United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 145 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, APRIL 29, 1999 No. 60

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m.

The Chaplain, Reverend James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

We know that in our prayers we can speak to You, O God, with any words we wish and with any thoughts we care to think. Give us boldness and honesty in our prayers so that we truly speak what is in our hearts. And give us wisdom in our minds so that in all things we may do justice, love mercy, and ever walk humbly with You. This is our earnest prayer. Amen.

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.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. GREEN of Texas 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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain 10 one-minutes on each side.

NEVADA TRAVEL AND TOURISM

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, today on behalf of the great State of Nevada, I would like to personally thank the travel and tourism industry because of its lasting partnership and patronage.

Nevada ranks sixth in both direct domestic and international travel spending among all 50 States. Total travel expenditures in Nevada exceed $17 billion, travel payroll climbed well over $5 billion, and it employed more than 307,000 people.

To this effect I would like to specifically recognize the Grand Canyon Air Tour Industry which has served southern Nevada and the Grand Canyon for more than 70 years. This service provides enjoyment to over 800,000 passengers annually, of which 30 percent are over the age of 50, to the outstanding air tours of the Grand Canyon, truly one of America's most treasured sites.

Without the Grand Canyon tour industry, many handicapped would never be able to enjoy the deep, colored canyons or the magnificent raging Colorado River.

Again on behalf of my constituents and the many tourists who visit southern Nevada, thank you for your economic contributions and your continued steadfast service.

HOUSE SENDS TERRIBLE MESSAGE REGARDING KOSOVO

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

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, I was elected to Congress 6 years ago and I came to Washington to work on health care and education for our children. But yesterday was one of the worst days I have served in 26 years of elected office. What a terrible message this House sent yesterday to our men and women serving our country in the Balkan conflict. The quote I heard ''taking ownership of this war'' by my Republican colleagues should be unacceptable, not only to myself but the American people. Our country's finest young men and women serving our Nation deserve more than politics as usual on this floor of the House. This reminds me of World War II when my Republican colleagues referred to World War II as ''Mr. Roosevelt's war.''

Please put your hatred aside for this President and realize that this conflict was not started by Bill Clinton, it was started by Serbia's murderers of civilians, and it was started by our commitment to NATO and to our allies who have protected us for 50 years from communism. Now your hatred of Bill Clinton is giving hope to our Nation's enemies who are trying to shoot down our men and women literally as we stand here today.

Please think and reflect on your action because our service people are in harm's way.

ON ORIOLES-CUBA BASEBALL GAME

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, it is ironic that as NATO forces are bombing the Butcher of the Balkans, the Clinton administration is cozying up to the Butcher of the Caribbean, Cuba's Fidel Castro.

In the aftermath of the tragedy in Colorado as we search for answers and discuss role models and values, it is ironic that the United States is preparing to play ball with the regime that violates the human rights and civil liberties of its people.

Monday's game between the Baltimore Orioles and the Cuban team will send a message to our children that America's pastime can also be an instrument for dictators; that money, power and individual interests are more important than freedom and democracy for the oppressed people of Cuba.

Printed on recycled paper.

The May 3rd game, as the one played in Cuba, will be a political and public relations home run for Fidel Castro but it will be a strikeout for political prisoners, for human rights dissidents and the Cuban people as a whole.

Let us send the right message to our young people and to the international community as a whole that the U.S., its institutions and its symbols will not be accessories to the crimes committed by the Castro regime and that we will not be manipulated into covering up those crimes.

PRESIDENTIAL ASSAILANT JOHN HINCKLEY VACATIONS ON TAXPAYER DOLLARS

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Madam Speaker, John Hinckley shot President Reagan with intent to kill. He was acquitted by reason of insanity and confined to a hospital where after a routine search they found correspondence between Hinckley and mass murderers Charles Manson and Ted Bundy.

But despite all of this, a Federal judge ruled that Hinckley is not an inmate, that Hinckley is a guest and is thus entitled to supervised leave privileges.

Beam me up. Is it any wonder what is happening to our society? Hinckley, who shot the President with intent to kill, is now enjoying weekends in the country. What is next, Disney World?

I yield back the tragic ordeal of James Brady and the two policemen also shot by this bum now vacationing on taxpayer dollars.

GEORGIA TRAVEL AND TOURISM

(Mr. DEAL of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the travel and tourism industry in my State of Georgia and in my Ninth District. It is an industry that contributes some 190,000 jobs in my State.

My district is blessed to be the home of Lake Lanier which is the most visited Corps of Engineers lake in the United States and has some $2 billion of economic impact annually. We also have some 750,000 acres of the Chattahoochee National Forest.

The Appalachian Trail begins at Springer Mountain in my district and ends some 2,100 plus miles later in Maine.

We also have the Etowah Indian Mound and the Tallulah Gorge State Park. And in Dahlonega, Georgia, the first actual gold rush in our country was ignited there in 1828. The gold museum there is the second most visited museum in our State.

We also have the Chickamauga-Chattanooga National Battle Park which is the first military park in our Nation that celebrates the fact that it was a bloody 2 days in which over 35,000 men were either killed, wounded or missing. We have visitors that come from all over the world to visit that park.

A number of other attractions include our Prater's Mill, Chief Vann House and others. It is absolutely the reason why the tourism industry is referred to as America's largest services export.

U.S. ROLE IN KOSOVO TURNED INTO PARTISAN POLITICAL CONTEST

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

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam Speaker, yesterday Republicans turned the question of ethnic cleansing, NATO's future and America's role in the world into a partisan political contest. Well over 30 Republican Members switched their votes from supporting the air strikes to ending the conflict yesterday so that they could vote against President Clinton.

Now, after having voted in a way that is totally inconsistent and having voted, some of them actually voted to not only not withdraw the troops in Campbell I and then not to declare war and then they voted at the end not to support the President's air campaign to end the ethnic cleansing, to end the genocide, they want to load the appropriations bill that the President proposes to try to sustain our troops in the field and take it from $6 billion to $12 billion, all of it coming from Social Security.

It is inconceivable to be spending twice the amount the President asked for when you are not even willing to vote to stop the ethnic cleansing in Kosovo. It is outrageous and it cannot be tolerated.

SALUTING UNIONVILLE HIGH SCHOOL'S ''MAKE A DIFFERENCE'' PROGRAM

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

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, last week I visited a high school in my district that was a great encouragement to me in the aftermath of the horrible tragedy in Littleton, Colorado.

As I met with several English honors classes at Unionville High School in Pennsylvania, I witnessed presentations by students who shared the results of community service assignments called ''Make A Difference'' projects. From planting trees to stream clean-up, to adopting a needy family, raising money to pay utility bills for a poor family, these kids did it all. Volunteering with school tutoring, helping a Salvation Army food bank, even sharing the joy of music with seniors at a nursing home, all of these activities gave the students a new perspective.

I listened to these thoughtful, well-organized and poised presentations about the lessons these students learned and the benefits of giving themselves to help others.

There are many wonderful people across this Nation who are making a difference in our neighborhoods, including students. We need to continue to praise our kids and teachers and remind them of the importance of their contributions to our communities.

Thank you, Unionville High School, Mrs. Sheeler and students. Keep it up.

AN INFAMOUS MOMENT IN THE HOUSE

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

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Speaker, last night's vote failing to support the NATO air campaign against Milosevic was an infamous moment in this House. The majority proclaims its support for the troops but will not support what the troops are now risking their lives to do. The majority wants to double appropriations for an effort most of them apparently oppose. What is left for bipartisanship when the Republican majority will not use it in times as these? For them, there seems no water's edge. They mock the memory of that great Republican Senator from my home State, Arthur Vandenberg.

TOO MANY MISSIONS, TOO FEW RESOURCES

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

Mr. SCHAFFER. Madam Speaker, our military problem is simple: too many missions, too few resources. This administration adds new missions every year and then gives the Pentagon fewer resources to accomplish them. And then to add insult to injury, our own continent remains vulnerable to a ballistic missile attack. A national missile defense system remains unbuilt, sacrificed on the altar of arms control. Instead of an America safe from a missile attack, we have a contract, a piece of paper with a country that no longer exists, the Soviet Union. That piece of paper, known as the ABM Treaty, does not keep America safe. It cannot protect us from the evil designs of Osama bin Laden, Saddam Hussein and other world troublemakers who hate America and despise the very liberty we represent.

Tyrannical regimes cannot abide the idea of liberty. The existence of liberty is a threat to the power of the despots, tyrants and dictators.

Meanwhile, as the world becomes a dangerous place, our military is ignored and a national missile defense system is rejected. This is the path of dangerous folly.

HOUSE VOTES REGARDING KOSOVO

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

Mr. POMEROY. Madam Speaker, there is a vile partisanship in this Chamber. We may have a new Speaker, but make no mistake about it, we have the same utterly dysfunctional leadership that saw us through government shutdowns and that made a partisan mockery out of the constitutional impeachment responsibility in this body.

Yesterday more than 30 Members of the majority voted against stopping U.S. participation in the NATO action, against the horrendous ethnic cleansing of Slobodan Milosevic, but then refused to vote for a resolution in support of the NATO action. There can only be one explanation for the House vote against the NATO campaign. The Republican majority will seize any opportunity to strike at President Clinton, even if it means giving encouragement to such a vile criminal as Slobodan Milosevic. Our national interest must rise above our partisan inclinations. The memory of those killed and raped in Kosovo and the support of the brave men and women carrying out this mission on NATO's behalf deserve better than this vote.

□ 1015

MANY LIBERALS IN EDUCATION HAVE HOSTILE ATTITUDES TOWARDS PEOPLE WITH RELIGIOUSLY-INSPIRED VALUES

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

Mr. TIAHRT. Madam Speaker, the recent tragedy in Littleton, Colorado, points to an issue that has gone unaddressed for too long. Too many of our public schools are unsafe, and this is unacceptable.

What kind of system is it that allows kids to quote Hitler in the hallway, but which would see students get hauled into the principal's office for quoting the bible in the classroom? The pendulum has swung too far to the left.

Madam Speaker, many Americans believe that America has lost its way when our schools ignore the morals and the values that built this great Nation. But too many of the liberals in education have such a hostile attitude towards religion that they can not even conceive of a tolerant, multi-denominational religious presence in the public square which does not harm anyone's rights. Their caricatures of religious people are nothing but unfair stereotypes, and they falsely portray the agenda of ordinary people who think that religiously-inspired values are something to be proud of and something that has always made America great.

There is no magic solution for the problems we face in schools, but it is time for the pendulum to swing the other way, back to the virtues and the values that built this great Nation.

COST OF FAILURE INFINITELY GREATER THAN THE PRICE OF VICTORY

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

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, Dante said that nothing was necessary for the spread of evil but that good men do nothing.

Yesterday, last night, shamefully the House of Representatives voted to do nothing. It sent an uncertain trumpet, not only to our NATO allies, but to one of the evils of this world: Slobodan Milosevic.

Let me read from a speech given by JOHN MCCAIN, not a member of my party, but one of this body, the Congress of the United States, that knows about war and knows about the American interest, not the partisan political interest. He said this:

Let me close by saying that both the Congress and the administration must show resolve and the confidence of a superpower. Our cause is just, and our early success is imperative. Let us keep our nerve and see the things through to the end. No matter how awful the images of war appear on television, the cost of failure, JOHN MCCAIN said correctly, are infinitely greater than the price of victory.

Madam Speaker, we failed last night. Let us not fail in the days ahead.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). Members should avoid references to members of the other body.

REPUBLICAN COMPLAINTS ABOUT ABUNDANT MILITARY SHORTAGES MET WITH SILENCE AT THE WHITE HOUSE

(Mr. BALLENGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BALLENGER. Madam Speaker, the war in Kosovo has exposed a military readiness and national security vulnerability that must be removed. Evidence of our current military shortage is abundant:

We are dangerously close to running out of air-launched cruise missiles, a situation unthinkable in the days of Ronald Reagan's strong leadership. More than half of the B1–B bombers in Ellsworth Air Force Base are not mission capable because they lack critical parts. We are diverting planes from their patrols over the Iraqi no-fly zone in order to fill out the Kosovo mission.

Republican complaints and oversight hearings about this deteriorating situation over the past 6 years have been met with silence in the White House and indifference in the press. No one seems to care. For four straight years, four straight years, the Republican Congress appropriated more money for defense than the President requested. But each year it is more of the same: an inadequate defense budget and insufficient resources.

Now will the President finally care?

INTRODUCTION OF THE RURAL TEACHERS' RECRUITMENT ACT OF 1999

(Mrs. CLAYTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CLAYTON. Madam Speaker, today I am introducing the Rural Teachers' Recruitment Act of 1999, a much needed measure designed to address teacher shortage, recruitment and retention. Recruiting and retaining quality teachers is so important and difficult in schools across the country. Accomplishing this goal in rural areas is even a greater task.

Madam Speaker, there is little motivation for teachers to teach and to remain in rural areas. My bill offers an incentive to teachers to teach in these unrepresented areas.

The Rural Teachers' Recruitment Act of 1999 allows rural local education agencies to submit an application to the Secretary of the Department of Education for a grant to develop incentives that they like for whatever they like, for recruitment and retaining teachers and providing opportunities.

As we move in the 21st century, it is time to ensure that we have talented, dedicated and qualified teachers. We must give these new teachers a reason to favor providing instruction in our rural areas. We must reduce the shortage of quality teachers in areas where they are most needed. Without these teachers, our communities and children are the ones who suffer.

Madam Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues in rural areas and urban areas to support my bill, the Rural Teachers' Recruitment Act of 1999.

LAST NIGHT'S APPALLING VOTE

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, what have we wrought? I ended my time on the floor last night by speaking to this body of my shock and appall at our vote not to support those military men and women trying to save lives in the Kosovo area.

It is interesting, having gone to the Hershey retreat to uphold and promote bipartisanship, that yesterday I saw the crumbling edges of bipartisanship. I saw the repeat of the impeachment vote, the undermining of a President, not because one found good reason that there was no basis for this onslaught that is going on or this attack that is

going on in Kosovo because of the enormous loss of life, but because we simply do not like him.

Madam Speaker, it is a shame that we would fall to partisanship while thousands and thousands and hundreds of thousands of women and children are being murdered and moved from their homes. What have we wrought?

Martin Luther King said injustice anywhere is injustice everywhere. My question to my Republican friends: Where is the outrage?

Stop the partisanship. Let us unify around saving lives, and standing up for American principles and believing that we must fight this humanitarian war.

CALLING ON THE PRESIDENT TO PROVIDE LEADERSHIP

(Mr. BLUNT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BLUNT. Madam Speaker, there was no vote taken yesterday not to support our military. There was a vote taken not to endorse a policy that we should have been asked weeks ago before the bombing started to be part of. There was a vote not to endorse a policy that has not been explained to this Congress the way it should have been explained by the administration.

We have heard of vile partisanship on this House yesterday, but over 2 dozen members of the Democratic party voted with Republicans, Republicans voted with Democrats. We would be glad to have those 2 dozen members of that party if they do not want them.

This was not a statement about vile partisanship. This was a statement about principle. This is about whether foreign policy is driven by the Constitution or by CNN, and the Constitution says the President and the Congress should be involved in that.

I call on the President to provide the leadership that this Congress needs.

THIS PLACE IS GETTING CURIOUSER AND CURIOUSER

(Mr. MCDERMOTT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, yesterday, as I listened to that debate, I thought of my time in the Vietnam war when I listened to soldiers and sailors and marines talk about what it was like fighting a war when the American people did not support them. I got to wonder what people think sitting on the flight line in Aviano in Italy today, asking themselves:

Where is the Congress? Are we going out there risking our lives, and they do not support us?

Now I watched last night when the leadership of this House stood by that back retail and did not turn a single vote around. Amazing. One can be the leader of this House, and they cannot change a single vote. They do not even speak to anybody to change a vote.

Now next week we will see it all different. Then we will have an appropriations act out here, and we will want to give money to an effort that we do not support.

Madam Speaker, Lewis Carroll must be writing the script because this place is getting curiouser and curiouser.

WHY IS SPARTANBURG HIGH SCHOOL SO SUCCESSFUL?

(Mr. DEMINT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DEMINT. Madam Speaker, on a more positive note, the upstate region of South Carolina is home to Spartanburg High School, a four-time winner of the National Blue Ribbon Award. It is the only school in our Nation to achieve this honor four times.

Why Spartanburg High so successful? Caring parents, quality students, committed teachers, creative administrators, an active school board and encouraging community. The people have taken control of their school and have succeeded in spite of misguided federal programs and paperwork.

Do not just take my word for it. Yesterday the Spartanburg Herald Journal wrote an editorial praising Congress for passing legislation to give schools more flexibility. It read:

Federal lawmakers need to do more to free state and local educators so they can run their schools as they see fit. Education is a State and local matter.

I could not have said it better myself.

LAST NIGHT'S VOTE NOT TO SUPPORT NATO

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

Mr. PASTOR. Madam Speaker, I could understand a year ago when the majority, because of their hate for President Clinton, made the impeachment process a partisan procedure. But last night I could not believe that the vote to not support NATO was done because of the hate the majority has for the President.

What message have we sent to NATO? What message have we sent to our troops? That we do not support them.

The ironic thing is today, this afternoon, I am going to be asked to vote on the supplemental that doubles the request, and yet I am being asked to vote for a supplemental that the majority does not support, does not support the action of the NATO cause.

In the words of the great Congressman, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT), all I can say is:

Beam me up, Scotty.

AMENDING RULES OF HOUSE FOR 106TH CONGRESS

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules be discharged from further consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 153) amending House Resolution 5, One Hundred Sixth Congress, as amended by House Resolution 129, One Hundred Sixth Congress, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 153

Resolved,

SECTION 1. AMENDMENT OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 5.

Section 2(f)(1) of House Resolution 5, One Hundred Sixth Congress, agreed to January 6, 1999 (as amended by House Resolution 129, One Hundred Sixth Congress, agreed to March 24, 1999), is amended by striking ''April 30, 1999'' and inserting ''May 14, 1999''.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1999

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 154 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 154

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1480) to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the United States Army Corps of Engineers to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure now printed in the bill, modified by the amendments printed in part 1 of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part 2 of the report of the Committee on Rules. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent,

shall not be subject to an amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. The chairman of the Committee of the Whole may: (1) postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment; and (2) reduce to five minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any postponed question that follows another electronic vote without intervening business, provided that the minimum time for electronic voting on the first in any series of questions shall be 15 minutes. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendments the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

□ 1030

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). The gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, for purposes 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.

(Mr. HASTINGS of Washington asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, H.R. 154 is a structured rule providing 1 hour of general debate to be equally divided and controlled between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. The rule makes in order the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure amendment in the nature of a substitute as an original bill for the purposes of amendment, modified by the amendments printed in part 1 of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution.

The rule waives points of order against consideration of the amendment in the nature of a substitute and makes in order only those amendments printed in part 2 of the Committee on Rules report accompanying the resolution.

Furthermore, the rule provides that amendments made in order may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by the Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by an opponent and proponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to demand for a division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

The rule allows for the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole to postpone votes during consideration of the bill and to reduce voting time to 5 minutes on a postponed question if the vote follows a 15 minute vote.

Finally, the rule provides for one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Madam Speaker, the Water Resources Development Act of 1999, H.R. 1480, is the culmination of work that was begun in the 105th Congress on a variety of Bureau of Reclamation and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers water projects. In fact, I would like to take this opportunity to commend the chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and all committee members for their hard work on this important legislation.

The maintenance and improvement of water resource infrastructure is vital to the residents in my own district and to the people and economy of the entire Nation as a whole.

Specifically, H.R. 1480 authorizes 95 new water resource projects, makes necessary modifications to six existing projects, and authorizes the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to conduct 26 studies on a variety of water resource issues. The bill authorizes $1.9 billion for these development projects, which are funded on a cost-share basis with non-Federal partners. These projects are being authorized only after detailed feasibility studies conducted by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and by a careful review of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

H.R. 1480 also addresses the concerns of those who believe that past water resource projects have had unintended impacts on the environment. In particular, the bill establishes a pilot program to explore the feasibility of natural flood control methods, and it makes it easier for nonprofit organizations to participate in U.S. Army Corps of Engineers environmental programs.

Madam Speaker, passage of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 will allow needed maintenance and improvements to our Nation's navigation, irrigation, flood control and power generation infrastructure to move forward. I therefore encourage my colleagues to support H. Res. 154, which I believe is a fair rule, and to support the underlying legislation.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I am supporting this rule, in spite of the fact that the rule is not open and it does limit amendments to those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules. While I am perfectly aware that every amendment submitted to the Committee on Rules was made in order, the committee's ranking member, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) did point out at the Committee on Rules hearing last night that water resources bills are nearly always considered under open rules, or, in some cases, under suspension of the rules.

The Democratic members of the Committee on Rules would not ordinarily support closing down a rule on legislation as important as this water resources development bill. In this case, however, we will not oppose the rule. This is because the majority and minority on the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure have worked diligently to reach a number of compromises on controversial positions in the committee reported bill, and because every amendment submitted to the Committee on Rules has been made in order either in the manager's amendment or as a freestanding amendment.

The major controversy in the committee reported bill has been resolved in an amendment which will be self-executed into the text of the bill by virtue of adoption of the rule. The rule self-executes an amendment which removes language that would have allowed one Member to further development in his district at the expense of his neighbors along the Sacramento and American Rivers. I would like to commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) and the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TAUSCHER) for their willingness to work out an agreement on this thorny issue.

In spite of this compromise, the bill does not satisfactorily resolve the issue of flood control for the city of Sacramento, California. Flood control has been and remains a serious and potentially deadly issue for Sacramento. Quite frankly, the flood protection provided in the bill is inadequate, but an amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) seeks to improve those flood protection provisions and deserves the support of the House.

