

and not the refiners and processors. I do not fault them for their support of this amendment and the desired changes they seek in the sugar program, and I know we will work together on future issues of mutual concern.

I believe the virtual elimination of this program as now proposed would place the U.S. sugar industry as a whole, and the American consumer in particular, at the mercy of the inconsistent and heavily subsidized world sugar market.

Unlike my colleagues who support the amendment, I simply do not believe the American consumer is likely to realize a significant, if any, benefit should the amendment prevail. But, I am concerned that the domestic producers of sugar could suffer from reduced prices and would be made particularly vulnerable to foreign sources of sugar.

While refiners may pass along their savings, I seriously doubt many processors are likely to reciprocate. While the cumulative amounts being banded about today are significant, and represent real money regardless of one's social standing, the bottom-line is that we are talking about pennies or fractions of pennies on a commodity basis.

Quite frankly, I do not even know how one would calculate the savings that say a manufacturer should pass along for their finished product that now may cost them a fraction of a cent less to produce. Are we likely to see cans of soda from a machine selling for 59 cents instead of 60 cents?

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I would like to refer to some very basic statistics which I believe make clear the short-sightedness of the amendment.

The current sugar program operates at no cost to the Federal Government, and a special marketing tax on sugar farmers is earmarked for deficit reduction;

U.S. consumers pay an average of 25–28 cents less for sugar than do shoppers in other developed countries;

From 1990 to 1995, the retail price of sugar actually decreased approximately 7 percent;

U.S. retail sugar prices are approximately 32 percent below the average of other developed countries and the third lowest in the developed world;

New York consumers pay 5 percent less for sugar than the average consumer worldwide;

Close to a billion dollars are generated each year by the U.S. sugar industry in the State of New York alone; and, finally,

More than 5,690 jobs in New York State rely on the sugar industry.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment, and cast a vote in favor of a strong, fair and balanced domestic sugar program and product to the American farmer.

A BILL TO AMEND THE FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT

HON. CARLOS A. ROMERO-BARCELÓ

OF PUERTO RICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1997

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ. Mr. Speaker, today, as the sole representative of the 3.8 million disenfranchised U.S. citizens living in Puerto Rico, I am introducing a bill to amend section 301(h) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act that would allow the Puerto Rico

Aqueduct and Sewer Authority [PRASA] to apply for a waiver from certain wastewater treatment requirements affecting its Mayaguez facility.

Under existing law the Environmental Protection Agency [EPA] is not allowed to accept new applications for waivers from secondary treatment requirements. The proposal does not alter the rigorous criteria for issuing a waiver nor does it override the judgment of EPA. Our proposal reflects the goal of both Congress and the administration to find innovative, alternative and less-costly ways to apply existing statutes without compromising the environmental objectives underlying existing law.

Many scientists and experts agree that plans to construct deep ocean outfalls at locations can provide the best environmental and economic alternative for wastewater treatment. The plans would not only preserve but would even improve the coastal environments where these discharges occur.

PRASA proposes the construction of a deep ocean outfall that would release primary treated wastewater miles from shore at a depth and location that will have no adverse impact on human and marine life.

This alternative would improve the coral environment where the current outfall discharges and would also save the Government of Puerto Rico about \$65 million over 20 years that can be spent to address other water supply and infrastructure problems affecting the island.

EPA and the Department of Justice have agreed to enter into a consent order with PRASA that provides for deep water ocean outfall alternative to a secondary treatment plant. However, this alternative cannot even be considered without this legislation; and under the terms of the consent order, this alternative can only be considered if this legislation is enacted by August 1, 1998.

PRASA is currently conducting an Environmental Impact Statement review to assess relative benefits of the two treatment alternatives. This EIS will be completed before August 1, 1998 and will help EPA determine which alternative is preferable. If this legislation is enacted, EPA will have this choice; if it is not enacted, there will be no choice, regardless of the environmental or economic consequences. This is what this proposal will accomplish. It is a sound approach to environmental regulations.

It is imperative to stress the fact that this is only a limited and technical amendment that allows PRASA to refile under section 301(h). PRASA would be required by EPA to meet the same stringent legal and scientific tests, conduct the same environmental studies and implement the same monitoring program applicable to existing recipients of section 301(h) waivers. This amendment would not assure that a waiver would be granted; that decision would remain entirely within EPA's discretion.

EPA will be the ultimate decisionmaker, and will determine if PRASA's proposed alternative is feasible and environmentally beneficial. If after the review, that alternative is acceptable, then PRASA will immediately begin construction on the facility, with discharge location approved by the EPA. If EPA finds the alternative unacceptable, then PRASA will proceed with construction of the secondary treatment plant.

Puerto Rico is not asking for preferential treatment. Rather, we are only requesting that

EPA balance the cost of constructing a secondary treatment facility against the environmental, economic, and social benefits of constructing an outfall at a deep water location.

There are precedents for such limited amendment to section 301(h), recently for San Diego during the 105th Congress. In the instance of San Diego, legislation was enacted to permit EPA to consider a section 301(h) waiver application proposing a similar alternative to secondary treatment. I believe we deserve the same opportunity to implement alternatives and seek a section 301(h) waiver.

My environmental record speaks for itself. I would not support any measure that I believe compromises our resources or the environment of the island. I urge my colleagues to consider this proposal and its commonsense approach. The proposal is limited and targeted, provides for an efficient process, does not modify existing standards and would be implemented by EPA only if environmental and economic objectives are accomplished. I am hopeful that it will receive favorable congressional action at an early date.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOHN J. LaFALCE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1997

Mr. LaFALCE. Mr. Speaker, last week I missed a series of postponed votes because my pager did not function. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on Rollcall No. 270, "no" on Rollcall No. 271, "no" on Rollcall No. 272, and "no" on Rollcall No. 273.

A TRIBUTE TO LEWIS H. VAN DUSEN, JR.

HON. JON D. FOX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1997

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to tell you that Lewis Harlow Van Dusen, Jr., of Pennsylvania is this year's winner of the American Bar Association's Michael Franck Professional Responsibility Award. This important award is given annually by the American Bar Association to a lawyer for outstanding contribution to the field of professional responsibility. The award is to be formally presented to Mr. Van Dusen by N. Lee Cooper, the president of the ABA, on Friday, August 1 in San Francisco, CA, in connection with the American Bar Association's annual meeting.

Mr. Van Dusen received his undergraduate degree from Princeton University and his bachelor of civil law from Oxford University in England. He served with distinction on the American Bar Association's Standing Committee on Ethics and Professional Responsibility longer than any lawyer in the history of the ABA except his own partner, Henry S. Drinker—from 1953 to 1956 and then again from 1962 to 1974, chairing the committee for the last 3 years. During his tenure the ABA adopted the model code of professional responsibility which is still the current ethics code in a dozen jurisdictions. The committee, under Van