOUE, Mr. BRADLEY, Mrs. KASSEBAUM, Mr. GLENN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. CRAIG, and Mr. SIMPSON):

S. 896. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to make certain technical corrections relating to physicians' services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 897. A bill to provide for a nationally coordinated program of research, promotion, and consumer information regarding kiwifruit for the purpose of expanding domestic and foreign markets for kiwifruit; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. MURKOWSKI (by request):

S. 898. A bill to amend the Helium Act to cease operation of the government helium refinery, authorize facility and crude helium disposal, and cancel the helium debt, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. ROTH (for himself, Mr. NICKLES, and Mr. PRESSLER):

S. 899. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prevent fraud and abuse involving the earned income tax credit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BENNETT (for himself and Mr. HATCH):

S. 900. A bill to amend the Reclamation Projects Authorization and Adjustment Act of 1992 to direct the Secretary of the Interior to allow for prepayment of repayment contracts between the United States and the Central Utah Water Conservancy District dated December 28, 1965, and November 26, 1985, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

S. 901. A bill to amend the Reclamation Projects Authorization and Adjustment Act of 1992 to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to participate in the design, planning, and construction of certain water reclamation and reuse projects and desalination research and development projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. COCHRAN:

S. 902. A bill to amend Public Law 100-479 to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to assist in the construction of a building to be used jointly by the Secretary for park purposes and by the city of Natchez as an intermodal transportation center, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. NICKLES (for Mr. DOLE):

S. Res. 129. A resolution to elect Kelly D. Johnston as Secretary of the Senate; considered and agreed to.

S. Res. 130. A resolution providing for notification to the President of the United States of the election of Secretary of the Senate; considered and agreed to.

S. Res. 131. A resolution providing for notification to the House of Representatives of the election of Secretary of the Senate; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. SANTORUM (for himself, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. SPECTER, and Mr. DODD):

S. Con. Res. 17. A concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the exhibition of the RAH-66 Comanche helicopter; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 894. A bill to establish a California ocean protection zone, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

THE CALIFORNIA OCEAN PROTECTION ACT OF 1995

• Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I am pleased to introduce today the California Ocean Protection Act of 1995. This act will provide permanent protection for California's Outer Continental Shelf [OCS] from the adverse effects of new offshore oil and gas development, deep-sea mining, at-sea incineration of toxic wastes, and harmful ocean dumping. This act will make management of the Federal OCS consistent with State-mandated protection of State waters.

This act recognizes that the resources of the lands offshore California, and of the Pacific Ocean itself, are priceless. This act recognizes that the real costs of offshore fossil fuel development, mining and toxic waste disposal far outweigh any benefits that might accrue from those activities. Finally, this act recognizes that renewable uses of the ocean and OCS lands are irreplaceable elements of a healthy, growing, California economy.

California's coast, from San Diego to Crescent City, is a natural marvel. From the white sand beaches and secluded coves of southern California, to the grandeur of Big Sur, to the wild, rocky north, this coast is one of the Earth's great wonders—enjoyed by Californians and visitors from around the globe alike. But the California coast is much more than a scenic treasure; it is a dynamic convergence of land and sea—a grand yet fragile system that ultimately depends on the health of the Pacific Ocean for its continued viability.

The cold, clear waters of the Pacific give life to a wealth of plant, fish, bird and marine mammal species. Some of those species in turn support Califor-

nia's multibillion-dollar fishing industry—an industry founded on renewable resource management. Clean Pacific waters also form the basis for California's coastal tourism industry—valued at over \$27 billion annually and creator of tens of thousands of jobs in California's economy.

Fishing and tourism are just two of the industries that we must weigh in the balance against non-sustainable, polluting uses of the ocean. The other values supported by an unpolluted Pacific are less easily quantified, but every bit as important. These values are economic, scientific and, indeed, spiritual. These are the values that have somehow gotten lost in the shuffle, as the Congress and past administrations have debated the issue of developing California's offshore resources.

When those values are added to the scales and weighed against the benefits to be obtained from non-sustainable exploitation, permanent protection becomes the only viable choice. Consider that if all the unleased areas of the California coast were suddenly opened to oil and gas development, we would produce less than 60 days of oil for the nation at current rates of consumption. Such production would come at the certain cost of oil spills, contamination by the toxic wastes and air emissions generated by offshore rigs and the increased risk of tanker accidents.

The Nation's interest in future energy security does not require that we pay those costs. Conservation measures are now available that will achieve far greater oil savings than the California OCS can produce, without the environmental risks brought by development. For example, raising CAFE standards to a readily achievable 40 miles per gallon would save 20 billion barrels of oil by 2020—over 18 times the estimated total California OCS reserves in unleased areas. And California is leading the nation in adopting an energy strategy that lessens our dependence on fossil fuels. Conservation programs already put in place by the State of California will save two billion barrels of oil over the next 20 years—almost twice the oil thought to lie in the State's frontier offshore areas.

The legislation I am introducing today would bring the Federal OCS program for California into line with protection now in place for State waters. The State legislature, working cooperatively with Gov. Pete Wilson, has acted to protect most areas of the State tidelands that had not already been protected from oil and gas development. The danger is that unless we act Federal development will render protection of State waters practically meaningless. To State the obvious: water flows. An oilspill in Federal waters offshore California can rapidly foul State beaches, contaminate nutrient-rich ocean upwellings upon which California's fishing industry depends