Madam Speaker, I would like to point out that there are many provisions in this legislation that are strongly supported by communities across the country. In particular, the committee has responded to the request of a community in my congressional district to alter the original flood control plans of the Corps of Engineers.

The city of Arlington, Texas, had requested that the committee include a locally preferred plan for flood control for Johnson Creek, a tributary of the Trinity River which flows through the cities of Arlington and Grand Prairie, in lieu of the original Corps plan.

This locally preferred plan, which will have a total cost of $20 million and a Federal share of $12 million, would allow the city of Arlington to include recreational facilities and environmental restoration along Johnson Creek, which will benefit the residents of that city on an ongoing basis, while assuring that adequate flood control will protect life and property in the surrounding area. I am particularly pleased that this amendment to the

plan and the funding for it have been included in H.R. 1480.

Madam Speaker, I know that the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman SHUSTER) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) are eager to move their legislation, especially now that the controversy on the Sacramento and American Rivers has been resolved. However, I must again point out that a bill like water resources really should be considered under an open rule.

Madam Speaker, that being said, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules.

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

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this rule, and I congratulate my friends on both sides of the aisle for their management of it. I would like to especially congratulate my friend the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) for the role that he has played in helping to fashion a compromise here. I would like to also congratulate the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman SHUSTER) and the others who have worked on this measure, and, of course, the many Californians who have played a role in getting to where we are.

These projects are particularly important to western States, the 23 that have been authorized in this package that we are going to be considering. My State of California is very, very key, as I mentioned, because access to safe, usable water is obviously very, very critical to our State's survival.

This bill addresses past environmental concerns that water resources projects have had unintended impacts on the environment. For example, the bill establishes a pilot program to explore the feasibility of natural flood control methods, and, in addition to that, the bill makes it easier for nonprofit organizations to participate in U.S. Army Corps of Engineers environmental programs.

The rule also ensures that no provisions in the bill will interfere with California State water rights, which are balanced with great care by State laws that we have today. In particular, members of my delegation with communities wrestling with major water issues will be given the time that they need to work on compromise language that will be fair to everyone and address the concerns that are there.

So I urge strong support of the rule. I congratulate my friends on both sides of the aisle for having fashioned this compromise, and look forward to passage of both the rule and the bill itself.

Mr. FROST. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR).

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

Madam Speaker, many of our colleagues on our side of the aisle in committee and other Members have expressed surprise that we bring a water resources bill to the floor, any bill from our committee, to the floor under what amounts to a modified closed rule and to a very unusual self-executing provision in the rule that deals with the substantive provision of the bill.

My response is that not in my 36 years' experience on the committee have we done such a maneuver on a water resources bill. Generally this is a matter that is brought to the floor under an open rule, as we have nothing to fear. But in this case there were some extenuating circumstances.

This water resources bill has been held up for two Congresses over one project, and, even though that one issue of flood control protection for the city of Sacramento and water distribution for potential upstream users has not yet been satisfactorily resolved, it has at least been deferred to another time. That is the purpose of the self-executing provision in the rule.

The bill deals with all the rest of what is needed in the rest of this country. Indeed, as the previous speaker said, a good deal of this bill benefits the rest of the State of California outside of Sacramento.

So, reluctant as I would be to support this type of procedure for our committee, in this case, this exceptional case, it is a means to get through the problem that has held up all the rest of the country and deal substantively with the needs of other Members, and put off to another time the appropriate protection for the city of Sacramento.

So, Madam Speaker, I support the rule, with those caveats.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), the chairman of the subcommittee dealing with this issue.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding me time.

Madam Speaker, I want to rise in strong support of the rule. The chairman and the committee and the Committee on Rules have crafted a rule that provides for the fair consideration of the Water Resources and Development Act of 1999 and a rule that resolves the primary fiscal and environmental concerns that were raised about this legislation.

□ 1045

Specifically, the rule includes an amendment that I offered at the Committee on Rules yesterday that strips all water supply language that was opposed by the environmental community and the fiscal watchdog organizations like Taxpayers for Common Sense. In fact, the leading environmental and taxpayer groups have endorsed my amendment.

As the chairman of the Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment, I am proud to report that we have labored long and hard in a bipartisan manner to craft this bill. Essentially, we are going forward with unfinished business. We should have concluded it at the end of the last Congress, but we were not able to do so because of a serious controversy about one region of the country. That controversy has now been resolved.

I think that WRDA 1999 specifically deals with the California water supply and Sacramento flood protection provisions in a very responsible way. Once again, let me report the environmental community is endorsing what we are about and so, too, are the fiscal watchdogs.

What I did was I listened, I learned, I heard and I heeded. So the bill we are bringing forward today has earned the support of a broad coalition of Republicans and Democrats alike. We are about the Nation's business. We are committed to dealing with infrastructure, and in this bill we are dealing with infrastructure in a very responsible way in the best interests of the entire Nation.

Mr. FROST. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BORSKI).

Mr. BORSKI. Madam Speaker, I want to just follow up with my distinguished colleague and chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) and explain just briefly, if I may, that in the subcommittee we had a very partisan divide on this issue; and as a matter of fact, in the full committee in reporting the bill, there was still a very partisan struggle, if you will.

I am reminded somewhat of the old Mark Twain quote that ''whiskey is for drinking and water is for fighting.'' We fought a little bit in the subcommittee, and I particularly want to commend the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TAUSCHER) for her efforts in subcommittee and full committee to bring this to light.

This rule, with the self-enacting rule will, in effect, do what the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TAUSCHER) wanted to do in committee. I want to commend our distinguished chairman, because again, he had suggested to us in the strongest terms possible that he would continue to work with us to improve the bill. He has done so, and I support the rule.

Mr. GOSS. Madam Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support this rule. It is a fair rule that makes in order every amendment that was offered, ensuring an open debate.

Let me begin by commending the transportation committee for resolving the issues that held this much needed legislation up over the last year. It is a critically important bill for my home state of Florida and the rest of the country. I am pleased to see that Congress, as evidenced by the funding levels in this bill, has once again turned back the Clinton-Gore administration's assault on beach renourishment projects. These vital projects serve the same function as other flood control projects: they

save lives and limit damage to property. I simply cannot understand the Clinton-Gore administration's continued neglect of these important projects. It is irresponsible and it's past time they got the message.

I am particularly grateful for the committee's attention to southwest Florida and the captiva project. In addition, I would point out that this bill will help us continue moving forward on the Everglades restoration program. The bill extends the authorization period for the Everglades ''critical projects'' so they can be funded and completed as planned. Once again, Congress has reaffirmed its commitment to the Everglades restoration program and is meeting its obligations to help restore this national treasure.

In conclusion, Madam Speaker, this is a fair rule and a good bill. I encourage my colleagues to support both.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam 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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). Pursuant to House Resolution 154 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1480.

□ 1048

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1480) to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the United States Army Corps of Engineers to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes, with Mrs. EMERSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, 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).

Mr. SHUSTER. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. H.R. 1480, the Water Resources Development Act of 1999, is a comprehensive authorization of the water resources programs of the Army Corps of Engineers. It represents two-and-a-half years of bipartisan effort to preserve and develop the water infrastructure that is so vital to our Nation's safety and economic well-being.

First, let me thank and congratulate my colleagues on the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure for their tireless efforts. I want to give special thanks to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), the ranking member of the full committee; the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), the chairman of the subcommittee; and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BORSKI), the ranking member of the subcommittee.

This legislation is unfinished business that should be enacted as soon as possible. The 105th Congress failed to enact the Water Resources Development Act, largely because of a contentious flood control issue in California.

The bill we bring to the floor today, however, ends the impasse. It represents a fair and balanced compromise on all fronts.

Madam Chairman, this legislation accomplishes three important objectives. First, it reflects the committee's continuing commitment to improving the Nation's water infrastructure and keeping to a regular schedule for authorizations.

Second, it responds to policy initiatives to modernize the Corps of Engineers' activities and to achieve programmatic reforms.

Third, and this is very important, it takes advantage of the Corps' capabilities and recognizes evolving national priorities by expanding and creating new authorities for protecting and enhancing the environment.

Now, is this bill 100 percent perfect, free of controversy? I am sure it is not. We have heard concerns about a few provisions, and intend to address those as the bill progresses. There are also some differences between this legislation and the Senate counterpart that must be resolved. In many cases, people are not getting everything they want here, so many are not totally pleased, but it is a balanced compromise and one that we think deserves support.

Madam Chairman, as we move forward with this important legislation, I intend to work with all parties to ensure that the final product reflects a balance of all interests. I also want to assure my colleagues that we do intend to move another water resources bill that will really be the vehicle to address new items and requests that have arisen and are likely to arise in the coming months, and we intend indeed to move that legislation early in the next session.

This legislation is a strong bipartisan bill that reflects balance in every sense of the word, and a responsible approach to developing water infrastructure, preserving and enhancing the Federal, State and local partnerships.

Madam Chairman, I strongly urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chairman, before yielding, I would like to take this opportunity to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BORSKI) for his splendid work over several years of trying to shape this bill and bring it to this point. He has been most diligent and deserves credit for the work product that we bring to the House today with great pride.

And now, Madam Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BORSKI), the ranking Democrat on the Subcommittee on Water Resources.

Mr. BORSKI. Madam Chairman, let me thank the distinguished ranking member for yielding me this time and for his outstanding leadership on all issues, but particularly on this water resources issue that is before us today. I also want to congratulate and commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), my friend, the distinguished chairman, and the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), my good friend and the subcommittee chairman, for, as always, listening to the members of the minority, working with us in a fair and bipartisan manner. The bill before us today is one which we all can support.

Madam Chairman, the committee on Transportation and Infrastructure strongly supports biennial legislation for the Corps' water resources program because it provides stability to Corps programs, certainly to local project sponsors, and timely response to changing circumstances.

The bill before us today authorizes major flood control navigation, shore protection, and other water resource development projects. These projects have gone through the traditional review and evaluation process of the Corps and have received favorable reports from the Chief of Engineers. Another 16 projects will be authorized to proceed to construction if their Chief's reports are complete by September 30, 1999.

This bill also establishes a new flood mitigation and riverine restoration pilot program that is modeled after the administration's proposed Challenge 21 program. It takes a broader approach to address the issues of flood protection, especially by using nonstructural measures and environmental restoration in a coherent manner. I see a great deal of value in this approach and expect overall savings as well as enhancement of the environment.

The bill also addresses current policies concerning shore protection and cost share of deep-draft harbors. With regard to shore protection and beach nourishment, I hope the provisions in this bill will bring the administration's policy more in line with congressional intent. The proposed change to harbor cost sharing is intended to proactively deal with potentially deeper draft requirements of new generations of oceangoing vessels.

Madam Chairman, we all know that our failure to enact the bill last year during its normal cycle was due entirely to one issue: providing adequate flood protection for Sacramento, California. The bill, as reported by the committee, attempted to address this issue but further complicated the debate by adding numerous provisions relating to water supply. I am pleased

that the adoption of the rule removed the offending water supply provisions from the bill. Any Federal involvement in a reallocation of water rights adversely affects the traditional State prerogative jealously guarded by the States and, in particular, by Western States. I do not believe the Federal Government should get involved in such matters.

Finally, I am concerned that the bill does not provide the adequate flood protection that Sacramento needs. I support a level of flood protection for Sacramento closer to 200 years, not to 117 in the current bill. That level would allow the issue to be disposed of once and for all. Future WRDAs would not be held hostage by similar disagreements as occurred last year.

Madam Chairman, but for the issue of flood protection for Sacramento, H.R. 1480 is a good bill and is worthy of the strong support of the House.

Mr. SHUSTER. Madam Chairman, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), the chairman of our distinguished subcommittee.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Before anything else, I just wanted to pay tribute to the outstanding professionalism of the entire staff, the staff of the Subcommittee on Water Resources and Development and the full committee staff on the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. Mike Strachn and Jeff More, Ben Grumbles, the whole team on our side and on the other side, a team of very able professionals.

Secondly, I want to say this proves that we can work things out the way we should. Our Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure I think is the envy of a lot of other committees on Capitol Hill, because while we have differences, we come together in a bipartisan manner and we overcome those differences, and the product we have on the floor today is as a result of that.

Before us this morning we have a water resources bill that provides billions of dollars for flood protection, navigation improvements, water infrastructure and the enhancement of critical environmental resources. This legislation is critical to our Nation's ports, our Nation's cities, the millions of Americans who live along our Nation's rivers; and yes, this bill is critical to the environment, which is a very important subject that warms my heart.

I would like to share with my colleagues a list of some of the environmental provisions in the Water Resources Development Act of 1999. It authorizes a $100 million pilot project for nonstructural flood control and riverine environmental restoration. It enhances environmentally sensitive floodplain management measures. It authorizes an aquatic ecosystem restoration project. It reauthorizes a sediment decontamination program. It encourages beneficial reuse of dredge material. The list goes on and on.

Madam Chairman, I include the entire list at this point in the RECORD.

ENVIRONMENTAL HIGHLIGHTS OF H.R. 1480, THE WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1999

A. PROGRAMMATIC AND POLICY CHANGES

Authorizes a $100 million pilot program for nonstructural flood control and riverine environmental restoration

Advances environmentally sensitive floodplain management measures (including those involving nonstructural features such as buyouts and relocations)

Continues Corps' efforts to coordinate with FEMA's hazard mitigation program

Authorizes aquatic ecosystem restoration projects and makes programmatic changes to encourage new local sponsors

Reauthorizes sediment decontamination program and authorizes the development and testing of innovative dredging technologies to minimize release of contaminants and improve water quality

Encourages beneficial reuse of dredged material

Promotes a ''systems approach'' to sand management and beach nourishment

Expands Corps' efforts to control non-indigenous invasive aquatic plant species

Extends authorization for critical projects under the Everglades and South Florida ecosystem restoration program

Authorizes in-kind contributions to projects to enhance fish and wildlife resources thereby promoting additional local sponsorship of such projects

Encourages the use of innovative treatment technologies for watershed and environmental restoration and protection projects involving water quality

Authorizes development of coastal aquatic habitat management plans to address problems associated with toxic micro-organisms and the resulting degradation of ecosystems in tidal and non-tidal wetlands

Provides for restoration of abandoned and inactive coal mines

B. REGIONAL PROGRAMS

Reauthorizes and improves the Upper Mississippi Environmental Management Program

Directs a comprehensive study of the Great Lakes environment to promote effective planning and management

Increases the acreage cap for the Missouri River mitigation project to increase the program's effectiveness

Provides financial and technical assistance for management of non-indigenous species in the Great Lakes

Provides for aquatic restoration projects on the Lower Missouri River

Provides for aquatic resources restoration in the Pacific Northwest

Authorizes assistance for integrated water management planning for the State of Texas

C. MISCELLANEOUS PROJECTS AND PROVISIONS

Adds 3 additional projects to the Corps' Clean Lakes Program to improve water quality by reducing silt and sediment

Authorizes 3 projects for improvement of the environment under the authority of section 1135 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986

Authorizes 16 projects for aquatic ecosystem restoration under the authority of section 206 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996

Authorizes technical assistance for 8 watersheds for environmental restoration and protection.

Madam Chairman, whether it is helping clean up abandoned mines in the West or the development of nonstructural flood control measures in the East, or the establishment of aquatic restoration projects in the South, WRDA 1999 provides critical resources for the enhancement of our environment. In recent years we have seen a gradual greening of the Corps of Engineers, and the legislation before us today continues that trend. Our committee is most responsible for that greening of the Corps.

The Corps' traditional functions, flood control and navigation, are also continued in WRDA 1999. Dredging of our great harbors and navigation routes is a central component of this legislation. Moving bulk commodities such as grain and coal by water is essential to our growing economy.

☐ 1100

WRDA 1999 provides increased protection for flooding for millions of Americans. Perhaps no place is a better example of that than the city of Sacramento, the capital of California, of why WRDA 1999 is so critically needed.

Today the city of Sacramento has only about 77 years of flood protection. The legislation before us today, this day, authorizes over $300 million for projects designed to increase the flood protection for Sacramento to nearly 140 years.

As my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BORSKI), the ranking member of our subcommittee, has stated so eloquently, and we have no disagreement on this, we want to provide the maximum level of protection for Sacramento, and we are determined to do so. Not only are we investing $300 million in this bill. No, we are expediting studies of the possibility of elevating the Folsom Dam. We are expediting studies of the possibility of doing levee work south of the dam. We are looking at this in a very serious, professional way.

That is what we should do, because we want our final decisions to be made not based upon emotions, and we all can get very emotional about these subjects, but based upon facts. That is exactly what we are going to do.

We have moved responsibly to dramatically increase the flood protection for the capital of California, and I remain committed to the proposition that we can provide additional flood protection for Sacramento in next year's water bill.

The chairman of the full committee has indicated that as soon as this bill is behind us, we are going to start on WRDA 2000. There is a fundamental national interest in moving this legislation forward in a bipartisan, expeditious fashion.

WRDA 1999 is important to the lives and livelihood of millions of Americans, from Sacramento to Syracuse, from Savannah to Seattle, from Urbana to Utica. WRDA 1999 deserves our support.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the

gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), ranking member of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. STENHOLM. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

I would like to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman SHUSTER), the ranking member, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BORSKI), and the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) for their action and hard work in bringing this bill to the floor.

I rise today to speak in favor of this legislation. I do it as the ranking member of the Committee on Agriculture, but also to make my colleagues aware of a rather ironic situation.

Section 501 would mandate that the Army Corps of Engineers would take control of some of the projects of the USDA's Natural Resources and Conservation Service. This would be done because of a $1.5 billion backlog in the USDA's small watershed program.

Local residents who have sponsored these projects have lost confidence in USDA's ability to provide funding, and they are now looking at other sources of funding. This situation is indicative of the lack of resources and support currently being provided to agriculture.

Funding for the NRCS's Small Watershed Program is no greater today than it was in the 1950s. In fact, the program has been virtually cut in half in the last 5 years. As a result, projects typically sit on the backlog list for more than a decade.

We cannot blame the sponsors. In essence, they are shopping for the most available source of funding. There simply is not enough funding in the USDA program to live up to existing responsibilities and commitments.

In 1937, the United States invested 6 percent of the Federal budget in USDA conservation programs. This is in stark contrast to the .16 percent included in the 1999 Federal budget. In 1937, Congress appropriated $440 million for financial assistance, and $23 million in technical assistance. In 1999 dollars, that would be $5.3 billion.

In 1999, the estimated appropriation for USDA conservation financial and technical assistance programs is $1.2 billion. These numbers speak for themselves. I would challenge my colleagues to make conservation spending a priority in order to meet the pressing needs in rural America.

Again, I thank the sponsors of this legislation for, in another way, dealing with a part of the problem for many areas, of which this was the only available opportunity that they had.

Mr. SHUSTER. Madam Chairman, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE), a member of the committee.

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

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Madam Chairman, today we come to the floor with a very important bill, the water bill. I am very, very pleased to be able to support it. It contains many important projects across the country that can be developed with the passage and enactment of this legislation.

I would particularly like to thank for their work on our problem in Sacramento our chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), and our subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) and their staffs. They have been tremendously helpful, and it has been a very, very difficult problem for us to resolve.

I would like to thank my colleagues from the Sacramento region who have been involved with me for months of intense negotiation with our staffs, the gentlemen from California, Mr. POMBO, Mr. OSE, Mr. HERGER, and Mr. MATSUI. All of us have worked hard to try and come up with a solution.

Ultimately that solution that we worked on did not materialize in the exact way that we had desired. But the bottom line is this, Madam Chairman, this bill today enables Sacramento to take a giant step forward in the area of flood control, achieving virtually a 1 hundred percent increase in the level of protection over what we presently have.

Madam Chairman, I would be less than candid if I did not say that this is still not what we need. But the truth of the matter is that we will never have what we need until, in one fashion or another, we are able to complete the construction of the Auburn Dam. It is the only solution that provides the level of flood protection for Sacramento. Everything else ultimately falls short.

But this is a political process, and one that requires a certain agreement between all the parties. We are moving in the right direction, and when we come to issues of water and flood control and so forth, I think if you are moving in the right direction and making progress, that is something that we have to acknowledge and encourage.

We are taking this step today. It is something that will be, I think, a very significant improvement for our community. Moreover, we do not do any harm, such as by passing the disastrous stepped release plan which is in the Senate bill, which would actually make things worse, increase the danger to life and property, and export flood control problems to those down below. So I am grateful to see that.

I cannot help but acknowledge that this process has revealed the tremendous problem we also face in our State, which is the shortage of water. Even in an average year we are short of water. In a drought year we are significantly short of water, by about 5 million acre feet a year.

We in California are going to have to address that problem, and in my own subcommittee which I chair, next month we will be specifically addressing that problem as we continue oversight over the Cal-Fed process. Water storage has to be developed.

I strongly encourage my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chairman, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MATSUI), and to also commend him for his diligent work on behalf of his community and people who desperately need the flood control protection. He has been a vigilant advocate for the people he represents.

Mr. MATSUI. Madam Chairman, I first would like to thank the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) for his very kind remarks and all of his help over the last decade, but particularly over the last 3 or 4 years that he has given me, along with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BORSKI) as the subcommittee ranking member, obviously, and thanks to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) for all of the help he has given me as ranking member of the full committee as well.

I would like to turn to my colleagues on the other side, the other side of the aisle. Certainly the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman SHUSTER) has been extremely helpful in trying to put together a consensus for all of us in the Sacramento region. I want to express my gratitude and thanks to him, along with the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), who has been tireless over the last 3 or 4 years on our behalf. The staffs of both majority and minority have been extremely helpful, as well. I do want to express my appreciation.

I also want to express my apologies to members of the subcommittee and certainly the Members of the entire House of Representatives. As we know, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BORSKI) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) have said, this bill had been delayed from the last Congress to this Congress. It was basically because of the Sacramento problem, and particularly about the flood control issue.

