

the bill will grant decedents of the Cheyenne and Arapaho tribes access to allow traditional observances on the land.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this legislation is long overdue, and this bill appropriately recognizes the massacre.

“CALIFORNIA RECLAIMED WATER
ACT FOR THE 21ST CENTURY”

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 2000

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join Senator BARBARA BOXER in introducing the California Reclaimed Water Act for the 21st Century.

The recent string of wet winters in California should not let us forget that water shortages and drought are quite normal in our State. I strongly believe that investment in reclaimed water technology—water recycling—can help us “drought-proof” any of our community water supplies in California.

Projects that recycle water result in a net increase in available local water supplies and can decrease the need for water that must be supplied and often imported from other sources. Because wastewater for recycling is available even when other water supplies are diminished, recycled water can assist in providing a long-term, reliable, local source of water even during droughts.

Our farmers, urban dwellers, sport and commercial fishing interests, tribes, mountain communities and environmentalists all seek a more reliable and a more certain water future. Recycled water plays an important part in meeting California’s water needs today and will play an even more important role in the next several decades.

About 3% of the water supply in the San Francisco Bay Area is now recycled. Water managers hope that eventually as much as 40% of the water will be recycled, perhaps as much as 500,000 acre-feet per year. California cities need planning help and financial assistance to find markets for the recycled water, and to construct the treatment and conveyance facilities needed to get the treated water to identified markets.

Recycled water can be used for irrigation of golf courses, parks, school lands, business campuses, and highway medians, and for groundwater recharge, wetlands development, and industrial purposes. We have to start thinking about recycled water as a critical component of the water supply picture in California.

Californians and government agencies have recently affirmed their support for water recycling, first with the passage of the California water bond last March, and more recently with the approval of the CALFED water agreement which broadly sets a course for California’s water future. Water recycling and reuse is a major element of both these new actions and policies.

The Federal government’s support for water recycling was initially authorized in the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act of 1992. The Bureau of Reclamation’s so-called “Title XVI” program origi-

nally approved financial assistance for planning, design and construction of four water recycling projects in California. More projects were approved in 1996.

The legislation I introduce today builds upon these Congressional efforts, voter ballot initiatives and agency studies. Senator BARBARA BOXER has today introduced identical legislation in the U.S. Senate.

The bill authorizes a series of new Title XVI water recycling projects and directs the Secretary of the Interior to work with various water districts throughout the State on water recycling activities. Specific projects included in the bill are: Castaic Lake Water Agency; Clear Lake Basin Water Reuse Project; San Ramon Valley Recycled Water Project; Inland Empire Regional Water Recycling Project; San Pablo Baylands Water Reuse Project in Sonoma, Napa, Marin and Solano Counties; State of California Water Recycling Program; Regional Brine Lines (salt removal) in Southern California and in the San Francisco Bay and the Santa Clara Valley areas; Lower Chino Dairy Area Desalination Demonstration and Reclamation Project; and the West Basin Comprehensive Desalination Demonstration Program.

These projects will have the capacity to produce hundreds of thousands of acre-feet of useable water. Each acre-foot of recycled water produced by these projects will reduce the demand in California for imported water from the Bay-Delta and the Colorado River.

Unlike traditional Bureau of Reclamation water projects, these water recycling projects require a majority of funds to be locally provided. Consistent with Title XVI limitations on recycling projects as authorized in 1992 and 1996, the projects proposed in my bill require 75% local funding. Federal cost sharing is limited to 25%. Moreover, this bill specifies that none of the funds can be used for annual operation and maintenance costs. Those annual expenses are the responsibility of the local water districts or management agency.

I strongly believe that water recycling will continue to play an important and growing role in total water management strategies to provide a safe and sustainable water supply in California and in many other parts of the country. The water recycling projects authorized by the legislation I am introducing today are part of a long-term solution to some of California’s most difficult challenges. Water recycling is not the only solution. But, water recycling and water reuse can play a significant part as these projects can be designed, built, and placed in service within a short time.

CONCERNING VIOLENCE IN
MIDDLE EAST

SPEECH OF

HON. CAROLYN C. KILPATRICK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2000

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to House Concurrent Resolution 426, Concerning the Violence in the Middle East.

It is truly disheartening to witness the renewed violence that has plagued Israel and

the Palestinian territories for nearly thirty days. World leaders, especially President Clinton and United Nations Secretary-General Kofi Annan, have made numerous attempts to engage the Israeli and Palestinian leaders in negotiations toward an immediate cease-fire agreement that can realistically be implemented. Unfortunately, the latest emergency summit that took place in Egypt on October 16 had little impact on the cessation of violence or the pacification of hostilities.

The United States, as one of the foremost advocates of a sustainable Middle East peace agreement, must be very careful not to actively create conditions which defeat the very progress we are trying to achieve. H. Con. Res. 426 suggests that Palestinian Authority Chairman Yasser Arafat and the Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO) are the sole parties responsible for the current tragic state of affairs. By supporting this type of inaccurate portrayal, we damage our credibility as a neutral party genuinely seeking to bring about a peaceful solution to an extremely volatile situation.

On October 4, 2000, the United Nations Security Council passed Resolution 1322, condemning the surging violence by both Israelis and Palestinians, and the destruction of holy sites in the city of Jerusalem. This resolution passed the Security Council without a single opposing vote—the United States was the only nation to abstain. Due to language in the UN measure regarding the provocation of violence by Likud Party leader Ariel Sharon, and the excessive use of force against Palestinian civilians by Israeli troops, H. Con. Res. 426 expresses its desire for the President exercise UN veto power to “ensure that the Security Council does not again adopt unbalanced resolutions addressing the uncontrolled violence in the areas controlled by the Palestinian Authority.” Yet H. Con. Res. 426 itself is undeniably unbalanced and fails to acknowledge any responsibility on the part of Israel.

The conflict in the Holy Land has endured far too long, resulting in the unnecessary loss of human life, creating a rift between ethnic and religious groups, and eroding the historic and aesthetic attributes of the area. A lasting peace agreement will require the commitment of both Israeli and Palestinian leaders and citizens. At this fragile moment in Middle East history, let us not assign blame to one group or another, but rather suggest shared responsibility. The goal of the U.S. is to foster mutual, unwavering effort on the part of both parties to desist from violence and to accept negotiation as the only means of political action.

Last month, I further demonstrated my commitment to the negotiation process by supporting H.R. 5272, the Peace Through Negotiations Act of 2000. This measure strongly encourages the Palestinian Authority not to undermine the prospects of peace by unilaterally declaring Palestinian Statehood. Before the United States can be accepted as an honest broker in these or any negotiations, it must demonstrate an even-handed approach with both parties. H. Con. Res. 426 undercuts this goal.

I extend my heartfelt condolences to the surviving family members of the individuals killed on both sides of the conflict. May the memory of those victims serve as a catalyst to end the cycle of violence.