I know it was very difficult for the Members of this body, but I appreciate the fact that there was tolerance to me and my constituents. I certainly would hope that I would never have to put my colleagues in that kind of imposition again.

I would like to, if I may, just comment a little bit about my problem in Sacramento County. We have about a 100-year protection, now. This bill would get us up to about 137 years protection, because it would modify the existing Folsom Dam in Sacramento County.

The problem with this, as all of us know, is the fact that we still would be by far the lowest community in terms of flood protection in this Nation. Just to read off a few, Kansas City currently has 500-year protection; St. Louis, 50-year protection; Dallas, Texas, 500-

year; New Orleans, 300 years; Topeka, Kansas, 500 years; and Omaha, Nebraska, Tacoma and the quad cities all have 500-year protection.

We now will have, with this bill, 137 years. We wanted to get up to about 170 years, and we are, of course, afraid, because of the rainfall in northern California and the continuing uncertainty of our climate, that we could fall again in terms of hydrology studies.

We have approximately 600,000 people at risk. We have over six major regional hospitals. We have 100 public schools. All of these are at risk with respect to Sacramento County. This bill will go a long way, obviously, in making sure that we are given some additional level of protection, but we need more. I think my colleagues on both sides of the aisle know this, and would want to help us.

I would hope that as we proceed along over the next few weeks and perhaps months that we not confuse this issue. Sacramento County needs flood protection, and one of the real concerns that I have is that we have been tied into the whole issue of water supply.

I agree with the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE), the previous speaker, that Northern California needs more water. We are the fastest growing region in America. We need more water. But we are trying to work that through right now with the State-Federal compact.

We have Bruce Babbitt from the Interior Department. Obviously, former Governor Wilson and now Governor Gray Davis are attempting through Cal-Fed to come up with a solution, because there are various competing interests in California with respect to the limited supply of water.

We do need to solve this problem, but it has to be done in a methodical way. But please, I urge my colleagues not to tie flood protection for 600,000 people with this issue that has been raging in the State of California for over 125 years. We are not going to solve the issue of water supply in California as long as it is tied to the whole issue of flood protection, which we need immediately.

The issue of water supply has to be an issue that is going to be dealt with from a larger perspective, from a Federal-State perspective, with all the water districts in California.

I am not, however, suggesting that my colleague up north of me, the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE) is incorrect. Placer County is growing and it will need water in a few years. But that issue is one we need to work together on, not in an adversarial role on, and flood protection, unfortunately, puts us somewhat at odds.

So I want to express my thanks to my colleagues, all of them, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TAUSCHER) and all of them for all of the tolerance and help they have given my community and myself over the last few months, and I urge adoption of this bill.

Mr. SHUSTER. Madam Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. FORBES).

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

Mr. FORBES. Madam Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman for yielding time to me.

Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999, H.R. 1480. This is critically needed legislation, and I want to thank the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) for his leadership, and of course, my friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) for really shepherding this bill, this much-needed bill, through the committee and bringing it to the floor, understanding that it had to go through some tenuous minefields getting fiscal watchdogs, environmental watchdogs to agree to this much-needed legislation.

I might remind my colleagues that the ritual here in Congress has been that this program, this important program, has been funded generally and sufficiently by the Congress, not by the administration, for years. Whether it be the current administration or previous administrations, they have not provided the Army Corps of Engineers, in my estimation, the kinds of support they need, and it has been Congress that has come to the rescue.

Again this year, it is the United States House of Representatives and this committee that have provided this adequate support. For over 150 years the Corps has done a phenomenal job of protecting our lives and property. If you come from a place like I do, on Long Island, New York, you understand the tremendous importance of the Army Corps program.

I might point out in this bill is the Atlantic Coast Monitoring Study, which is a very, very important undertaking that will study tides, erosion data, make future erosion predictions, and try to get ahead, if you will, of Mother Nature, to the extent that we can do that, and provide protection for our coastlines; very, very important.

I again thank the committee for recognizing that and bringing the other Federal agencies together with the Army Corps of Engineers to get a final plan in place by June 30 for the Moriches Inlet Island plan.

□ 1115

I thank the committee tremendously for this support. This is a tremendous program. It deserves the support that is demonstrated in this bill today, and I urge my colleagues to support it, and I hope the President will sign it.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TAUSCHER), who has made a very valuable contribution to our committee in her service and has been a leader on these California water projects for the committee.

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for those kind words, and I also want to thank him and the ranking member, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BORSKI) for all their help.

Madam Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1480, which has incorporated the Tauscher-Petri amendment to strip the controversial American River water supply provisions from H.R. 1480. I appreciate the work of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) and the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) to self-execute this important amendment as part of the rule.

As my colleagues know, H.R. 1480 traditionally funds flood control and port and harbor maintenance projects. This year, however, over $287 million in municipal water supply projects were included in the bill at the last minute which were wrong for the American taxpayer, wrong for the environment and wrong for the development of long-term water policy in my State of California. Over the past 2 weeks I have worked hard with members of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and Members of the House in general to address the implications of this water grab.

The Bay-Delta in my district is the largest estuary on the West Coast and serves as the drinking water source for 22 million Californians. Moreover, it serves as a key component of the State's $24 billion agricultural industry. In California, water is a zero-sum game, and these ill-conceived projects that have been stripped out would have had devastating effects for water for two out of every three Californians. In addition, the projects were terribly expensive.

I am pleased to have been joined by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI), Taxpayers for Common Sense, Friends of the River and Friends of the Earth, and scores of other taxpayer and environmental organizations in effectively getting that message out. Officials throughout California, including Governor Gray Davis and Attorney General Bill Lockyer expressed extreme apprehension with the projects included in the bill.

Once again, I want to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) and others for urging the removal of those audacious provisions from H.R. 1480.

At the same time, however, I must object to the concurrent removal of the much needed flood control for the city of Sacramento. That city currently has only 85 years of flood protection, making it the largest metropolitan area in the country without an adequate flood control system. That is why I urge support for the Oberstar amendment.

Mr. SHUSTER. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH).

Mr. WALSH. Madam Chairman, I thank the chairman for his leadership

on this incredibly important bill. I would also like to thank my good friend and neighbor, colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), who chairs the subcommittee, for the hard work he has done in bringing this bill to fruition; also to the ranking member, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR). I want to thank them all for this terrific bill. The work that they have done is remarkable, getting it this far, given all the traps along the way.

The project that I am supporting has been identified by my community as the number one priority project, and we could not do it without the help of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Army Corps of Engineers and the Environmental Protection Agency. This is a critical bill to my community, I strongly support it, and I urge all my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. Madam Chairman, I thank the esteemed ranking member for yielding me time and I would like to congratulate the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking member, as well as the full committee chairman and ranking member on what I consider to be an excellent Water Resources Development Act piece of legislation.

This bill is vital in three major areas for my State and for many States across the Union. It contains investment in appropriate projects that are vital to the economic infrastructure and the competitiveness of the United States in the international economy.

In particular, we have provided for an authorization, should all of the environmental reviews be adequately completed by the Corps of Engineers, for the Columbia River. It is vital if the port of Portland is to compete in the Asia Rim, that they be able to accommodate the new larger class of ships.

It is vital in a number of other areas. The environment. Certainly we can say this is probably the most important piece of environmental legislation to pass this Congress. It contains money for a number of projects in my district: Amazon Creek; Springfield Millrace; going to look at nonstructural flood control alternatives for the Willamette River; Skinner Butte Park environmental restoration right in the heart of the largest city of my district; and, finally, it is good for salmon. It contains a large investment in a long overdue Willamette River temperature control project that I have been working on for almost a decade here in Congress. It is a large project, $65 million, but it will correct problems created by the Federal Government when those dams were constructed, which are destroying salmon runs in the McKenzie and Willamette Rivers.

All in all, this is an excellent piece of legislation. It is good for the economy, good for the environment, and good for water resources across the United States.

Mr. SHUSTER. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST), the chairman of one of our subcommittees.

Mr. GILCHREST. Madam Chairman, I too want to make some comments about the water bill of 1999, sort of a retroactive process.

There are a lot of good projects in here. As the previous speaker mentioned, there are a number of positive environmental provisions in here. There are several in particular in my district. One of those provisions is to correct a couple of previous mistakes by the Corps of Engineers in Chesapeake City, where a water pipe was cut as a result of dredging in the C&D Canal.

Another provision which is under evaluation to be corrected is an area where there is a dredge disposal site by the Corps of Engineers that was not managed properly and the wells of the community right now cannot be used as a result of the acidic leaching from that dredge disposal site. That will be corrected.

There is a small community on the ocean side called Snug Harbor. There is going to be some effort into producing nonstructural flood control measures.

And the other provision that is in the water bill, that I am very, very pleased with, is a study that has never been done before, not even by the Chesapeake Bay Program, NMFS, or Fish and Wildlife. This is a study to evaluate the nutrient loads into the Chesapeake Bay as a result of dredging across the entire bay.

Now, the Chesapeake Bay Program, what we have funded every single year with millions and millions and millions of dollars tries to evaluate the amount of nitrogen and phosphorus and other pollutants that get into the bay from all kinds of sources: from air deposition, from agricultural runoff, from shopping plazas, from housing developments, from roads; all kinds of sources, with one exception, and that is the nutrient pollution problem from dredging. In this bill there is going to be an 18-month study to determine the contribution of pollution nutrient overloads from dredging.

And if we are going to restore the Chesapeake Bay to the kind of health that is necessary for that marine ecosystem to be sustained for future generations, this is the kind of thing we really need to do, and this is in this bill and we are very pleased with it.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from the State of Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Madam Chairman, I thank my friend from Minnesota and the chairman of the committee, and I rise in support of this bill and, in particular, section 573, which authorizes $7 million for the Corps of Engineers to work with USDA, Interior, EPA, NOAA and State and local agencies to develop strategies for dealing with toxic microorganisms and the damage they inflict on aquatic ecosystems.

I want to congratulate my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. WAYNE GILCHREST) on his support of this provision and his discussions just earlier about some of the studies he has undertaken and his support of making sure the Chesapeake Bay is what we want it to be.

Toxic microorganisms, Madam Chairman, are a serious threat. The summer before last, Maryland was struck by the toxic microorganism pfiesteria. Linked to the flow of excess nutrients and the loss of aquatic habitat in our waterways, toxic blooms like pfiesteria seriously impact regional economies and threaten sensitive aquatic resources.

Several Federal agencies, including the EPA, NOAA, and the Centers for Disease Control presently are assisting States impacted by these toxic algae blooms. I have worked diligently in the past, through the appropriations process, to ensure that these agencies have the proper resources to undertake this effort. Although they have responded quickly and made substantial progress, no single agency is tasked with taking a comprehensive look at the problem and developing a master plan.

Given its expertise in water resources modeling, water quality monitoring, watershed management and restoration, and environmental planning, the Corps of Engineers has a vital role to play in this process. Section 573 simply authorizes $7 million for the Corps' participation in these efforts, and I urge my colleagues to support this important initiative and the bill itself.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the delegate from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD).

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for yielding me the time. I rise today to support the passage of H.R. 1480 to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources projects, and I wish to thank the committee's leadership for moving this legislation quickly, well, not quickly, but successfully to the House floor.

The projects in this bill are important to the successful development of water-related projects across America. It helps to prepare communities to mitigate themselves against natural disasters and helps redress the destruction of storms past.

The projects for Guam are a prime example of repairing damages that were inflicted by a cumulative series of storms that have devastated Guam over the past decade. The most recent one, Supertyphoon Paka, was one of the largest and more powerful storms that have hit Guam in recent years. It inflicted a lot of damage to individual homes and businesses, but, most important, it nearly destroyed the lifeline of our island, which is our port facilities. Seaports are the direct link to an island's economic development activities

and without them communities and families suffer.

Guam's plan to build a seawall to protect our harbor, the hardening of our piers, and the reconstruction of two of our largest marinas will help our island mitigate against any future damages caused by natural disasters. I might add that the development of these harbor projects are also very important for national defense.

I wish to thank again the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER); the subcommittee chairman the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT); as well as the two ranking Members, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BORSKI) for their roles in moving this legislation and these projects successfully to the floor.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining on our side?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) has 12 minutes remaining.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to the organization frequently mentioned in debate here but almost never discussed, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. It celebrates its 224th birthday this year. It is 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.

Little is it known that the Corps of Engineers, among its many responsibilities, had jurisdiction over Yellowstone Park.

□ 1130

The Corps managed Yellowstone for 30 years. And Lieutenant Dan Kingman of the Corps, later to become chief of 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 fewer 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 2 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 two 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 protecting the great resource of the Great Lakes, one fifth of all the fresh water on the face of the Earth.

And that is the spirit in which we normally present the Water Resources Development Act, projects throughout our Nation to promote control of floods, to enhance river navigation, to protect our shores, to protect and restore the environment, to enhance navigation.

And that is mostly what this bill before us does today, with one flaw. It fails to give the capital of the world's sixth largest economy, the City of Sacramento, the flood protection it needs and deserves.

This deficiency comes from a dispute between two parts of the State of California that has resulted in flood control at Sacramento being held hostage for almost a decade. The amendment made in order by the self-executing rule, and which is now adopted because the rule has been adopted, gives the City of Sacramento only 117 years of flood protection, and that is the estimate of the Corps of Engineers in their 1997 analysis.

That is significantly less than the protection given cities of comparable size, the nearly 200 to 500 years protection for Santa Ana, Tacoma, New Orleans, St. Louis, Dallas, Kansas City, Omaha. Surely Sacramento deserves as much flood protection as those cities.

Today some 400,000 residents in Sacramento face an unacceptable risk of flood; 160,000 residential structures are in the flood plain in the capital city, 5,000 businesses, 1,200 government facilities, with an estimated value of $37 billion. The 55,000-acre flood plain includes seven of the nine major hospitals in the region and 130 schools.

Potential losses from flood in the City of Sacramento range from $7 billion to $16 billion depending on the size of the flood. Even at the lower end of the scale, flood losses in Sacramento would be comparable to the losses experienced in the Northridge earthquake a few years ago, to date the single largest disaster in U.S. history.

Now, I do not say these words and make those comments in the abstract. I have traveled several times to Sacramento. I have bicycled along the flood protection walls of the American River. I have traveled to Folsom Dam and further up river to the site once planned and once development begun on the Auburn Dam proposal by the Bureau of Reclamation. I understand what is at stake here.

Linking flood protection for Sacramento and reallocation of water through a new dam at Auburn has been in the works for many, many years. But the Bureau of Reclamation already stubbed its toe to the tune of $250 million developing the base for a dam right on the fault line of a major earthquake region in the upper reaches of the American River.

The Auburn Dam has already been rejected by the House in 1992 in a vote of 273–140. And it was rejected in 1996 in our Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure in a vote of 28 ayes, 35 nays. There is no reason to believe the vote would be any different today.

So why could we not have just simply accommodated whatever water resource needs there may be for the upper reaches of the American River, and at the same time provide Sacramento its requested 200-year flood protection, and have done it in this bill?

I had an amendment in committee to do that. I offered the amendment in committee to make the adjustments to Folsom, to widen the outlets so the gates can discharge more water, raise the level of the dam to allow more water to be discharged in advance of midwinter melt from the Sierra Nevada Mountains, where they get as much as 30 feet of snow and often have midwinter rains that cause not only runoff but melt, to accommodate that runoff, accommodate in a larger basin and protect Sacramento and its residents and facilities, and also improve the levees at Sacramento to accommodate that increased runoff.

The amendment was defeated on a straight party-line vote. And now we come to the floor with this legislation that does not do what Sacramento truly deserves and, as the gentleman from California (Mr. MATSUI) said, does not really provide the water resources needs of the upper reaches of the American River Valley area.

There were several arguments made about the amendment that I offered. One was that the levee strengthening proposed for Sacramento in my amendment would create unacceptable risks to areas downstream. But that objection fails on closer scrutiny.

The Army Corps of Engineers analyzed that argument and rejected it. The Corps specifically stated this: ''Additional protection can be provided without adversely affecting the reaches below the mouth of the American River without project conditions.''

The Corps' plan includes several different structural and operational modifications to ensure that no flood threat is transferred to downstream interests. In addition, I talked with the City of Sacramento. They have committed to spend $100 million to mitigate any possible further adverse effects downstream.

Finally, my amendment specifically required that measures to increase the capacity of the levees be undertaken only after downstream mitigation features will have been constructed.

So absent any objective, substantive reason for opposition to the Sacramento amendment, I am left only to

surmise that the real basis for opposition was the desire by upstream interests to withhold flood protection from Sacramento in hope that the Auburn Dam at some future time could be revived or that some alternative, far more expensive yet unstudied water distribution plan be enacted.

That is not the way to conduct the water resources business of the country. And while I am not prepared to accept this legislation as it is to go forward with the bill on the floor, the bill before us, I will not relent in my purpose of providing for Sacramento the protection that it rightly deserves and to address in a rational and responsible manner the water resources requirements upstream of Sacramento in an appropriate time frame.

We should not hold Sacramento hostage. We will have to come back at another time to address this issue. And I am confident that at that future time we will treat the lives and the property of the residents of Sacramento in an appropriate and responsible manner, as this committee has always done, absent these extraneous considerations.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBERSTAR. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BOEHLERT. As the gentleman from California (Mr. MATSUI) and the endless flow of visitors from Sacramento can attest, this Chair of this subcommittee is determined to work cooperatively to provide the maximum level of protection for Sacramento. That is a commitment.

Secondly, let me point out, we are nearly doubling the level of protection in this bill, as the gentleman from California (Mr. MATSUI) himself has indicated, from 77 to 137 years, and we are studying the feasibility and practicability and affordability of additional measures. So we will continue to work together to protect Sacramento.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chairman, I look forward to that happy outcome.

Mr. SHUSTER. Madam Chairman, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER).

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

Mr. HERGER. Madam Chairman, I would like to thank Chairman SHUSTER, Speaker HASTERT, and the other members of the leadership for their invaluable assistance in reaching a final compromise for our California area flood control. The compromise that is included in this bill is a win for those of us who have sought sincere dialogue and consensus in California flood control issues. More importantly, however, this legislation is also a partial win for northern California. I can testify from personal experience that California has a very real need for increased flood protection. For example, just two years ago the district I represent in norhtern California suffered a horrendous tragedy as a result of an inadequate flood control system. On January 2nd, 1997, a levee in my district near the community of Arboga suddenly broke, and as a result, three people drowned. This tragedy could have been avoided if flood control officials had been allowed to complete repairs on the levee when the problem was first acknowledged six years earlier. In 1955, almost directly across the river from the Arboga break, another levee broke and this time flooded Yuba City. However, instead of three people losing their lives 37 people died. Mr. Speaker and members, we have a natural phenomenon in California where heavy snowfall in the Sierra Nevada Mountains, followed by warm rains results in an overwhelming amount of water that flows into our Sacramento River Valley. There is no levee system in the world that can handle this kind of extreme flows. Until we build a flood control structure that can hold back this overwhelming flow of water and release it in a controlled manner, our levees are set up to fail. As California's first State Engineer, William Hall, said, ''There are two types of levees, those that have failed and those that will.'' This legislation provides $26.6 million to complete flood control repairs along the Yuba River basin, but regrettably, it won't be enough. I hope and pray that it will not take another great tragedy before we are allowed to proceed with the development of a structure that can hold back these waters. Next time, it may not be just three or even 37 people who drown, but rather, if a levee breaks in Sacramento or in my Marysville and Yuba City area, we could be talking about thousands of people drowned by this type of flooding. I do, however, want to commend my colleagues, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. POMBO and Mr. OSE for their hard work in reaching this historic compromise for further flood protection in our northern California area in a responsible manner. I therefore urge my colleagues to support this legislation and vote in favor of the 1999 Water Resources Development Act.

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

I wish to emphasize, Madam Chairman, that with the passage of this legislation today, it will represent the 21st piece of legislation that the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House has brought to the floor and has seen passed.

In addition, thus far, six of our bills of the 21 pieces of legislation that have come to the floor have been signed into law, representing 25 percent of the public laws which have been signed into law thus far this year.

So the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure is moving vigorously to bring important legislation to the floor. And I certainly want to compliment, on a bipartisan basis, the leadership on the other side of the aisle as well as my colleagues on our committee who have made this possible.

I want to particularly, in addition, recognize Dr. Joe Westphal, the Assistant Secretary of the Army, for the valuable steps that he set in motion last fall so that we could proceed; the water experts in the Corps of Engineers, especially Mr. Bob Childs in the Corps' Sacramento office, who has certainly made a major contribution; and to Mr. Dave Mendelsohn and Curt Haensel in our Legislative Counsel's Office for their expertise, patience, and undying efforts.

Jack Schenendorf, our chief of staff, is without fear, in my judgment. There never has been a more competent chief of staff in the history of the Congress that I am aware of, in my judgment.

I want to thank our water staff for the excellent work which they have done: Ben Grumbles, Jeff More, Carrie Jelsma on the Republican staff, Ken Kopocis, and Art Chan on the Democratic staff.

I would also like to thank John Anderson, the detailee of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure from the Corps of Engineers, for his fine work.

But the one person who needs to really be singled out for his superb work on the Sacramento River and American River issues, that person is Mike Strachn. His outstanding knowledge of water resource programs and his high standard of professionalism were of tremendous benefit to all Members of the House as we tried to work out these difficult issues. His efforts were in the highest tradition of the House and certainly has set an example for all staffs.

□ 1145

I want to compliment all the individuals on both sides of the aisle, both Members and staff, as well as the administration, who were involved in bringing us to this point today to be able to bring this very important national bipartisan legislation to the floor. I urge its passage.

Mrs. FOWLER. Madam Chairman, today, I rise in strong support of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999.

This bill authorizes vital projects for our nation's coast line and the shoreline of our rivers and tributaries, for dredging in our nation's harbors, and for flood control throughout our States.

My district includes over 100 miles of coastline, several ports and navigation channels. It is easy to understand how important this bill is to my district.

The corps projects authorized in this bill will protect and create avenues of commerce and transportation. Improvements to our harbors are necessary to open up access to our ports and enhance international trade. It is imperative to continue projects that preserve property and protect our beaches. Shore protection projects are particularly important to Florida and I applaud the committee's work in understanding the need for preserving our beaches—something that the administration has failed to do.

This bill protects and maintains our vast and crucial water resources not just in my district but, across the country.

I encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting this important legislation.

Mr. EVERETT. Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Water Resources Development Act (H.R. 1480). This long overdue legislation authorizes important civil works projects of the Army Corps of Engineers to address critical water resource and management issues facing the Nation. This $4.2 billion national investment in flood control, navigation, and water quality initiatives goes a long way in meeting the water resource needs in virtually every part of the country.

In Alabama, we are blessed with many river systems that contribute significant environmental, commercial, and recreational benefits to the State and southeastern region. The Alabama/Coosa/Tallapoosa and the Appalachicola/Chattahoochee/Flint river systems both flow through my district and are important navigable waterways that, in addition to enhancing the environment, help drive the economy. This legislation continues to provide the Corps of Engineers with the necessary funds to continue the operation and maintenance of these systems.

Of particular note in my own district in southeast Alabama, flooding has been a problem. In the past decade, Coffee and Geneva counties have been subjected to three major floods that forced the evacuation of the towns of Elba and Geneva. The flooding resulted from heavy tropical storms and hurricanes, which are seasonal occurrences, and caused these old and outdated levees to fail. I am pleased that this legislation includes funds to rebuild both of these two levees to modern standards. Section 520 authorizes $12.9 million to repair and rehabilitate the Elba levee and section 521 authorizes $16.6 million to repair and rehabilitate the Geneva levee.

It's important that we move this overdue authorization forward, so I encourage the adoption of this measure in order to go to conference with the Senate to arrive at a final reauthorization bill for these water resource projects.

Mr. CRANE. Madam Chairman, I just wanted to take this opportunity to commend and thank the members of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, and its Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment, for the good work they have done in assembling this year's version of the Water Resources Development Act (WRDA). As reported, H.R. 1480 authorizes numerous flood control, navigational improvement, beach restoration and ecosystem enhancement projects that will be of significant benefit to millions of Americans.

Let me cite one example with which I am particularly familiar. Thirteen years ago, the Des Plaines River, which flows through my congressional district in northeastern Illinois, went on a rampage, flooding over 10,000 homes and businesses, forcing 15,000 people to flee to drier ground, and causing at least $35 million in damages. A year later, there was another major flood along the Des Plaines and several times since the waters of that river have spilled over their banks. Just this past week, in fact, residents in the area were reminded of the threat posed by the Des Plaines, when a pair of rainstorms caused the river to crest 1.4 feet above flood stage in Gurnee, IL.

Much to my relief, and not just to mine alone, sections 101 and 408 of H.R. 1480 address this flood threat by authorizing (subject to the timely completion of the final Corps of Engineers report) the construction of the first phase of the Des Plaines River Flood Control Project and an expanded study of the options for Phase II. Assuming their wording remains unchanged and H.R. 1480 is enacted into law, those provisions will allow the Corps of Engineers to proceed expeditiously with work on three floodwater storage areas, the construction of a pair of levees, the raising of an existing dam and development of additional flood control alternatives. As a result, a 25-percent reduction in Des Plaines River flood damages can be expected when the authorized construction work is complete, the benefits of which are anticipated to exceed the costs by a ratio of 1.7 to 1. Furthermore, the groundwork will have been laid for the implementation of additional flood prevention and/or reduction measures.

In short, these efforts to mitigate, if not eliminate, flood damages along the Des Plaines are a win-win proposition. Thousands of people in the northern Chicago suburbs will profit because they will not suffer the same, or as severe, disruptions as they have in the past and millions of taxpayers will benefit because they are less likely to be asked to repair the damages that future flooding episodes would otherwise cause. Moreover, the same can be said for a number of the other projects in the bill, one reason being that, much to its credit, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers takes very seriously its obligation to determine that water-resource projects under its jurisdiction have a favorable benefit-to-cost ratio. Also, it should be noted that H.R. 1480 contains a number of provisions aimed at making future flood control and water resource projects as environmentally friendly as possible.

To sum up, what we have before us today is a long-awaited bill which authorizes projects that promise substantial and cost-effective returns on the financial investment being made in them. With that thought very much in mind, let me reiterate my thanks to our Transportation and Infrastructure colleagues for bringing this WRDA99 bill before us today and let me urge my colleagues in the House to give H.R. 1480 their full support. It deserves no less.

Mr. VENTO. Madam Chairman, I would like to express my thanks and appreciation to the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee Chairman BUD SHUSTER and Ranking Member JIM OBERSTAR, and Water Resources and Environment Subcommittee Chairman SHERWOOD BOEHLERT and Ranking Member ROBERT BORSKI for their hard work and tireless effort to pass this long overdue and much needed legislation. I would also like to thank ranking member and friend JIM OBERSTAR for his special effort in providing the authorization needed to implement an important educational tool for the residents of Minnesota, the Mississippi Place. The Mississippi Place would bring together the Army Corps of Engineers, the U.S. Geological Survey, the Environmental Protection Agency and NASA to offer the nation an opportunity to develop a more complete understanding of the unique resource which the Upper Mississippi River System represents. Located on the banks of the Mississippi River in downtown St. Paul, Mississippi Place will provide these Federal entities an opportunity to partner with State, local, and educational institutions in providing the public with real time learning opportunities on important issues affecting the river. In addition, the Corps and the USGS will operate Mississippi River monitoring stations at Mississippi Place for practical research purposes while still being accessible to the public. Once again, I would like to thank my colleagues for their efforts in finally crafting this bipartisan legislation.

Mr. CASTLE. Madam Chairman, I have some serious concerns with the potential environmental and economic ramifications of the project authorized to deepen the Delaware River ship channel from 40 to 45 feet. I had prepared a number of amendments to address some of these concerns, but I have agreed to withhold them with the assurance from the chairman that we will address these concerns by working together as the process moves forward. It is essential that as this project moves forward, it does so in an environmentally and economically sound manner.

First, let met state that I am concerned with the environmental consequences that the project may have on the State of Delaware. I have heard from many of my constituents and there remains many unanswered questions that the Army Corps of Engineers has yet to address to Delaware's satisfaction.

I am concerned with the authority clarified in this bill to allow the local sponsor—the Delaware River Port Authority—to operate a revenue generating dredge spoil disposal operation that is designed to import dredge spoils—that could be contaminated—and dump them at sites along the Delaware River. The Army Corps of Engineers requires a permit for this disposal with checks and balances to prevent environmentally unsafe disposal of the dredge spoils. Even so, it would be a great comfort to me to know that the Delaware Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Control (DNREC) has approved the details because there are many different ways to dispose of dredge spoils, each with a different degree of environmental protection. The method chosen needs to meet Delaware's standards because Delawareans living near these sites are the most at risk.

Furthermore, I want to make absolutely certain that the Coastal Zone Management consistency provisions apply to Federal activities relating to the Delaware River channel deepening project. DNREC has given its approval conditioned upon a list of requirements being met, however this conditional approval is not final approval as some have suggested in public meetings. The Army Corps of Engineers has given me assurances that they are fully aware they must meet the growing list of requirements before consistency approval from Delaware is effective.

Third, while this project has been authorized since 1992, last week, just prior to committee consideration of this bill, section 347 was included in this bill to relocate a portion of the channel along the Camden area. It is my understanding that this portion has been relocated to deeper water that will not require any dredging or disruption of the existing soils. In fact, this shift in the channel will make the project less expensive for the taxpayer because the Army Corps of Engineers will not have to dredge there. This is an encouraging development, but there should be more public notice for stakeholders and efforts made to inform the congressional delegations involved about changes to the project as originally authorized.

Madam Chairman, I also have concerns about the economic risks of this project to the American taxpayer. According to the Army Corps of Engineers benefit-cost analysis, over 80 percent of the benefits have been attributed to six oil facilities along the river channel. However, none of the benefitting oil companies have directly indicated outright support for the project. Although they are not legally required to commit to spending their own capital dollars to deepen their own berths to take advantage of a deeper channel, it seems prudent

for Congress or the Army Corps of Engineers to seek assurances that they will make those expenditures before $300 million in taxpayer funds are committed to building the channel.

In light of these financial concerns, it seems particularly important that Congress reinforce the intent of Congress in 1992 when the project was first authorized. Report 102–842 accompanying the Water Resource Development Act of 1992 states on page 12:

Committee comments.—The Committee believes that the non-Federal cost of the channel deepening should be funded by water transportation users, not surface transportation users. The Committee urges the Delaware River Port Authority to make every effort to ensure that the non-Federal cost of the project is borne by water transportation users.

There has been some discussion of bridge toll receipts being raised to help fund the non-Federal cost—$100 million. Although report language is not binding, raising bridge tolls would appear to violate the committee's intent. Before the Delaware River Port Authority raises bridge tolls, at a minimum it should demonstrate its efforts to raise the funds from water transportation users.

We must make sure that those projects Congress chooses to finance give Americans a sufficient return both on their tax dollar investment and their investment of natural resources. I look forward to continuing to address these fiscal and environmental concerns.

Mr. MOORE. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of the managers' amendment to H.R. 1480, the Water Resources Development Act of 1999, and in support of the underlying legislation.

I want to take this opportunity to thank publicly House Transportation Infrastructure Chairman BUD SHUSTER of Pennsylvania and ranking Democrat JIM OBERSTAR of Minnesota for their assistance in adding to the managers' amendment language I requested authorizing a badly needed flood control project for Turkey Creek Basin in Kansas City, MO, and Kansas City, KS.

This language also is included in S. 507, the Senate companion measure to H.R. 1480, which passed the other body by voice vote on April 19. This project is of significant importance to my congressional district. Turkey Creek flows from its urbanized drainage basin in Johnson County, KS, and into Kansas City, MO, and the Kansas River. Severe flooding has occurred along the basin, most recently in 1993 and again in 1998. An improvement plan has been prepared in partnership with the U.S. Corps of Engineers. This project will provide vitally needed protection for commercial and industrial areas in both cities. I hope that Congress also will approve later this year an appropriation I am seeking to complete design work on this project.

Once again, Madam Chairman, I commend the bipartisan leadership of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee for bringing this important legislation to the House floor and my constituents and I very much appreciate their timely responsiveness to this request.

Mr. RILEY. Madam Chairman, I had planned to offer an amendment today that would have expressed the Sense of Congress that any water agreement entered into between the States of Alabama, Georgia, and Florida should comply with existing Federal environmental water quality protection laws as they are presently written. At the Committee's request, I have decided not to offer my amendment, with the understanding that Chairman SHUSTER has pledged to work with me to identify an appropriate legislative vehicle for my proposal.

I would like to clarify that my amendment would not have altered or expanded the Clean Water Act, it simply urged the States to ensure that water quality should be considered within the scope of all water quantity negotiations as consistent with current Federal law. We need to emphasize that the citizens of these States deserve to have not only the proper quantity of water they need, but also the highest quality of water.

Mr. SHAW. Madam Chairman, I rise today in support of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999.

I represent a district in South Florida with over 90 miles of coastline, and 100 miles of Intracoastal Waterway, so water projects are very important to my constituents. I commend Chairmen SHUSTER, BOEHLERT, and all of the members of the Water Resources Subcommittee for their perseverance in getting this bill to the floor.

One issue of much concern to my constituents is the continued participation of the federal government to renourish beaches. Despite the Administration's decision to abandon coastal communities across the country, for three years the Committee has continued to ensure adequate funding levels for desperately needed projects. When the Committee finally decided to adjust the cost share formula for new construction projects, I am grateful they provided for a phased-in approach over three years. This will give local sponsors the chance to prepare for a reduced federal share. I am optimistic that the change will provide the needed motivation to the Clinton Administration to send a realistic budget to the Congress next year, with sensible funding levels for shore protection.

On a related topic, I am most grateful to the Committee for including a provision in H.R. 1480 that will allow Broward County, Florida to be reimbursed for the federal portion of their beach renourishment project in two phases. Although this language was not included in the Senate version, I hope the language will be included in the final conference report.

Finally, the Committee is also to be commended for their willingness to assist the Florida congressional delegation on the Everglades restoration effort. Three provisions in the bill relating to land acquisition and the extension of critical projects authority will ensure the program moves forward unimpeded.

Madam Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote for this bill.

Mr. BEREUTER. Madam Chairman, this Member rises in support of H.R. 1480, the Water Resources Development Act of 1999.

This Member would like to begin by commending the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER], the Chairman of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR], the ranking member of the Transportation Committee, the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT], the Chairman of the Water Resources and Environment Subcommittee, and the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BORSKI], the ranking member of the Subcommittee, for their extraordinary work in developing this bill and bringing it to the floor. This Member appreciates their diligence, persistence, and hard work.

This important legislation includes numerous projects designed to improve flood control, navigation, and shore protection. It also promotes environmental restoration and protection efforts across the nation.

In particular, this Member is pleased that the bill includes a provision he promoted which helps to ensure that the Missouri River Mitigation Project can be implemented as envisioned. In 1986, Congress authorized over $50 million (more than $79 million in today's dollars if adjusted for inflation) to fund the Missouri River Mitigation Project to restore fish and wildlife habitat that were lost due to the construction of structures to implement the Pick-Sloan plan. At that time the Corps did not choose to include funding requests for implementing that Act in their budgeting process. That is why this Member, along with other Members who represent the four states bordering the channelized Missouri River (Nebraska, Iowa, Kansas and Missouri), have worked to provide funding to implement the Missouri River Mitigation Project which has just begun to become a reality during the last few years.

This project is specifically needed to restore fish and wildlife habitat lost due to the Federally sponsored channelization and stabilization projects of the Pick-Sloan era. The islands, wetlands, and flat floodplains that are needed to support the wildlife and waterfowl that once lived along the river are dramatically reduced. And estimated 475,000 acres of habitat in Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri and Kansas have been lost because of Federal action in creating the flood control projects and channelization of the Missouri River. Today's fishery resources are estimated to be only one-fifth of those which existed in pre-development days.

The success of the project has resulted in a concern related to the original study that outlined habitat needs. Under this study, acreage goals for each state were listed and these goals are generally considered to be an acreage limitation for each state. Nebraska and Kansas have already reached their acreage limits and Missouri is fast approaching its ceiling. Before long, Iowa will also reach its acreage limit.

To correct this problem, H.R. 1480 authorizes an increase in mitigation lands authorized to the four states to 25% of the lands lost, or 118,650 acres. In addition, the Corps of Engineers—in conjunction with the four states—is directed to study the amount of funds that would need to be authorized to achieve that acreage goal.

This Member is also pleased that H.R. 1480 also includes a provision which provides for the completion of the Wood River Flood Control Project. When completed, this important project in Nebraska's Third Congressional District will provide protection for an estimated 1,755 home and business structures in southern Grand Island, Nebraska. It is also expected to protect more than 5,000 acres of irrigated farmland and 7,000 to 8,000 acres of grassland.

Madam Chairman, this Member urges his colleagues to support H.R. 1480, the Water Resources Development Act of 1999.

Mr. GARY MILLER of California. Madam Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.S. 1480, the ''Water Resources Development Act.''

The bill authorizes $4.2 billion for projects and programs of the Army Corps of Engineers civil works program.

It responds to pressing water infrastructure priorities, policy initiatives to update existing water resources programs,and opportunities to restore, protect, and enhance the aquatic environment.

Specifically, H.R. 1480 authorizes 95 new water resources projects, modifies 66 existing authorized projects, and authorizes the Corps. to conduct 26 studies to address a variety of water resources problems and opportunities.

The bill, Madam Chairman, is extremely important to my district, especially to the Chino Dairy Preserve in California.

The bill calls upon the Secretary of the Army, in coordination with the heads of other Federal agencies, to provide technical assistance to State and local agencies in the study, design, and implementation of measures for flood damage reduction and environmental restoration and protection in the Santa Ana River Watershed, with particular emphasis on structural and nonstructural measures in the vicinity of the Chino Dairy Preserve.

H.R. 1480 also calls upon the Secretary to conduct a feasibility study to determine the most cost-effective plan for flood damage reduction an environmental restoration and protection in the vicinity of the Chino Dairy Preserve, Santa Ana River Watershed, Orange County, and San Bernardino County, California.

I wish to extend my deep appreciation for the leadership shown by Chairman SHUSTER, Ranking Member OBERSTAR, Subcommittee Chairman BOEHLERT and Ranking Member BORSKI in drafting this important piece of legislation.

I ask my colleagues to vote for H.R. 1480.

Mr. WELLER. Madam Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 1480, the Water Resources Development Act. This important legislation includes a provision that will advance a flood control project important to thousands of my constituents and many residents of Chicago's South Suburbs. H.R. 1480 will advance the construction of the Thornton Reservoir, which is located in my Congressional District, through an innovative approach allowing the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District of Greater Chicago to work with the Natural Resources Conservation Service to build a transitional reservoir for Thorn Creek. Because of this project, my constituents in the South Suburbs of Chicago will see the much needed benefits of flood control more than a decade earlier than previously anticipated by the Army Corps of Engineers.

The innovative approach included in H.R. 1480 will allow the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District of Chicago to secure credit for the advance work which is critical to the development of the permanent Thornton Reservoir. The approach couples early protection with local/federal partnering resulting in significant benefits to area communities.

Frequent flooding has been a constant problem in the Chicago area. This has consistently been the cause of disruptions in major expressways, as well as rainwater and raw sewage back up into the basements of over 500,000 homes. The solution comes from the Tunnel and Reservoir Plan (TARP) through an intricate system of underground tunnels, pumping stations and storage reservoirs used to control this flooding and combined sewage pollution in the Chicago Metropolitan Area. The Thornton Reservoir is a crucial component of the TARP project. Once completed, the Thornton Reservoir will provide 5 billion gallons of floodwater storage. The reservoir will have a service area of 91 square miles and will provide flood relief to 131,000 dwellings in 18 communities.

The continuation of the TARP project and the Thornton Reservoir is important to 500,000 families in Chicago's South Suburbs. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1480.

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Madam Chairman, I'm excited to rise in strong support for the Water Resources Development Act today. Three words can sum up my thoughts—finally, finally, finally!

This Water Resources bill contains a reauthorization for the Wood River/Warm Slough flood control project in Grand Island, Nebraska. The residents of Grand Island and I have been working on reauthorization and waiting for an opportunity to move it since 1997. Their patience has been tested, but I'm pleased I'm going to be able to report good news today.

Construction of the Wood River project was originally authorized in the 1996 Water Resources Development Act. Soon after the initial authorization, the Army Corps of Engineers had to revise its cost estimates for the project. The revision increased the cost by more than 20 percent, thus requiring congressional review and reauthorization.

The project eventually will provide flood protection for more than 1,700 structures in Grand Island and protect 5,000 acres of irrigated cropland. The project also will enhance wildlife habitat for many species, including the endangered Whooping Crane, and provide opportunities for wetlands development.

This is a good project that deserves our support. I wish to extend my sincere appreciation to the Transportation Committee for expeditiously moving this bill this spring. And thank you very, very much for your work on behalf of the residents of Grand Island, Nebraska.

Mr. KIND. Madam Chairman, I rise today as a co-chair of the upper Mississippi River congressional task force, in support of the upper Mississippi environmental management program which is part of WRDA 99.

The EMP is designed to evaluate, restore and enhance river and wetland habitat along a 1200 mile stretch of the upper Mississippi and Illinois Rivers. It is a cooperative effort among the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the U.S. Geological Service, the Army Corps of Engineers and the 5 upper Mississippi River basin States.

The EMP has always had bipartisan support in Congress and the five midwestern States. I, along with Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. GUTKNECHT and Mr. LEACH co-chair the 16 member upper Mississippi River congressional task force, which strongly supports expansion of the EMP.

WRDA 99 authorizes funding of $33.17 million each year for EMP.

EMP was established in 1986 by my predecessor Steve Gunderson. At the time EMP was only authorized for 15 years. This WRDA bill gives EMP a permanent authorization. In the past EMP projects faced funding challenges due to the uncertain future of the program. With adequate funding and permanent authorization the EMP will be able to continue it's outstanding work protecting this great natural resource.

The EMP is vital to the environmental and economic well being of the Mississippi River, and it enjoys strong bipartisan support throughout the upper Mississippi region.

Navigation along the upper Mississippi River supports 400,000 full and part-time jobs, which produces over $4 billion in individual income. Recreation use totals 12 million visitors each year and 1.2 billion in direct and indirect expenditures annually. Communities along the river from St. Paul, Minnesota to St. Louis, Missouri are striving to enhance the river. The EMP helps to rehabilitate the natural areas up and down the river.

I urge the Members to support WRDA and the Environmental Management Program, and I thank the chairman for the time.

Mr. HILLEARY. Madam Chairman, I want to thank the distinguished Chairman of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee for his cooperation and assistance in addressing an important concern in my district.

I appreciate that the chairman's manager's amendment includes language to allow the Corps of Engineers to conduct a feasibility study on improvements to a regional water supply for Cumberland County, Tennessee.

Water Supply has become a critical concern on the Cumberland Plateau. Recent growth and development throughout this region has placed extreme pressure on the six county water utility districts in Cumberland County and the City of Crossville to expand water supplies.

The Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation worked with the water utility districts and local officials within Cumberland County to form a regional water planning partnership to work together to address their mutual problem.

By working together in this partnership, they will be able to resolve water issues, avoid and reduce impacts to natural streams and save time and taxpayers' money.

At the request of local and state officials, the Army Corps of Engineers conducted a regional water supply study. This Preliminary Engineering Report was completed earlier this year and provides Cumberland County residents with innovative alternatives for a water supply through the year 2050. This ''state of the art'' model can be used as a process for other local governments to effectively plan the use of their region's water resources.

The manager's amendment will help this rapidly growing county by allowing them to continue into the next phase of the process in solving their long-term water supply needs.

Again, I want to thank Chairman SHUSTER for his assistance and urge all my colleagues to support his amendment and the entire bill.

Mr. SHUSTER. Madam Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the bill, modified by the amendments printed in part 1 of House Report 106–120, is considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule and is considered read.

The text of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as modified, is as follows:

H.R. 1480

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Water Resources Development Act of 1999''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
Sec. 2. Secretary defined.

TITLE I—WATER RESOURCES PROJECTS

Sec. 101. Project authorizations.
Sec. 102. Small flood control projects.
Sec. 103. Small bank stabilization projects.
Sec. 104. Small navigation projects.
Sec. 105. Small projects for improvement of the environment.
Sec. 106. Small aquatic ecosystem restoration projects.

TITLE II—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 201. Small flood control authority.
Sec. 202. Use of non-Federal funds for compiling and disseminating information on floods and flood damages.
Sec. 203. Contributions by States and political subdivisions.
Sec. 204. Sediment decontamination technology.
Sec. 205. Control of aquatic plants.
Sec. 206. Use of continuing contracts required for construction of certain projects.
Sec. 207. Support of Army civil works program.
Sec. 208. Water resources development studies for the Pacific region.
Sec. 209. Everglades and south Florida ecosystem restoration.
Sec. 210. Beneficial uses of dredged material.
Sec. 211. Harbor cost sharing.
Sec. 212. Aquatic ecosystem restoration.
Sec. 213. Watershed management, restoration, and development.
Sec. 214. Flood mitigation and riverine restoration pilot program.
Sec. 215. Shoreline management program.
Sec. 216. Assistance for remediation, restoration, and reuse.
Sec. 217. Shore damage mitigation.
Sec. 218. Shore protection.
Sec. 219. Flood prevention coordination.
Sec. 220. Annual passes for recreation.
Sec. 221. Cooperative agreements for environmental and recreational measures.
Sec. 222. Nonstructural flood control projects.
Sec. 223. Lakes program.
Sec. 224. Construction of flood control projects by non-Federal interests.
Sec. 225. Enhancement of fish and wildlife resources.
Sec. 226. Sense of Congress; requirement regarding notice.
Sec. 227. Periodic beach nourishment.
Sec. 228. Environmental dredging.

TITLE III—PROJECT-RELATED PROVISIONS

Sec. 301. Missouri River Levee System.
Sec. 302. Ouzinkie Harbor, Alaska.
Sec. 303. Greers Ferry Lake, Arkansas.
Sec. 304. Ten- and Fifteen-Mile Bayous, Arkansas.
Sec. 305. Loggy Bayou, Red River below Denison Dam, Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and Texas.
Sec. 306. Sacramento River, Glenn-Colusa, California.
Sec. 307. San Lorenzo River, California.
Sec. 308. Terminus Dam, Kaweah River, California.
Sec. 309. Delaware River mainstem and channel deepening, Delaware, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania.
Sec. 310. Potomac River, Washington, District of Columbia.
Sec. 311. Brevard County, Florida.
Sec. 312. Broward County and Hillsboro Inlet, Florida.
Sec. 313. Fort Pierce, Florida.
Sec. 314. Nassau County, Florida.
Sec. 315. Miami Harbor Channel, Florida.
Sec. 316. Lake Michigan, Illinois.
Sec. 317. Springfield, Illinois.
Sec. 318. Little Calumet River, Indiana.
Sec. 319. Ogden Dunes, Indiana.
Sec. 320. Saint Joseph River, South Bend, Indiana.
Sec. 321. White River, Indiana.
Sec. 322. Lake Pontchartrain, Louisiana.
Sec. 323. Larose to Golden Meadow, Louisiana.
Sec. 324. Louisiana State Penitentiary Levee, Louisiana.
Sec. 325. Twelve-mile Bayou, Caddo Parish, Louisiana.
Sec. 326. West Bank of the Mississippi River (East of Harvey Canal), Louisiana.
Sec. 327. Tolchester Channel, Baltimore Harbor and channels, Chesapeake Bay, Kent County, Maryland.
Sec. 328. Sault Sainte Marie, Chippewa County, Michigan.
Sec. 329. Jackson County, Mississippi.
Sec. 330. Tunica Lake, Mississippi.
Sec. 331. Bois Brule Drainage and Levee District, Missouri.
Sec. 332. Meramec River Basin, Valley Park Levee, Missouri.
Sec. 333. Missouri River mitigation project, Missouri, Kansas, Iowa, and Nebraska.
Sec. 334. Wood River, Grand Island, Nebraska.
Sec. 335. Absecon Island, New Jersey.
Sec. 336. New York Harbor and Adjacent Channels, Port Jersey, New Jersey
Sec. 337. Passaic River, New Jersey.
Sec. 338. Sandy Hook to Barnegat Inlet, New Jersey.
Sec. 339. Arthur Kill, New York and New Jersey.
Sec. 340. New York City watershed.
Sec. 341. New York State Canal System.
Sec. 342. Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point, New york.
Sec. 343. Broken Bow Lake, Red River Basin, Oklahoma.
Sec. 344. Willamette River temperature control, Mckenzie Subbasin, Oregon.
Sec. 345. Aylesworth Creek Reservoir, Pennsylvania.
Sec. 346. Curwensville Lake, Pennsylvania.
Sec. 347. Delaware River, Pennsylvania and Delaware.
Sec. 348. Mussers Dam, Pennsylvania.
Sec. 349. Nine-Mile Run, Allegheny County, Pennsylvania.
Sec. 350. Raystown Lake, Pennsylvania.
Sec. 351. South Central Pennsylvania.
Sec. 352. Cooper River, Charleston Harbor, South Carolina.
Sec. 353. Bowie County Levee, Texas.
Sec. 354. Clear Creek, Texas.
Sec. 355. Cypress Creek, Texas.
Sec. 356. Dallas Floodway Extension, Dallas, Texas.
Sec. 357. Upper Jordan River, Utah.
Sec. 358. Elizabeth River, Chesapeake, Virginia.
Sec. 359. Bluestone Lake, Ohio River Basin, West Virginia.
Sec. 360. Greenbrier Basin, West Virginia.
Sec. 361. Moorefield, West Virginia.
Sec. 362. West Virginia and Pennsylvania Flood Control.
Sec. 363. Project reauthorizations.
Sec. 364. Project deauthorizations.
Sec. 365. American and Sacramento Rivers, California.
Sec. 366. Martin, Kentucky.

TITLE IV—STUDIES

Sec. 401. Upper Mississippi and Illinois Rivers levees and streambanks protection.
Sec. 402. Upper Mississippi River comprehensive plan.
Sec. 403. El Dorado, Union County, Arkansas.
Sec. 404. Sweetwater Reservoir, San Diego County, California.
Sec. 405. Whitewater River Basin, California.
Sec. 406. Little Econlackhatchee River Basin, Florida.
Sec. 407. Port Everglades Inlet, Florida.
Sec. 408. Upper Des Plaines River and tributaries, Illinois and Wisconsin.
Sec. 409. Cameron Parish west of Calcasieu River, Louisiana.
Sec. 410. Grand Isle and vicinity, Louisiana.
Sec. 411. Lake Pontchartrain seawall, Louisiana.
Sec. 412. Westport, Massachusetts.
Sec. 413. Southwest Valley, Albuquerque, New Mexico.
Sec. 414. Cayuga Creek, New York.
Sec. 415. Arcola Creek Watershed, Madison, Ohio.
Sec. 416. Western Lake Erie Basin, Ohio, Indiana, and Michigan.
Sec. 417. Schuylkill River, Norristown, Pennsylvania.
Sec. 418. Lakes Marion and Moultrie, South Carolina.
Sec. 419. Day County, South Dakota.
Sec. 420. Corpus Christi, Texas.
Sec. 421. Mitchell's Cut Channel (Caney Fork Cut), Texas.
Sec. 422. Mouth of Colorado River, Texas.
Sec. 423. Kanawha River, Fayette County, West Virginia.
Sec. 424. West Virginia ports.
Sec. 425. Great Lakes region comprehensive study.
Sec. 426. Nutrient loading resulting from dredged material disposal.
Sec. 427. Santee Delta focus area, South Carolina.

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Sec. 501. Corps assumption of NRCS projects.
Sec. 502. Construction assistance.
Sec. 503. Contaminated sediment dredging technology.
Sec. 504. Dam safety.
Sec. 505. Great Lakes remedial action plans.
Sec. 506. Sea Lamprey control measures in the Great Lakes.
Sec. 507. Maintenance of navigation channels.
Sec. 508. Measurement of Lake Michigan diversions.
Sec. 509. Upper Mississippi River environmental management program.
Sec. 510. Atlantic Coast of New York monitoring.
Sec. 511. Water control management.
Sec. 512. Beneficial use of dredged material.
Sec. 513. Design and construction assistance.
Sec. 514. Lower Missouri River aquatic restoration projects.
Sec. 515. Aquatic resources restoration in the Northwest.
Sec. 516. Innovative technologies for watershed restoration.
Sec. 517. Environmental restoration.
Sec. 518. Expedited consideration of certain projects.
Sec. 519. Dog River, Alabama.
Sec. 520. Elba, Alabama.
Sec. 521. Geneva, Alabama.
Sec. 522. Navajo Reservation, Arizona, New Mexico, and Utah.
Sec. 523. Augusta and Devalls Bluff, Arkansas.
Sec. 524. Beaver Lake, Arkansas.
Sec. 525. Beaver Lake trout production facility, Arkansas.
Sec. 526. Chino Dairy Preserve, California.
Sec. 527. Novato, California.
Sec. 528. Orange and San Diego Counties, California.
Sec. 529. Salton Sea, California.
Sec. 530. Santa Cruz Harbor, California.
Sec. 531. Point Beach, Milford, Connecticut.
Sec. 532. Lower St. Johns River Basin, Florida.
Sec. 533. Shoreline protection and environmental restoration, Lake Allatoona, Georgia.
Sec. 534. Mayo's Bar Lock and Dam, Coosa River, Rome, Georgia.
Sec. 535. Comprehensive flood impact response modeling system, Coralville Reservoir and Iowa River Watershed, Iowa.

Sec. 536. Additional construction assistance in Illinois.
Sec. 537. Kanopolis Lake, Kansas.
Sec. 538. Southern and Eastern Kentucky.
Sec. 539. Southeast Louisiana.
Sec. 540. Snug Harbor, Maryland.
Sec. 541. Welch Point, Elk River, Cecil County, and Chesapeake City, Maryland.
Sec. 542. West View Shores, Cecil County, Maryland.
Sec. 543. Restoration projects for Maryland, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia.
Sec. 544. Cape Cod Canal Railroad Bridge, Buzzards Bay, Massachusetts.
Sec. 545. St. Louis, Missouri.
Sec. 546. Beaver Branch of Big Timber Creek, New Jersey.
Sec. 547. Lake Ontario and St. Lawrence River water levels, New York.
Sec. 548. New York-New Jersey Harbor, New York and New Jersey.
Sec. 549. Sea Gate Reach, Coney Island, New York, New York.
Sec. 550. Woodlawn, New York.
Sec. 551. Floodplain mapping, New York.
Sec. 552. White Oak River, North Carolina.
Sec. 553. Toussaint River, Carroll Township, Ottawa County, Ohio.
Sec. 554. Sardis Reservoir, Oklahoma.
Sec. 555. Waurika Lake, Oklahoma, water conveyance facilities.
Sec. 556. Skinner Butte Park, Eugene, Oregon.
Sec. 557. Willamette River basin, Oregon.
Sec. 558. Bradford and Sullivan Counties, Pennsylvania.
Sec. 559. Erie Harbor, Pennsylvania.
Sec. 560. Point Marion Lock And Dam, Pennsylvania.
Sec. 561. Seven Points' Harbor, Pennsylvania.
Sec. 562. Southeastern Pennsylvania.
Sec. 563. Upper Susquehanna-Lackawanna watershed restoration initiative.
Sec. 564. Aguadilla Harbor, Puerto Rico.
Sec. 565. Oahe Dam to Lake Sharpe, South Dakota, study.
Sec. 566. Integrated water management planning, Texas.
Sec. 567. Bolivar Peninsula, Jefferson, Chambers, and Galveston Counties, Texas.
Sec. 568. Galveston Beach, Galveston County, Texas.
Sec. 569. Packery Channel, Corpus Christi, Texas.
Sec. 570. Northern West Virginia.
Sec. 571. Urbanized peak flood management research.
Sec. 572. Mississippi River Commission.
Sec. 573. Coastal aquatic habitat management.
Sec. 574. Abandoned and inactive noncoal mine restoration.
Sec. 575. Beneficial use of waste tire rubber.
Sec. 576. Site designation.
Sec. 577. Land conveyances.
Sec. 578. Namings.
Sec. 579. Folsom Dam and Reservoir additional storage and additional flood control studies.
Sec. 580. Wallops Island, Virginia.
Sec. 581. Detroit River, Detroit, Michigan.

SEC. 2. SECRETARY DEFINED.

In this Act, the term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Army.

TITLE I—WATER RESOURCES PROJECTS

SEC. 101. PROJECT AUTHORIZATIONS.

(a) PROJECTS WITH CHIEF'S REPORTS.—The following projects for water resources development and conservation and other purposes are authorized to be carried out by the Secretary substantially in accordance with the plans, and subject to the conditions, described in the respective reports designated in this subsection:

(1) SAND POINT HARBOR, ALASKA.—The project for navigation, Sand Point Harbor, Alaska: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated October 13, 1998, at a total cost of $11,760,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $6,964,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $4,796,000.

(2) RIO SALADO, SALT RIVER, PHOENIX AND TEMPE, ARIZONA.—The project for flood control and environmental restoration, Rio Salado, Salt River, Phoenix and Tempe, Arizona: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated August 20, 1998, at a total cost of $88,048,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $56,355,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $31,693,000.

(3) TUCSON DRAINAGE AREA, ARIZONA.—The project for flood control, Tucson drainage area, Arizona: Report of the Chief of Engineers, dated May 20, 1998, at a total cost of $29,900,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $16,768,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $13,132,000.

(4) AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED, CALIFORNIA.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Folsom Dam Modification portion of the Folsom Modification Plan described in the United States Army Corps of Engineers Supplemental Information Report for the American River Watershed Project, California, dated March 1996, as modified by the report entitled ''Folsom Dam Modification Report, New Outlets Plan,'' dated March 1998, prepared by the Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency, at an estimated cost of $150,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $97,500,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $52,500,000. The Secretary shall coordinate with the Secretary of the Interior with respect to the design and construction of modifications at Folsom Dam authorized by this paragraph.

(B) REOPERATION MEASURES.—Upon completion of the improvements to Folsom Dam authorized by subparagraph (A), the variable space allocated to flood control within the Reservoir shall be reduced from the current operating range of 400,000-670,000 acre-feet to 400,000-600,000 acre-feet.

(C) MAKEUP OF WATER SHORTAGES CAUSED BY FLOOD CONTROL OPERATION.—The Secretary of the Interior shall enter into, or modify, such agreements with the Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency regarding the operation of Folsom Dam and reservoir as may be necessary in order that, notwithstanding any prior agreement or provision of law, 100 percent of the water needed to make up for any water shortage caused by variable flood control operation during any year at Folsom Dam and resulting in a significant impact on recreation at Folsom Reservoir shall be replaced, to the extent the water is available for purchase, by the Secretary of the Interior.

(D) SIGNIFICANT IMPACT ON RECREATION.—For the purposes of this paragraph, a significant impact on recreation is defined as any impact that results in a lake elevation at Folsom Reservoir below 435 feet above sea level starting on May 15 and ending on September 15 of any given year.

(5) SOUTH SACRAMENTO COUNTY STREAMS, CALIFORNIA.—The project for flood control, environmental restoration and recreation, South Sacramento County streams, California: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated October 6, 1998, at a total cost of $65,500,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $41,200,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $24,300,000.

(6) UPPER GUADALUPE RIVER, CALIFORNIA.—The project for flood control and recreation, Upper Guadalupe River, California: Locally Preferred Plan (known as the ''Bypass Channel Plan''), Report of the Chief of Engineers dated August 19, 1998, at a total cost of $140,285,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $44,000,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $96,285,000.

(7) YUBA RIVER BASIN, CALIFORNIA.—The project for flood control, Yuba River Basin, California: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated November 25, 1998, at a total cost of $26,600,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $17,350,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $9,250,000.

(8) DELAWARE BAY COASTLINE, DELAWARE AND NEW JERSEY-BROADKILL BEACH, DELAWARE.—The project for hurricane and storm damage reduction, Delaware Bay coastline, Delaware and New Jersey-Broadkill Beach, Delaware: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated August 17, 1998, at a total cost of $9,049,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $5,674,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $3,375,000, and at an estimated average annual cost of $538,200 for periodic nourishment over the 50-year life of the project, with an estimated annual Federal cost of $349,800 and an estimated annual non-Federal cost of $188,400.

(9) DELAWARE BAY COASTLINE, DELAWARE AND NEW JERSEY-PORT MAHON, DELAWARE.—The project for ecosystem restoration, Delaware Bay coastline, Delaware and New Jersey-Port Mahon, Delaware: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated September 28, 1998, at a total cost of $7,644,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $4,969,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $2,675,000, and at an estimated average annual cost of $234,000 for periodic nourishment over the 50-year life of the project, with an estimated annual Federal cost of $152,000 and an estimated annual non-Federal cost of $82,000.

(10) DELAWARE BAY COASTLINE, DELAWARE AND NEW JERSEY-ROOSEVELT INLET-LEWES BEACH, DELAWARE.—The project for navigation mitigation and hurricane and storm damage reduction, Delaware Bay coastline, Delaware and New Jersey-Roosevelt Inlet-Lewes Beach, Delaware: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated February 3, 1999, at a total cost of $3,393,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $2,620,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $773,000, and at an estimated average annual cost of $196,000 for periodic nourishment over the 50-year life of the project, with an estimated annual Federal cost of $152,000 and an estimated annual non-Federal cost of $44,000.

(11) JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, FLORIDA.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The project for navigation, Jacksonville Harbor, Florida: Report of the Chief of Engineers April 21, 1999, at a total cost of $26,116,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $9,129,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $16,987,000.

(B) SPECIAL RULE.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), the Secretary may construct the project to a depth of 40 feet if the non-Federal interest agrees to pay any additional costs above those for the recommended plan.

(12) TAMPA HARBOR-BIG BEND CHANNEL, FLORIDA.—The project for navigation, Tampa Harbor-Big Bend Channel, Florida: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated October 13, 1998, at a total cost of $9,356,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $6,235,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $3,121,000.

(13) BRUNSWICK HARBOR, GEORGIA.—The project for navigation, Brunswick Harbor, Georgia: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated October 6, 1998, at a total cost of $50,717,000, with an estimate Federal cost of $32,966,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $17,751,000.

(14) BEARGRASS CREEK, KENTUCKY.—The project for flood control, Beargrass Creek, Kentucky: Report of the Chief of Engineers, dated May 12, 1998, at a total cost of $11,171,300, with an estimated Federal cost of $7,261,500 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $3,909,800.

(15) AMITE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, LOUISIANA.—The project for flood control, Amite River and tributaries, Louisiana: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated December 23, 1996, at a total cost of $112,900,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $84,675,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $28,225,000. Cost sharing for the project shall be determined in accordance with section 103(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2213), as in effect on October 11, 1996.

(16) BALTIMORE HARBOR ANCHORAGES AND CHANNELS, MARYLAND AND VIRGINIA.—The project for navigation, Baltimore harbor anchorages and channels, Maryland and Virginia: Report of the Chief of Engineers, dated June 8, 1998, at a total cost of $28,430,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $19,000,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $9,430,000.

(17) RED RIVER LAKE AT CROOKSTON, MINNESOTA.—The project for flood control, Red River Lake at Crookston, Minnesota: Report of the Chief of Engineers, dated April 20, 1998, at a total cost of $8,950,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $5,720,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $3,230,000.

(18) LOWER CAPE MAY MEADOWS, CAPE MAY POINT, NEW JERSEY.—The project for navigation mitigation, ecosystem restoration, and hurricane and storm damage reduction, Lower Cape May Meadows, Cape May Point, New Jersey: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated April 5, 1999, at a total cost of $15,952,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $12,118,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $3,834,000, and at an estimated average annual cost of $1,114,000 for periodic nourishment over the 50-year life of the project, with an estimated annual Federal cost of $897,000 and an estimated annual non-Federal cost of $217,000.

(19) NEW JERSEY SHORE PROTECTION: TOWNSENDS INLET TO CAPE MAY INLET, NEW JERSEY.—The project for hurricane and storm damage reduction and ecosystem restoration, New Jersey Shore Protection: Townsends Inlet to Cape May Inlet, New Jersey: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated September 28, 1998, at a total cost of $56,503,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $36,727,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $19,776,000, and at an estimated average annual cost of $2,000,000 for periodic nourishment over the 50-year life of the project, with an estimated annual Federal cost of $1,300,000 and an estimated annual non-Federal cost of $700,000.

(20) GUANAJIBO RIVER, PUERTO RICO.—The project for flood control, Guanajibo River, Puerto Rico: Report of the Chief of Engineers, dated February 27, 1996, at a total cost of $27,031,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $20,273,250 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $6,757,750. Cost sharing for the project shall be determined in accordance with section 103(a) of the Water Resources Development Act 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2213) as in effect on October 11, 1986.

(21) RIO GRANDE DE MANATI, BARCELONETA, PUERTO RICO.—The project for flood control, Rio Grande De Manati, Barceloneta, Puerto Rico: Report of the Chief of Engineers, dated January 22, 1999, at a total cost of $13,491,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $8,785,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $4,706,000.

(22) RIO NIGUA AT SALINAS, PUERTO RICO.—The project for flood control, Rio Nigua at Salinas, Puerto Rico: Report of the Chief of Engineers, dated April 15, 1997, at a total cost of $13,702,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $7,645,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $6,057,000.

(23) SALT CREEK, GRAHAM, TEXAS.—The project for flood control, environmental restoration and recreation, Salt Creek, Graham, Texas: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated October 6, 1998, at a total cost of $10,080,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $6,560,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $3,520,000.

(b) PROJECTS SUBJECT TO REPORT.—The following projects for water resources development and conservation and other purposes are authorized to be carried out by the Secretary substantially in accordance with the plans, and subject to the conditions, recommended in a final report of the Corps of Engineers, if the report is completed not later than September 30, 1999.

(1) NOME, ALASKA.—The project for navigation, Nome, Alaska, at a total cost of $24,608,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $19,660,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $4,948,000.

(2) SEWARD HARBOR, ALASKA.—The project for navigation, Seward Harbor, Alaska, at a total cost of $12,240,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $4,364,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $7,876,000.

(3) HAMILTON AIRFIELD, CALIFORNIA.—The project for wetlands restoration, Hamilton Airfield, California, at a total cost of $55,200,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $41,400,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $13,800,000.

(4) OAKLAND HARBOR, CALIFORNIA.—The project for navigation, Oakland Harbor, California, at a total cost of $256,650,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $143,450,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $113,200,000.

(5) DELAWARE BAY COASTLINE, DELAWARE AND NEW JERSEY: REEDS BEACH AND PIERCES POINT, NEW JERSEY.—The project for shore protection and ecosystem restoration, Delaware Bay Coastline, Delaware and New Jersey: Reeds Beach and Pierces Point, New Jersey, at a total cost of $4,057,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $2,637,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $1,420,000.

(6) DELAWARE BAY COASTLINE, DELAWARE AND NEW JERSEY: VILLAS AND VICINITY, NEW JERSEY.—The project for shore protection and ecosystem restoration, Delaware Bay Coastline, Delaware and New Jersey: Villas and Vicinity, New Jersey, at a total cost of $7,520,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $4,888,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $2,632,000.

(7) DELAWARE COAST FROM CAPE HENELOPEN TO FENWICK ISLAND, BETHANY BEACH/SOUTH BETHANY BEACH, DELAWARE.—The project for hurricane and storm damage reduction, Delaware Coast from Cape Henelopen to Fenwick Island, Bethany Beach/South Bethany Beach, Delaware, at a total cost of $22,205,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $14,433,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $7,772,000, and at an estimated average annual cost of $1,584,000 for periodic nourishment over the 50-year life of the project, with an estimated annual Federal cost of $1,030,000 and an estimated annual non-Federal cost of $554,000.

(8) LITTLE TALBOT ISLAND, DUVAL COUNTY, FLORIDA.—The project for hurricane and storm damage prevention, Little Talbot Island, Duval County, Florida, at a total cost of $5,915,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $3,839,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $2,076,000.

(9) PONCE DE LEON INLET, FLORIDA.—The project for navigation and related purposes, Ponce de Leon Inlet, Volusia County, Florida, at a total cost of $5,454,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $2,988,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $2,466,000.

(10) SAVANNAH HARBOR EXPANSION, GEORGIA.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the project for navigation, Savannah Harbor expansion, Georgia, including implementation of the mitigation plan, with such modifications as the Secretary deems appropriate, at a total cost of $230,174,000 (of which amount a portion is authorized for implementation of the mitigation plan), with an estimated Federal cost of $145,160,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $85,014,000.

(B) CONDITIONS.—The project authorized by subparagraph (A) may be carried out only after—

(i) the Secretary, in consultation with affected Federal, State of Georgia, State of South Carolina, regional, and local entities, has reviewed and approved an environmental impact statement for the project that includes—

(I) an analysis of the impacts of project depth alternatives ranging from 42 feet through 48 feet; and

(II) a selected plan for navigation and an associated mitigation plan as required by section 906(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2283); and

(ii) the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Commerce, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, and the Secretary have approved the selected plan and have determined that the mitigation plan adequately addresses the potential environmental impacts of the project.

(C) MITIGATION REQUIREMENTS.—The mitigation plan shall be implemented in advance of or concurrently with construction of the project.

(11) DES PLAINES RIVER, ILLINOIS.—The project for flood control, Des Plaines River, Illinois, at a total cost of $44,300,000 with an estimated Federal cost of $28,800,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $15,500,000.

(12) NEW JERSEY SHORE PROTECTION, BRIGANTINE INLET TO GREAT EGG HARBOR, BRIGANTINE ISLAND, NEW JERSEY.—The project for hurricane and storm damage reduction, New Jersey shore protection, Brigantine Inlet to Great Egg Harbor, Brigantine Island, New Jersey, at a total cost of $4,970,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $3,230,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $1,740,000, and at an estimated average annual cost of $465,000 for periodic nourishment over the 50-year life of the project, with an estimated annual Federal cost of $302,000 and an estimated annual non-Federal cost of $163,000.

(13) COLUMBIA RIVER CHANNEL, OREGON AND WASHINGTON.—The project for navigation, Columbia River Channel, Oregon and Washington, at a total cost of $183,623,000 with an estimated Federal cost $106,132,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $77,491,000.

(14) JOHNSON CREEK, ARLINGTON, TEXAS.—The locally preferred project for flood control, Johnson Creek, Arlington, Texas, at a total cost of $20,300,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $12,000,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $8,300,000.

(15) HOWARD HANSON DAM, WASHINGTON.—The project for water supply and ecosystem restoration, Howard Hanson Dam, Washington, at a total cost of $75,600,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $36,900,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $38,700,000.

SEC. 102. SMALL FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a study for each of the following projects and, after completion of such study, shall carry out the project under section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 (33 U.S.C. 701s):

(1) LANCASTER, CALIFORNIA.—Project for flood control, Lancaster, California, westside stormwater retention facility.

(2) GATEWAY TRIANGLE AREA, FLORIDA.—Project for flood control, Gateway Triangle area, Collier County, Florida.

(3) PLANT CITY, FLORIDA.—Project for flood control, Plant City, Florida.

(4) STONE ISLAND, LAKE MONROE, FLORIDA.—Project for flood control, Stone Island, Lake Monroe, Florida.

(5) OHIO RIVER, ILLINOIS.—Project for flood control, Ohio River, Illinois.

(6) REPAUPO CREEK, NEW JERSEY.—Project for flood control, Repaupo Creek, New Jersey.

(7) OWASCO LAKE SEAWALL, NEW YORK.—Project for flood control, Owasco Lake seawall, New York.

(8) PORT CLINTON, OHIO.—Project for flood control, Port Clinton, Ohio.

(9) NORTH CANADIAN RIVER, OKLAHOMA.—Project for flood control, North Canadian River, Oklahoma.

(10) ABINGTON TOWNSHIP, PENNSYLVANIA.—Project for flood control, Baeder and Wanamaker Roads, Abington Township, Pennsylvania.

(11) PORT INDIAN, WEST NORRITON TOWNSHIP, MONTGOMERY COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA.—Project for flood control, Port Indian, West Norriton Township, Montgomery County, Pennsylvania.

(12) PORT PROVIDENCE, UPPER PROVIDENCE TOWNSHIP, PENNSYLVANIA.—Project for flood control, Port Providence, Upper Providence Township, Pennsylvania.

(13) SPRINGFIELD TOWNSHIP, MONTGOMERY COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA.—Project for flood control, Springfield Township, Montgomery County, Pennsylvania.

(14) FIRST CREEK, KNOXVILLE, TENNESSEE.—Project for flood control, First Creek, Knoxville, Tennessee.

(15) METRO CENTER LEVEE, CUMBERLAND RIVER, NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE.—Project for flood control, Metro Center Levee, Cumberland River, Nashville, Tennessee.

(b) FESTUS AND CRYSTAL CITY, MISSOURI.—

(1) MAXIMUM FEDERAL EXPENDITURE.—The maximum amount of Federal funds that may be expended for the project for flood control, Festus and Crystal City, Missouri, shall be $10,000,000.

(2) REVISION OF PROJECT COOPERATION AGREEMENT.—The Secretary shall revise the project cooperation agreement for the project referred to in paragraph (1) to take into account the change in the Federal participation in such project pursuant to paragraph (1).

(3) COST SHARING.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to affect any cost-sharing requirement applicable to the project referred to in paragraph (1) under the Water Resources Development Act of 1986.

SEC. 103. SMALL BANK STABILIZATION PROJECTS.

The Secretary shall conduct a study for each of the following projects and, after completion of such study, shall carry out the project under section 14 of the Flood Control Act of 1946 (33 U.S.C. 701r):

(1) SAINT JOSEPH RIVER, INDIANA.—Project for streambank erosion control, Saint Joseph River, Indiana.

(2) SAGINAW RIVER, BAY CITY, MICHIGAN.—Project for streambank erosion control, Saginaw River, Bay City, Michigan.

(3) BIG TIMBER CREEK, NEW JERSEY.—Project for streambank erosion control, Big Timber Creek, New Jersey.

(4) LAKE SHORE ROAD, ATHOL SPRINGS, NEW YORK.—Project for streambank erosion control, Lake Shore Road, Athol Springs, New York.

(5) MARIST COLLEGE, POUGHKEEPSIE, NEW YORK.—Project for streambank erosion control, Marist College, Poughkeepsie, New York.

(6) MONROE COUNTY, OHIO.—Project for streambank erosion control, Monroe County, Ohio.

(7) GREEN VALLEY, WEST VIRGINIA.—Project for streambank erosion control, Green Valley, West Virginia.

SEC. 104. SMALL NAVIGATION PROJECTS.

The Secretary shall conduct a study for each of the following projects and, after completion of such study, shall carry out the project under section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 577):

(1) GRAND MARAIS, ARKANSAS.—Project for navigation, Grand Marais, Arkansas.

(2) FIELDS LANDING CHANNEL, HUMBOLDT HARBOR, CALIFORNIA.—Project for navigation, Fields Landing Channel, Humboldt Harbor, California.

(3) SAN MATEO (PILLAR POINT HARBOR), CALIFORNIA.—Project for navigation San Mateo (Pillar Point Harbor), California.

(4) AGANA MARINA, GUAM.—Project for navigation, Agana Marina, Guam.

(5) AGAT MARINA, GUAM.—Project for navigation, Agat Marina, Guam.

(6) APRA HARBOR FUEL PIERS, GUAM.—Project for navigation, Apra Harbor Fuel Piers, Guam.

(7) APRA HARBOR PIER F–6, GUAM.—Project for navigation, Apra Harbor Pier F–6, Guam.

(8) APRA HARBOR SEAWALL, GUAM.—Project for navigation including a seawall, Apra Harbor, Guam.

(9) GUAM HARBOR, GUAM.—Project for navigation, Guam Harbor, Guam.

(10) ILLINOIS RIVER NEAR CHAUTAUQUA PARK, ILLINOIS.—Project for navigation, Illinois River near Chautauqua Park, Illinois.

(11) WHITING SHORELINE WATERFRONT, WHITING, INDIANA.—Project for navigation, Whiting Shoreline Waterfront, Whiting, Indiana.

(12) NARAGUAGUS RIVER, MACHIAS, MAINE.—Project for navigation, Naraguagus River, Machias, Maine.

(13) UNION RIVER, ELLSWORTH, MAINE.—Project for navigation, Union River, Ellsworth, Maine.

(14) DETROIT WATERFRONT, MICHIGAN.—Project for navigation, Detroit River, Michigan, including dredging and removal of a reef.

(15) FORTESCUE INLET, DELAWARE BAY, NEW JERSEY.—Project for navigation for Fortescue Inlet, Delaware Bay, New Jersey.

(16) BUFFALO AND LASALLE PARK, NEW YORK.—Project for navigation, Buffalo and LaSalle Park, New York.

(17) STURGEON POINT, NEW YORK.—Project for navigation, Sturgeon Point, New York.

SEC. 105. SMALL PROJECTS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE ENVIRONMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a study for each of the following projects and, after completion of such study, shall carry out the project under section 1135 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2309a):

(1) ILLINOIS RIVER IN THE VICINITY OF HAVANA, ILLINOIS.—Project for the improvement of the environment, Illinois River in the vicinity of Havana, Illinois.

(2) KNITTING MILL CREEK, VIRGINIA.—Project for the improvement of the environment, Knitting Mill Creek, Virginia.

(b) PINE FLAT DAM, KINGS RIVER, CALIFORNIA.—The Secretary shall carry out under section 1135(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2309a(a)) a project to construct a turbine bypass at Pine Flat Dam, Kings River, California, in accordance with the Project Modification Report and Environmental Assessment dated September 1996.

SEC. 106. SMALL AQUATIC ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION PROJECTS.

The Secretary shall conduct a study for each of the following projects and, after completion of such study, shall carry out the project under section 206 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (33 U.S.C. 2330):

(1) CONTRA COSTA COUNTY, BAY DELTA, CALIFORNIA.—Project for aquatic ecosystem restoration, Contra Costa County, Bay Delta, California.

(2) INDIAN RIVER, FLORIDA.—Project for aquatic ecosystem restoration and lagoon restoration, Indian River, Florida.

(3) LITTLE WEKIVA RIVER, FLORIDA.—Project for aquatic ecosystem restoration and erosion control, Little Wekiva River, Florida.

(4) COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS.—Project for aquatic ecosystem restoration and lagoon restoration and protection, Cook County, Illinois.

(5) GRAND BATTURE ISLAND, MISSISSIPPI.—Project for aquatic ecosystem restoration, Grand Batture Island, Mississippi.

(6) HANCOCK, HARRISON, AND JACKSON COUNTIES, MISSISSIPPI.—Project for aquatic ecosystem restoration and reef restoration along the Gulf Coast, Hancock, Harrison, and Jackson Counties, Mississippi.

(7) MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND RIVER DES PERES, ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI.—Project for aquatic ecosystem restoration and recreation, Mississippi River and River Des Peres, St. Louis, Missouri.

(8) HUDSON RIVER, NEW YORK.—Project for aquatic ecosystem restoration, Hudson River, New York.

(9) ONEIDA LAKE, NEW YORK.—Project for aquatic ecosystem restoration, Oneida Lake, Oneida County, New York.

(10) OTSEGO LAKE, NEW YORK.—Project for aquatic ecosystem restoration, Otsego Lake, Otsego County, New York.

(11) NORTH FORK OF YELLOW CREEK, OHIO.—Project for aquatic ecosystem restoration, North Fork of Yellow Creek, Ohio.

(12) WHEELING CREEK WATERSHED, OHIO.—Project for aquatic ecosystem restoration, Wheeling Creek watershed, Ohio.

(13) SPRINGFIELD MILLRACE, OREGON.—Project for aquatic ecosystem restoration, Springfield Millrace, Oregon.

(14) UPPER AMAZON CREEK, OREGON.—Project for aquatic ecosystem restoration, Upper Amazon Creek, Oregon.

(15) LAKE ONTELAUNEE RESERVOIR, BERKS COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA.—Project for aquatic ecosystem restoration and distilling pond facilities, Lake Ontelaunee Reservoir, Berks County, Pennsylvania.

(16) BLACKSTONE RIVER BASIN, RHODE ISLAND AND MASSACHUSETTS.—Project for aquatic ecosystem restoration and fish passage facilities, Blackstone River Basin, Rhode Island and Massachusetts.

TITLE II—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 201. SMALL FLOOD CONTROL AUTHORITY.

Section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 (33 U.S.C. 701s) is amended—

(1) by striking ''construction of small projects'' and inserting ''implementation of small structural and nonstructural projects''; and

(2) by striking ''$5,000,000'' and inserting ''$7,000,000''.

SEC. 202. USE OF NON-FEDERAL FUNDS FOR COMPILING AND DISSEMINATING INFORMATION ON FLOODS AND FLOOD DAMAGES.

The last sentence of section 206(b) of the Flood Control Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 709a(b)) is amended by inserting before the period the following: ''; except that this limitation on fees shall not apply to funds voluntarily contributed by such entities for the purpose of expanding the scope of the services requested by such entities''.

SEC. 203. CONTRIBUTIONS BY STATES AND POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS.

Section 5 of the Flood Control Act of June 22, 1936 (33 U.S.C. 701h), is amended by inserting ''or environmental restoration'' after ''flood control''.

SEC. 204. SEDIMENT DECONTAMINATION TECHNOLOGY.

Section 405 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (33 U.S.C. 2239 note; 106 Stat. 4863) is amended—

(1) by adding at the end of subsection (a) the following:

''(4) PRACTICAL END-USE PRODUCTS.—Technologies selected for demonstration at the pilot scale shall be intended to result in practical end-use products.

''(5) ASSISTANCE BY THE SECRETARY.—The Secretary shall assist the project to ensure expeditious completion by providing sufficient quantities of contaminated dredged material to conduct the full-scale demonstrations to stated capacity.'';

(2) in subsection (c) by striking the first sentence and inserting the following: ''There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $22,000,000 to complete technology testing, technology commercialization, and the development of full scale processing facilities within the New York/New Jersey Harbor.''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(e) SUPPORT.—In carrying out the program under this section, the Secretary is encouraged to utilize contracts, cooperative agreements, and grants with colleges and universities and other non-Federal entities.''.

SEC. 205. CONTROL OF AQUATIC PLANTS.

Section 104 of the River and Harbor Act of 1958 (33 U.S.C. 610) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a) by inserting ''arundo,'' after ''milfoil,'';

(2) in subsection (b) by striking ''$12,000,000'' and inserting ''$15,000,000.''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(c) SUPPORT.—In carrying out this program, the Secretary is encouraged to utilize contracts, cooperative agreements, and grants with colleges and universities and other non-Federal entities.''.

SEC. 206. USE OF CONTINUING CONTRACTS REQUIRED FOR CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN PROJECTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary shall not implement a fully allocated funding policy with respect to a water resources project if initiation of construction has occurred but sufficient funds are not available to complete the project. The

Secretary shall enter into continuing contracts for such project.

(b) INITIATION OF CONSTRUCTION CLARIFIED.—For the purposes of this section, initiation of construction for a project occurs on the date of enactment of an Act that appropriates funds for the project from 1 of the following appropriation accounts:

(1) Construction, General.

(2) Operation and Maintenance, General.

(3) Flood Control, Mississippi River and Tributaries.

SEC. 207. SUPPORT OF ARMY CIVIL WORKS PROGRAM.

The requirements of section 2361 of title 10, United States Code, shall not apply to any contract, cooperative research and development agreement, cooperative agreement, or grant entered into under section 229 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3703) between the Secretary and Marshall University or entered into under section 350 of this Act between the Secretary and Juniata College.

SEC. 208. WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT STUDIES FOR THE PACIFIC REGION.

Section 444 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3747) is amended by striking ''interest of navigation'' and inserting ''interests of water resources development, including navigation, flood damage reduction, and environmental restoration''.

SEC. 209. EVERGLADES AND SOUTH FLORIDA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION.

(a) PROGRAM EXTENSION.—Section 528(b)(3) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3769) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B) by striking ''1999'' and inserting ''2000''; and

(2) in subparagraph (C)(i) by striking ''1999'' and inserting ''2003''.

(b) CREDIT.—Section 528(b)(3) of such Act is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(D) CREDIT OF PAST AND FUTURE ACTIVITIES.—The Secretary may provide a credit to the non-Federal interests toward the non-Federal share of a project implemented under subparagraph (A). The credit shall be for reasonable costs of work performed by the non-Federal interests if the Secretary determines that the work substantially expedited completion of the project and is compatible with and an integral part of the project, and the credit is provided pursuant to a specific project cooperation agreement.''.

(c) CALOOSAHATCHEE RIVER BASIN, FLORIDA.—Section 528(e)(4) of such Act is amended by inserting before the period at the end of the first sentence the following: ''if the Secretary determines that such land acquisition is compatible with and an integral component of the Everglades and South Florida ecosystem restoration, including potential land acquisition in the Caloosahatchee River basin or other areas''.

SEC. 210. BENEFICIAL USES OF DREDGED MATERIAL.

Section 204 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4826–4827) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c) by striking ''cooperative agreement in accordance with the requirements of section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970'' and inserting ''binding agreement with the Secretary''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(g) NON-FEDERAL INTERESTS.—Notwithstanding section 221(b) of the Flood Control Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b(b)), the Secretary, after coordination with the appropriate State and local government officials having jurisdiction over an area in which a project under this section will be carried out, may allow a nonprofit entity to serve as the non-Federal interest for the project.''.

SEC. 211. HARBOR COST SHARING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Sections 101 and 214 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2211 and 2241; P.L. 99–662) are amended by striking ''45 feet'' each place it appears and inserting ''53 feet''.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall only apply to a project, or separable element thereof, on which a contract for physical construction has not been awarded before the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 212. AQUATIC ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION.

Section 206 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3679–3680) is amended—

(1) by adding at the end of subsection (b) the following: ''Before October 1, 2003, the Federal share may be provided in the form of grants or reimbursements of project costs.''; and

(2) by adding at the end of subsection (c) the following: ''Notwithstanding section 221(b) of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b(b)), the Secretary, after coordination with the appropriate State and local government officials having jurisdiction over an area in which a project under this section will be carried out, may allow a nonprofit entity to serve as the non-Federal interest for the project.''.

SEC. 213. WATERSHED MANAGEMENT, RESTORATION, AND DEVELOPMENT.

(a) NONPROFIT ENTITY AS NON-FEDERAL INTEREST.—Section 503(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3756) is amended by adding at the end the following: ''Notwithstanding section 221(b) of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b(b)), the Secretary, after coordination with the appropriate State and local government officials having jurisdiction over an area in which a project under this section will be carried out, may allow a nonprofit entity to serve as the non-Federal interest for the project.''.

(b) PROJECT LOCATIONS.—Section 503(d) of such Act is amended—

(1) in paragraph (7) by inserting before the period at the end '', including Clear Lake''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(14) Fresno Slough watershed, California.

''(15) Hayward Marsh, Southern San Francisco Bay watershed, California.

''(16) Kaweah River watershed, California.

''(17) Malibu Creek watershed, California.

''(18) Illinois River watershed, Illinois.

''(19) Catawba River watershed, North Carolina.

''(20) Cabin Creek basin, West Virginia.

''(21) Lower St. Johns River basin, Florida.''.

SEC. 214. FLOOD MITIGATION AND RIVERINE RESTORATION PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may undertake a program for the purpose of conducting projects that reduce flood hazards and restore the natural functions and values of rivers throughout the United States.

(b) STUDIES AND PROJECTS.—

(1) AUTHORITY.—In carrying out the program, the Secretary may conduct studies to identify appropriate flood damage reduction, conservation, and restoration measures and may design and implement projects described in subsection (a).

(2) CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION.—The studies and projects carried out under this section shall be conducted, to the maximum extent practicable, in consultation and coordination with the Federal Emergency Management Agency and other appropriate Federal agencies, and in consultation and coordination with appropriate State, tribal, and local agencies.

(3) NONSTRUCTURAL APPROACHES.—The studies and projects shall emphasize, to the maximum extent practicable and appropriate, nonstructural approaches to preventing or reducing flood damages.

(4) USE OF STATE, TRIBAL, AND LOCAL STUDIES AND PROJECTS.—The studies and projects shall include consideration of and coordination with any State, tribal, and local flood damage reduction or riverine and wetland restoration studies and projects that conserve, restore, and manage hydrologic and hydraulic regimes and restore the natural functions and values of floodplains.

(c) COST-SHARING REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) STUDIES.—Studies conducted under this section shall be subject to cost sharing in accordance with section 105 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2215).

(2) ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND NONSTRUCTURAL FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS.—The non-Federal interests shall pay 35 percent of the cost of any environmental restoration or nonstructural flood control project carried out under this section. The non-Federal interests shall provide all land, easements, rights-of-way, dredged material disposal areas, and relocations necessary for such projects. The value of such land, easements, rights-of-way, dredged material disposal areas, and relocations shall be credited toward the payment required under this paragraph.

(3) STRUCTURAL FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS.—Any structural flood control measures carried out under this section shall be subject to cost sharing in accordance with section 103(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2213(a)).

(4) OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.—The non-Federal interests shall be responsible for all costs associated with operating, maintaining, replacing, repairing, and rehabilitating all projects carried out under this section.

(d) PROJECT JUSTIFICATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law or requirement for economic justification established pursuant to section 209 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962–2), the Secretary may implement a project under this section if the Secretary determines that the project—

(A) will significantly reduce potential flood damages;

(B) will improve the quality of the environment; and

(C) is justified considering all costs and beneficial outputs of the project.

(2) ESTABLISHMENT OF SELECTION AND RATING CRITERIA AND POLICIES.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary, in cooperation with State, tribal, and local agencies, shall develop, and transmit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate, criteria for selecting and rating projects to be carried out under this section and shall establish policies and procedures for carrying out the studies and projects undertaken under this section. Such criteria shall include, as a priority, the extent to which the appropriate State government supports the project.

(e) PRIORITY AREAS.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall examine the potential for flood damage reductions at appropriate locations, including the following:

(1) Upper Delaware River, New York.

(2) Willamette River floodplain, Oregon.

(3) Pima County, Arizona, at Paseo De Las Iglesias and Rillito River.

(4) Los Angeles and San Gabriel Rivers, California.

(5) Murrieta Creek, California.

(6) Napa County, California, at Yountville, St. Helena, Calistoga, and American Canyon.

(7) Santa Clara basin, California, at Upper Guadalupe River and tributaries, San Francisquito Creek, and Upper Penitencia Creek.

(8) Pine Mount Creek, New Jersey.

(9) Chagrin River, Ohio.

(10) Blair County, Pennsylvania, at Altoona and Frankstown Township.

(11) Lincoln Creek, Wisconsin.

(f) PROGRAM REVIEW.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The program established under this section shall be subject to an independent review to evaluate the efficacy of the program in achieving the dual goals of flood hazard mitigation and riverine restoration.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than April 15, 2003, the Secretary shall transmit to the Committee on

Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report on the findings of the review conducted under this subsection with any recommendations concerning continuation of the program.

(g) COST LIMITATIONS.—

(1) MAXIMUM FEDERAL COST PER PROJECT.—No more than $30,000,000 may be expended by the United States on any single project under this section.

(2) COMMITTEE RESOLUTION PROCEDURE.—

(A) LIMITATION ON APPROPRIATIONS.—No appropriation shall be made to construct any project under this section the total Federal cost of construction of which exceeds $15,000,000 if the project has not been approved by resolutions adopted by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate.

(B) REPORT.—For the purpose of securing consideration of approval under this paragraph, the Secretary shall transmit a report on the proposed project, including all relevant data and information on all costs.

(h) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section—

(1) $25,000,000 for fiscal year 2000;

(2) $25,000,000 for fiscal year 2001 if $12,500,000 or more is appropriated to carry out subsection (e) for fiscal year 2000;

(3) $25,000,000 for fiscal year 2002 if $12,500,000 or more is appropriated to carry out subsection (e) for fiscal year 2001; and

(4) $25,000,000 for fiscal year 2003 if $12,500,000 or more is appropriated to carry out subsection (e) for fiscal year 2002.

SEC. 215. SHORELINE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM.

(a) REVIEW.—The Secretary shall review the implementation of the Corps of Engineers' shoreline management program, with particular attention to inconsistencies in implementation among the divisions and districts of the Corps of Engineers and complaints by or potential inequities regarding property owners in the Savannah District including an accounting of the number and disposition of complaints over the last 5 years in the District.

(b) REPORT.—As expeditiously as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall transmit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report describing the results of the review conducted under subsection (a).

SEC. 216. ASSISTANCE FOR REMEDIATION, RESTORATION, AND REUSE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may provide to State and local governments assessment, planning, and design assistance for remediation, environmental restoration, or reuse of areas located within the boundaries of such State or local governments where such remediation, environmental restoration, or reuse will contribute to the conservation of water and related resources of drainage basins and watersheds within the United States.

(b) BENEFICIAL USE OF DREDGED MATERIAL.—In providing assistance under subsection (a), the Secretary shall encourage the beneficial use of dredged material, consistent with the findings of the Secretary under section 204 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (33 U.S.C. 2326).

(c) NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—The non-Federal share of the cost of assistance provided under subsection (a) shall be 50 percent.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $3,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2000 through 2004.

SEC. 217. SHORE DAMAGE MITIGATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 111 of the River and Harbor Act of 1968 (33 U.S.C. 426i; 100 Stat. 4199) is amended by inserting after ''navigation works'' the following: ''and shore damages attributable to the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway and the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway''.

(b) PALM BEACH COUNTY, FLORIDA.—The project for navigation, Palm Beach County, Florida, authorized by section 2 of the River and Harbor Act of March 2, 1945 (59 Stat. 11), is modified to authorize the Secretary to undertake beach nourishment as a dredged material disposal option under the project.

(c) GALVESTON COUNTY, TEXAS.—The Secretary may place dredged material from the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway on the beaches along Rollover Pass, Galveston County, Texas, to stabilize beach erosion.

SEC. 218. SHORE PROTECTION.

(a) NON-FEDERAL SHARE OF PERIODIC NOURISHMENT.—Section 103(d) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4085–5086) is amended—

(1) by inserting ''(1) CONSTRUCTION.—'' before ''Costs of constructing'';

(2) by inserting at the end the following:

''(2) PERIODIC NOURISHMENT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the non-Federal share of costs of periodic nourishment measures for shore protection or beach erosion control that are carried out—

''(i) after January 1, 2001, shall be 40 percent;

''(ii) after January 1, 2002, shall be 45 percent; and

''(iii) after January 1, 2003, shall be 50 percent;

''(B) BENEFITS TO PRIVATELY OWNED SHORES.—All costs assigned to benefits of periodic nourishment measures to privately owned shores (where use of such shores is limited to private interests) or to prevention of losses of private lands shall be borne by the non-Federal interest and all costs assigned to the protection of federally owned shores for such measures shall be borne by the United States.''; and

(C) by indenting paragraph (1) (as designated by subparagraph (A) of this paragraph) and aligning such paragraph with paragraph (2) (as added by subparagraph (B) of this paragraph).

(b) UTILIZATION OF SAND FROM OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF.—Section 8(k)(2)(B) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1337(k)(2)(B)) is amended by striking ''an agency of the Federal Government'' and inserting ''a Federal, State, or local government agency''.

(c) REPORT ON NATION'S SHORELINES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall report to Congress on the state of the Nation's shorelines.

(2) CONTENTS.—The report shall include—

(A) a description of the extent of, and economic and environmental effects caused by, erosion and accretion along the Nation's shores and the causes thereof;

(B) a description of resources committed by local, State, and Federal governments to restore and renourish shorelines;

(C) a description of the systematic movement of sand along the Nation's shores; and

(D) recommendations regarding (i) appropriate levels of Federal and non-Federal participation in shoreline protection, and (ii) utilization of a systems approach to sand management.

(3) UTILIZATION OF SPECIFIC LOCATION DATA.—In developing the report, the Secretary shall utilize data from specific locations on the Atlantic, Pacific, Great Lakes, and Gulf of Mexico coasts.

(d) NATIONAL COASTAL DATA BANK.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT OF DATA BANK.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall establish a national coastal data bank containing data on the geophysical and climatological characteristics of the Nation's shorelines.

(2) CONTENT.—To the extent practical, the national coastal data bank shall include data regarding current and predicted shoreline positions, information on federally-authorized shore protection projects, and data on the movement of sand along the Nation's shores, including impediments to such movement caused by natural and manmade features.

(3) ACCESS.—The national coastal data bank shall be made readily accessible to the public.

SEC. 219. FLOOD PREVENTION COORDINATION.

Section 206 of the Flood Control Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 709a) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (b) and (c) as subsections (c) and (d), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (a) the following:

''(b) FLOOD PREVENTION COORDINATION.—The Secretary shall coordinate with the Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency and the heads of other Federal agencies to ensure that flood control projects and plans are complementary and integrated to the extent practicable and appropriate.''.

SEC. 220. ANNUAL PASSES FOR RECREATION.

Section 208(c)(4) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (16 U.S.C. 460d note; 110 Stat. 3680) is amended by striking ''1999, or the date of transmittal of the report under paragraph (3)'' and inserting ''2003''.

SEC. 221. COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS FOR ENVIRONMENTAL AND RECREATIONAL MEASURES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary is authorized to enter into cooperative agreements with non-Federal public bodies and non-profit entities for the purpose of facilitating collaborative efforts involving environmental protection and restoration, natural resources conservation, and recreation in connection with the development, operation, and management of water resources projects under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall transmit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report that includes—

(1) a listing and general description of the cooperative agreements entered into by the Secretary with non-Federal public bodies and entities under subsection (a);

(2) a determination of whether such agreements are facilitating collaborative efforts; and

(3) a recommendation on whether such agreements should be further encouraged.

SEC. 222. NONSTRUCTURAL FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS.

(a) ANALYSIS OF BENEFITS.—Section 308 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (33 U.S.C. 2318; 104 Stat. 4638) is amended—

(1) in the heading to subsection (a) by inserting ''ELEMENTS EXCLUDED FROM'' before ''BENEFIT-COST'';

(2) by redesignating subsections (b) through (e) as subsections (c) through (f), respectively; and

(3) by inserting after subsection (a) the following:

''(b) FLOOD DAMAGE REDUCTION BENEFITS.—In calculating the benefits of a proposed project for nonstructural flood damage reduction, the Secretary shall calculate benefits of nonstructural projects using methods similar to structural projects, including similar treatment in calculating the benefits from losses avoided from both structural and nonstructural alternatives. In carrying out this subsection, the Secretary should avoid double counting of benefits.''.

(b) REEVALUATION OF FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS.—At the request of a non-Federal interest for a flood control project, the Secretary shall conduct a reevaluation of a previously authorized project to consider nonstructural alternatives in light of the amendments made by subsection (a).

(c) COST SHARING.—Section 103(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33

U.S.C. 2213(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following: ''At any time during construction of the project, where the Secretary determines that the costs of lands, easements, rights-of-way, dredged material disposal areas, and relocations in combination with other costs contributed by the non-Federal interests will exceed 35 percent, any additional costs for the project, but not to exceed 65 percent of the total costs of the project, shall be a Federal responsibility and shall be contributed during construction as part of the Federal share.''.

SEC. 223. LAKES PROGRAM.

Section 602(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (110 Stat. 3758) is amended—

(1) by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (15);

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (16) and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(17) Clear Lake, Lake County, California, removal of silt and aquatic growth and measures to address excessive sedimentation and high nutrient concentration; and

''(18) Osgood Pond, Milford, Hillsborough County, New Hampshire, removal of silt and aquatic growth and measures to address excessive sedimentation.

''(19) Flints Pond, Hollis, Hillsborough County, New Hampshire, removal of silt and aquatic growth and measures to address excessive sedimentation.''.

SEC. 224. CONSTRUCTION OF FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS BY NON-FEDERAL INTERESTS.

(a) CONSTRUCTION BY NON-FEDERAL INTERESTS.—Section 211(d)(1) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (33 U.S.C. 701b–13(d)(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''(b) or'';

(2) by striking ''Any non-Federal'' and inserting the following:

''(A) STUDIES AND DESIGN ACTIVITIES UNDER SUBSECTION (b).—A non-Federal interest may only carry out construction for which studies and design documents are prepared under subsection (b) if the Secretary approves such construction. The Secretary shall approve such construction unless the Secretary determines, in writing, that the design documents do not meet standard practices for design methodologies or that the project is not economically justified or environmentally acceptable or does not meet the requirements for obtaining the appropriate permits required under the Secretary's authority. The Secretary shall not unreasonably withhold approval. Nothing in this subparagraph may be construed to affect any regulatory authority of the Secretary.

''(B) STUDIES AND DESIGN ACTIVITIES UNDER SUBSECTION (c).—Any non-Federal''; and

(3) by aligning the remainder of subparagraph (B) (as designated by paragraph (2) of this subsection) with subparagraph (A) (as inserted by paragraph (2) of this subsection).

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 211(d)(2) of such Act is amended by inserting ''(other than paragraph (1)(A))'' after ''this subsection''.

(c) REIMBURSEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 211(e)(1) of such Act is amended—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (1) by inserting after ''constructed pursuant to this section'' the following: ''and provide credit for the non-Federal share of the project'';

(B) by striking ''and'' at the end of subparagraph (A);

(C) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (B) and inserting ''; and''; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

''(C) if the construction work is reasonably equivalent to Federal construction work.''.

(2) SPECIAL RULES.—Section 211(e)(2)(A) of such Act is amended—

(A) by striking ''subject to amounts being made available in advance in appropriations Acts'' and inserting ''subject to appropriations''; and

(B) by inserting after ''the cost of such work'' the following: '', or provide credit (depending on the request of the non-Federal interest) for the non-Federal share of such work,''.

(3) SCHEDULE AND MANNER OF REIMBURSEMENTS.—Section 211(e) of such Act (33 U.S.C. 701b–13(e)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(6) SCHEDULE AND MANNER OF REIMBURSEMENT.—

''(A) BUDGETING.—The Secretary shall budget and request appropriations for reimbursements under this section on a schedule that is consistent with a Federal construction schedule.

''(B) COMMENCEMENT OF REIMBURSEMENTS.—Reimbursements under this section may commence upon approval of a project by the Secretary.

''(C) CREDIT.—At the request of a non-Federal interest, the Secretary may reimburse the non-Federal interest by providing credit toward future non-Federal costs of the project.

''(D) SCHEDULING.—Nothing in this paragraph shall affect the President's discretion to schedule new construction starts.''.

SEC. 225. ENHANCEMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE RESOURCES.

Section 906(e) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2283(e)) is amended by inserting after the second sentence the following: ''Not more than 80 percent of the non-Federal share of such first costs may be satisfied through in-kind contributions, including facilities, supplies, and services that are necessary to carry out the enhancement project.''.

SEC. 226. SENSE OF CONGRESS; REQUIREMENT REGARDING NOTICE.

(a) PURCHASE OF AMERICAN-MADE EQUIPMENT AND PRODUCTS.—It is the sense of Congress that, to the greatest extent practicable, all equipment and products purchased with funds made available under this Act should be American made.

(b) NOTICE TO RECIPIENTS OF ASSISTANCE.—In providing financial assistance under this Act, the Secretary, to the greatest extent practicable, shall provide to each recipient of the assistance a notice describing the statement made in subsection (a).

SEC. 227. PERIODIC BEACH NOURISHMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 506(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3757) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(5) LEE COUNTY, FLORIDA.—Project for shoreline protection, Lee County, Captiva Island segment, Florida.''.

(b) PROJECTS.—Section 506(b)(3) of such Act (110 Stat. 3758) is amended by striking subparagraph (A) and redesignating subparagraphs (B) through (D) as subparagraphs (A) through (C), respectively.

SEC. 228. ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING.

Section 312 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (104 Stat. 4639–4640) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(1) by striking ''50'' and inserting ''35''; and

(2) in subsection (d) by striking ''non-Federal responsibility'' and inserting ''shared as a cost of construction''.

TITLE III—PROJECT-RELATED PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. MISSOURI RIVER LEVEE SYSTEM.

The project for flood control, Missouri River Levee System, authorized by section 10 of the Act entitled ''An Act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and other purposes'', approved December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 897), is modified to provide that project costs totaling $2,616,000 expended on Units L–15, L–246, and L–385 out of the Construction, General account of the Corps of Engineers before the date of enactment of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2201 note) shall not be treated as part of total project costs.

SEC. 302. OUZINKIE HARBOR, ALASKA.

(a) MAXIMUM FEDERAL EXPENDITURE.—The maximum amount of Federal funds that may be expended for the project for navigation, Ouzinkie Harbor, Alaska, shall be $8,500,000.

(b) REVISION OF PROJECT COOPERATION AGREEMENT.—The Secretary shall revise the project cooperation agreement for the project referred to in subsection (a) to take into account the change in the Federal participation in such project pursuant to subsection (a).

(c) COST SHARING.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to affect any cost-sharing requirement applicable to the project referred to in subsection (a) under the Water Resources Development Act of 1986.

SEC. 303. GREERS FERRY LAKE, ARKANSAS.

The project for flood control, Greers Ferry Lake, Arkansas, authorized by the Act entitled ''An Act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and other purposes'', approved June 28, 1938 (52 Stat. 1218), is modified to authorize the Secretary to construct water intake facilities for the benefit of Lonoke and White Counties, Arkansas.

SEC. 304. TEN- AND FIFTEEN-MILE BAYOUS, ARKANSAS.

The project for flood control, St. Francis River Basin, Missouri and Arkansas, authorized by section 204 of the Flood Control Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 172), is modified to expand the project boundaries to include Ten- and Fifteen-Mile Bayous near West Memphis, Arkansas. Notwithstanding section 103(f) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4086), the flood control work at Ten- and Fifteen-Mile Bayous shall not be considered separable elements of the St. Francis Basin project.

SEC. 305. LOGGY BAYOU, RED RIVER BELOW DENISON DAM, ARKANSAS, LOUISIANA, OKLAHOMA, AND TEXAS.

The project for flood control on the Red River Below Denison Dam, Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and Texas, authorized by section 10 of the Flood Control Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 647), is modified to direct the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of expanding the project to include mile 0.0 to mile 7.8 of Loggy Bayou between the Red River and Flat River. If the Secretary determines as a result of the study that the project should be expanded, the Secretary may assume responsibility for operation and maintenance of the expanded project.

SEC. 306. SACRAMENTO RIVER, GLENN-COLUSA, CALIFORNIA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The project for flood control, Sacramento River, California, authorized by section 2 of the Act entitled ''An Act to provide for the control of the floods of the Mississippi River and of the Sacramento River, California, and for other purposes'', approved March 1, 1917 (39 Stat. 949), and modified by section 102 of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 1990 (103 Stat. 649), section 301(b)(3) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3110), and title I of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 1999 (112 Stat. 1841), is further modified to authorize the Secretary—

(1) to carry out the portion of the project at Glenn-Colusa, California, at a total cost of $26,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $20,000,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $6,000,000; and

(2) to carry out bank stabilization work in the vicinity of the riverbed gradient facility, particularly in the vicinity of River Mile 208.

(b) CREDIT.—The Secretary shall provide the non-Federal interests for the project referred to in subsection (a) a credit of up to $4,000,000 toward the non-Federal share of the project costs for the direct and indirect costs incurred by the

non-Federal sponsor in carrying out activities associated with environmental compliance for the project. Such credit may be in the form of reimbursements for costs which were incurred by the non-Federal interests prior to an agreement with the Corps of Engineers, to include the value of lands, easements, rights-of-way, relocations, or dredged material disposal areas.

SEC. 307. SAN LORENZO RIVER, CALIFORNIA.

The project for flood control and habitat restoration, San Lorenzo River, California, authorized by section 101(a)(5) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3663), is modified to authorize the Secretary to expand the boundaries of the project to include bank stabilization for a 1,000-foot portion of the San Lorenzo River.

SEC. 308. TERMINUS DAM, KAWEAH RIVER, CALIFORNIA.

(a) TRANSFER OF TITLE TO ADDITIONAL LAND.—If the non-Federal interests for the project for flood control and water supply, Terminus Dam, Kaweah River, California, authorized by section 101(b)(5) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3667), transfers to the Secretary without consideration title to perimeter lands acquired for the project by the non-Federal interests, the Secretary may accept the transfer of such title.

(b) LANDS, EASEMENT, AND RIGHTS-OF-WAY.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to change, modify, or otherwise affect the responsibility of the non-Federal interests to provide lands, easements, rights-of-way, relocations, and dredged material disposal areas necessary for the Terminus Dam project and to perform operation and maintenance for the project.

(c) OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.—Upon request by the non-Federal interests, the Secretary shall carry out operation, maintenance, repair, replacement, and rehabilitation of the project if the non-Federal interests enter into a binding agreement with the Secretary to reimburse the Secretary for 100 percent of the costs of such operation, maintenance, repair, replacement, and rehabilitation.

(d) HOLD HARMLESS.—The non-Federal interests shall hold the United States harmless for ownership, operation, and maintenance of lands and facilities of the Terminus Dam project title to which is transferred to the Secretary under this section.

SEC. 309. DELAWARE RIVER MAINSTEM AND CHANNEL DEEPENING, DELAWARE, NEW JERSEY, AND PENNSYLVANIA.

The project for navigation, Delaware River Mainstem and Channel Deepening, Delaware, New Jersey and Pennsylvania, authorized by section 101(6) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4802), is modified as follows:

(1) The Secretary is authorized to provide non-Federal interests credit toward cash contributions required for construction and subsequent to construction for engineering and design and construction management work that is performed by non-Federal interests and that the Secretary determines is necessary to implement the project. Any such credits extended shall reduce the Philadelphia District's private sector performance goals for engineering work by a like amount.

(2) The Secretary is authorized to provide to non-Federal interests credit toward cash contributions required during construction and subsequent to construction for the costs of construction carried out by the non-Federal interest on behalf of the Secretary and that the Secretary determines is necessary to implement the project.

(3) The Secretary is authorized to enter into an agreement with a non-Federal interest for the payment of disposal or tipping fees for dredged material from a Federal project other than for the construction or operation and maintenance of the new deepening project as described in the Limited Reevaluation Report of May 1997, where the non-Federal interest has supplied the corresponding disposal capacity.

(4) The Secretary is authorized to enter into an agreement with a non-Federal interest that will provide that the non-Federal interest may carry out or cause to have carried out, on behalf of the Secretary, a disposal area management program for dredged material disposal areas necessary to construct, operate, and maintain the project and to authorize the Secretary to reimburse the non-Federal interest for the costs of the disposal area management program activities carried out by the non-Federal interest.

SEC. 310. POTOMAC RIVER, WASHINGTON, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

The project for flood control authorized by section 5 of the Flood Control Act of June 22, 1936 (69 Stat. 1574), as modified by section 301(a)(4) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3707), is further modified to authorize the Secretary to construct the project at a Federal cost of $5,965,000.

SEC. 311. BREVARD COUNTY, FLORIDA.

(a) STUDY.—The Secretary, in cooperation with the non-Federal interest, shall conduct a study of any damage to the project for shoreline protection, Brevard County, Florida, authorized by section 101(b)(7) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3667), to determine whether the damage is the result of a Federal navigation project.

(b) CONDITIONS.—In conducting the study, the Secretary shall utilize the services of an independent coastal expert who shall consider all relevant studies completed by the Corps of Engineers and the project's local sponsor. The study shall be completed within 120 days of the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) MITIGATION OF DAMAGES.—After completion of the study, the Secretary shall mitigate any damage to the shoreline protection project that is the result of a Federal navigation project. The costs of the mitigation shall be allocated to the Federal navigation project as operation and maintenance.

SEC. 312. BROWARD COUNTY AND HILLSBORO INLET, FLORIDA.

The project for shoreline protection, Broward County and Hillsboro Inlet, Florida, authorized by section 301 of the River and Harbor Act of 1965 (79 Stat. 1090), is modified to authorize the Secretary to reimburse the non-Federal interest for the Federal share of the cost of preconstruction planning and design for the project upon execution of a contract to construct the project if the Secretary determines such work is compatible with and integral to the project.

SEC. 313. FORT PIERCE, FLORIDA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The project for shore protection and harbor mitigation, Fort Pierce, Florida, authorized by section 301 of the River and Harbor Act of 1965 (79 Stat. 1092) and section 506(a)(2) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3757), is modified to incorporate an additional 1 mile into the project in accordance with a final approved General Reevaluation Report, at a total cost for initial nourishment for the entire project of $9,128,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $7,073,500 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $2,054,500.

(b) PERIOD NOURISHMENT.—Periodic nourishment is authorized for the project in accordance with section 506(a)(2) of Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3757).

(c) REVISION OF THE PROJECT COOPERATION AGREEMENT.—The Secretary shall revise the project cooperation agreement for the project referred to in subsection (a) to take into account the change in Federal participation in the project pursuant to subsection (a).

SEC. 314. NASSAU COUNTY, FLORIDA.

The project for beach erosion control, Nassau County (Amelia fIsland), Florida, authorized by section 3(a)(3) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1988 (102 Stat. 4013), is modified to authorize the Secretary to construct the project at a total cost of $17,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $13,300,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $3,700,000.

SEC. 315. MIAMI HARBOR CHANNEL, FLORIDA.

The project for navigation, Miami Harbor Channel, Florida, authorized by section 101(a)(9) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (104 Stat. 4606), is modified to include construction of artificial reefs and related environmental mitigation required by Federal, State, and local environmental permitting agencies for the project.

SEC. 316. LAKE MICHIGAN, ILLINOIS.

The project for storm damage reduction and shoreline erosion protection, Lake Michigan, Illinois, from Wilmette, Illinois, to the Illinois-Indiana State line, authorized by section 101(a)(12) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3664), is modified to authorize the Secretary to provide a credit against the non-Federal share of the cost of the project for costs incurred by the non-Federal interest—

(1) in constructing Reach 2D and Segment 8 of Reach 4 of the project; and

(2) in reconstructing Solidarity Drive in Chicago, Illinois, prior to entry into a project cooperation agreement with the Secretary.

SEC. 317. SPRINGFIELD, ILLINOIS.

Section 417 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3743) is amended—

(1) by inserting ''(a) IN GENERAL.—'' before ''The Secretary''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(b) COST SHARING.—The non-Federal share of assistance provided under this section before, on, or after the date of enactment of this subsection shall be 50 percent.''.

SEC. 318. LITTLE CALUMET RIVER, INDIANA.

The project for flood control, Little Calumet River, Indiana, authorized by section 401(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4115), is modified to authorize the Secretary to construct the project substantially in accordance with the report of the Corps of Engineers, at a total cost of $167,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $122,000,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $45,000,000.

SEC. 319. OGDEN DUNES, INDIANA.

(a) STUDY.—The Secretary shall conduct a study of beach erosion in and around the town of Ogden Dunes, Indiana, to determine whether the damage is the result of a Federal navigation project.

(b) MITIGATION OF DAMAGES.—After completion of the study, the Secretary shall mitigate any damage to the beach and shoreline that is the result of a Federal navigation project. The cost of the mitigation shall be allocated to the Federal navigation project as operation and maintenance.

SEC. 320. SAINT JOSEPH RIVER, SOUTH BEND, INDIANA.

(a) MAXIMUM TOTAL EXPENDITURE.—The maximum total expenditure for the project for streambank erosion, recreation, and pedestrian access features, Saint Joseph River, South Bend, Indiana, shall be $7,800,000.

(b) REVISION OF PROJECT COOPERATION AGREEMENT.—The Secretary shall revise the project cooperation agreement for the project referred to in subsection (a) to take into account the change in the Federal participation in such project pursuant to subsection (a).

(c) COST SHARING.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to affect any cost-sharing requirement applicable to the project referred to in subsection (a) under title I of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2211 et seq.).

SEC. 321. WHITE RIVER, INDIANA.

The project for flood control, Indianapolis on West Fork of the White River, Indiana, authorized by section 5 of the Act entitled ''An Act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and other purposes'', approved June 22, 1936 (49

Stat. 1586), and modified by section 323 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3716), is further modified to authorize the Secretary to undertake riverfront alterations as described in the Central Indianapolis Waterfront Concept Master Plan, dated February 1994, at a total cost of $110,975,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $52,475,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $58,500,000.

SEC. 322. LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN, LOUISIANA.

The project for hurricane-flood protection, Lake Pontchartrain, Louisiana, authorized by section 204 of the Flood Control Act of 1965 (79 Stat. 1077), is modified—

(1) to direct the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of constructing a pump adjacent to each of the 4 proposed drainage structures for the Saint Charles Parish feature of the project; and

(2) to authorize the Secretary to construct such pumps upon completion of the study.

SEC. 323. LAROSE TO GOLDEN MEADOW, LOUISIANA.

The project for hurricane protection Larose to Golden Meadow, Louisiana, authorized by section 204 of the Flood Control Act of 1965 (79 Stat. 1077), is modified to direct the Secretary to convert the Golden Meadow floodgate into a navigation lock if the Secretary determines that the conversion is feasible.

SEC. 324. LOUISIANA STATE PENITENTIARY LEVEE, LOUISIANA.

The Louisiana State Penitentiary Levee project, Louisiana, authorized by section 401(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4117), is modified to direct the Secretary to provide credit to the non-Federal interest toward the non-Federal share of the cost of the project. The credit shall be for cost of work performed by the non-Federal interest prior to the execution of a project cooperation agreement as determined by the Secretary to be compatible with and an integral part of the project.

SEC. 325. TWELVE-MILE BAYOU, CADDO PARISH, LOUISIANA.

The Secretary shall be responsible for maintenance of the levee along Twelve-Mile Bayou from its junction with the existing Red River Below Denison Dam Levee approximately 26 miles upstream to its terminus at high ground in the vicinity of Black Bayou, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, if the Secretary determines that such maintenance is economically justified and environmentally acceptable and that the levee was constructed in accordance with appropriate design and engineering standards.

SEC. 326. WEST BANK OF THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER (EAST OF HARVEY CANAL), LOUISIANA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The project for flood control and storm damage reduction, West Bank of the Mississippi River (East of Harvey Canal), Louisiana, authorized by section 401(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4128) and section 101(a)(17) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3665), is modified—

(1) to provide that any liability under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.) from the construction of the project is a Federal responsibility; and

(2) to authorize the Secretary to carry out operation and maintenance of that portion of the project included in the report of the Chief of Engineers, dated May 1, 1995, referred to as ''Algiers Channel'', if the non-Federal sponsor reimburses the Secretary for the amount of such operation and maintenance included in the report of the Chief of Engineers.

(b) COMBINATION OF PROJECTS.—The Secretary shall carry out work authorized as part of the Westwego to Harvey Canal project, the East of Harvey cannal project, and the Lake Cataouatche modifications as a single project, to be known as the West Bank and vicinity, New Orleans, Louisiana, hurricane protection project, with a combined total cost of $280,300,000.

SEC. 327. TOLCHESTER CHANNEL, BALTIMORE HARBOR AND CHANNELS, CHESAPEAKE BAY, KENT COUNTY, MARYLAND.

The project for navigation, Tolchester Channel, Baltimore Harbor and Channels, Chesapeake Bay, Kent County, Maryland, authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 297), is modified to authorize the Secretary to straighten the navigation channel in accordance with the District Engineer's Navigation Assessment Report and Environmental Assessment, dated April 30, 1997. This modification shall be carried out in order to improve navigation safety.

SEC. 328. SAULT SAINTE MARIE, CHIPPEWA COUNTY, MICHIGAN.

The project for navigation Sault Sainte Marie, Chippewa County, Michigan, authorized by section 1149 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4254–4255) and modified by section 330 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3717–3718), is further modified to provide that the amount to be paid by non-Federal interests pursuant to section 101(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2211(a)) and subsection (a) of such section 330 shall not include any interest payments.

SEC. 329. JACKSON COUNTY, MISSISSIPPI.

The project for environmental infrastructure, Jackson County, Mississippi, authorized by section 219(c)(5) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835) and modified by section 504 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3757), is further modified to direct the Secretary to provide a credit, not to exceed $5,000,000, against the non-Federal share of the cost of the project for the costs incurred by the Jackson County Board of Supervisors since February 8, 1994, in constructing the project if the Secretary determines that such costs are for work that the Secretary determines is compatible with and integral to the project.

SEC. 330. TUNICA LAKE, MISSISSIPPI.

The project for flood control, Mississippi River Channel Improvement Project, Tunica Lake, Mississippi, authorized by the Act entitled: ''An Act for the control of floods on the Mississippi River and its tributaries, and for other purposes'', approved May 15, 1928 (45 Stat. 534–538), is modified to include construction of a weir at the Tunica Cutoff, Mississippi.

SEC. 331. BOIS BRULE DRAINAGE AND LEVEE DISTRICT, MISSOURI.

(a) MAXIMUM FEDERAL EXPENDITURE.—The maximum amount of Federal funds that may be allocated for the project for flood control, Bois Brule Drainage and Levee District, Missouri, authorized pursuant to section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 (33 U.S.C. 701s), shall be $15,000,000.

(b) REVISION OF THE PROJECT COOPERATION AGREEMENT.—The Secretary shall revise the project cooperation agreement for the project referred to in subsection (a) to take into account the change in Federal participation in the project pursuant to subsection (a).

(c) COST SHARING.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to affect any cost-sharing requirement applicable to the project referred to in subsection (a) under title I of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2211 et seq.).

SEC. 332. MERAMEC RIVER BASIN, VALLEY PARK LEVEE, MISSOURI.

The project for flood control, Meramec River Basin, Valley Park Levee, Missouri, authorized by section 2(h) of an Act entitled ''An Act to deauthorize several projects within the jurisdiction of the Army Corps of Engineers'' (95 Stat. 1682–1683) and modified by section 1128 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986, (100 Stat. 4246), is further modified to authorize the Secretary to construct the project at a maximum Federal expenditure of $35,000,000.

SEC. 333. MISSOURI RIVER MITIGATION PROJECT, MISSOURI, KANSAS, IOWA, AND NEBRASKA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The project for mitigation of fish and wildlife losses, Missouri River Bank Stabilization and Navigation Project, Missouri, Kansas, Iowa, and Nebraska, authorized by section 601 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4143), is modified to increase by 118,650 acres the lands and interests in lands to be acquired for the project.

(b) STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in conjunction with the States of Nebraska, Iowa, Kansas, and Missouri, shall conduct a study to determine the cost of restoring, under the authority of the Missouri River fish and wildlife mitigation project, a total of 118,650 acres of lost Missouri River habitat.

(2) REPORT.—The Secretary shall report to Congress on the results of the study not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 334. WOOD RIVER, GRAND ISLAND, NEBRASKA.

The project for flood control, Wood River, Grand Island, Nebraska, authorized by section 101(a)(19) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3665), is modified to authorize the Secretary to construct the project substantially in accordance with the report of the Corps of Engineers dated June 29, 1998, at a total cost of $17,039,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $9,730,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $7,309,000.

SEC. 335. ABSECON ISLAND, NEW JERSEY.

The project for storm damage reduction and shoreline protection, Brigantine Inlet to Great Egg Harbor Inlet, Absecon Island, New Jersey, authorized by section 101(b)(13) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3668), is modified to provide that, if, after October 12, 1996, the non-Federal interests carry out any work associated with the project that is later recommended by the Chief of Engineers and approved by the Secretary, the Secretary may credit the non-Federal interests toward the non-Federal share of the cost of the project an amount equal to the Federal share of the cost of such work, without interest.

SEC. 336. NEW YORK HARBOR AND ADJACENT CHANNELS, PORT JERSEY, NEW JERSEY

The project for navigation, New York Harbor and Adjacent Channels, New York and New Jersey, authorized by section 202(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4098), is modified to authorize the Secretary to construct that portion of the project that is located between Military Ocean Terminal Bayonne and Global Terminal in Bayonne, New Jersey, substantially in accordance with the report of the Corps of Engineers, at a total cost of $103,267,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $76,909,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $26,358,000.

SEC. 337. PASSAIC RIVER, NEW JERSEY.

Section 101(a)(18)(B) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (104 Stat. 4608–4609) is amended by inserting '', including an esplanade for safe pedestrian access with an overall width of 600 feet'' after ''public access to Route 21''.

SEC. 338. SANDY HOOK TO BARNEGAT INLET, NEW JERSEY.

The project for shoreline protection, Sandy Hook to Barnegat Inlet, New Jersey, authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 299), is modified—

(1) to include the demolition of Long Branch pier and extension of Ocean Grove pier; and

(2) to authorize the Secretary to reimburse the non-Federal sponsor for the Federal share of costs associated with the demolition of Long Branch pier and the construction of the Ocean Grove pier.

SEC. 339. ARTHUR KILL, NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY.

The project for navigation, Arthur Kill, New York and New Jersey, authorized by section

202(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4098) and modified by section 301(b)(11) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3711), is further modified to authorize the Secretary to construct the portion of the project at Howland Hook Marine Terminal substantially in accordance with the report of the Corps of Engineers, dated September 30, 1998, at a total cost of $315,700,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $183,200,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $132,500,000.

SEC. 340. NEW YORK CITY WATERSHED.

Section 552(i) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3781) is amended by striking ''$22,500,000'' and inserting ''$42,500,000''.

SEC. 341. NEW YORK STATE CANAL SYSTEM.

Section 553(e) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3781) is amended by striking ''$8,000,000'' and inserting ''$18,000,000''.

SEC. 342. FIRE ISLAND INLET TO MONTAUK POINT, NEW YORK.

The project for combined beach erosion control and hurricane protection, Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point, Long Island, New York, authorized by the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (74 Stat. 483) and modified by the River and Harbor Act of 1962, the Water Resources Development Act of 1974, and the Water Resources Development Act of 1986, is further modified to direct the Secretary, in coordination with the heads of other Federal departments and agencies, to complete all procedures and reviews expeditiously and to adopt and transmit to Congress not later than June 30, 1999, a mutually acceptable shore erosion plan for the Fire Island Inlet to Moriches Inlet reach of the project.

SEC. 343. BROKEN BOW LAKE, RED RIVER BASIN, OKLAHOMA.

The project for flood control and water supply, Broken Bow Lake, Red River Basin, Oklahoma, authorized by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 309) and modified by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1187), section 102(v) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4808), and section 338 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3720), is further modified to require the Secretary to make seasonal adjustments to the top of the conservation pool at the project as follows (if the Secretary determines that the adjustments will be undertaken at no cost to the United States and will adequately protect impacted water and related resources):

(1) Maintain an elevation of 599.5 from November 1 through March 31.

(2) Increase elevation gradually from 599.5 to 602.5 during April and May.

(3) Maintain an elevation of 602.5 from June 1 to September 30.

(4) Decrease elevation gradually from 602.5 to 599.5 during October.

SEC. 344. WILLAMETTE RIVER TEMPERATURE CONTROL, MCKENZIE SUBBASIN, OREGON.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The project for environmental restoration, Willamette River Temperature Control, McKenzie Subbasin, Oregon, authorized by section 101(a)(25) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3665), is modified to authorize the Secretary to construct the project substantially in accordance with the Feature Memorandum dated July 31, 1998, at a total cost of $64,741,000.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall report to Congress on the reasons for the cost growth of the Willamette River project and outline the steps the Corps of Engineers is taking to control project costs, including the application of value engineering and other appropriate measures. In the report, the Secretary shall also include a cost estimate for, and recommendations on the advisability of, adding fish screens to the project.

SEC. 345. AYLESWORTH CREEK RESERVOIR, PENNSYLVANIA.

The project for flood control, Aylesworth Creek Reservoir, Pennsylvania, authorized by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1182), is modified to authorize the Secretary to transfer, in each of fiscal years 1999 and 2000, $50,000 to the Aylesworth Creek Reservoir Park Authority for recreational facilities.

SEC. 346. CURWENSVILLE LAKE, PENNSYLVANIA.

Section 562 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3784) is amended by adding at the end the following: ''The Secretary shall provide design and construction assistance for recreational facilities at Curwensville Lake and, when appropriate, may require the non-Federal interest to provide not more than 25 percent of the cost of designing and constructing such facilities. The Secretary may transfer, in each of fiscal years 1999 through 2003, $100,000 to the Clearfield County Municipal Services and Recreation Authority for recreational facilities.''.

SEC. 347. DELAWARE RIVER, PENNSYLVANIA AND DELAWARE.

The project for navigation, Delaware River, Philadelphia to Wilmington, Pennsylvania and Delaware, authorized by section 3(a)(12) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1988 (102 Stat. 4014), is modified to authorize the Secretary to extend the channel of the Delaware River at Camden, New Jersey, to within 150 feet of the existing bulkhead and to relocate the 40-foot deep Federal navigation channel, eastward within Philadelphia Harbor, from the Ben Franklin Bridge to the Walt Whitman Bridge, into deep water.

SEC. 348. MUSSERS DAM, PENNSYLVANIA.

Section 209 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4830) is amended by striking subsection (e) and redesignating subsection (f) as subsection (e).

SEC. 349. NINE-MILE RUN, ALLEGHENY COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA.

The Nine-Mile Run project, Allegheny County, Pennsylvania, carried out pursuant to section 206 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (33 U.S.C. 2330; 110 Stat. 3679–3680), is modified to authorize the Secretary to provide a credit toward the non-Federal share of the project for costs incurred by the non-Federal interest in preparing environmental and feasibility documentation for the project before entering into an agreement with the Corps of Engineers with respect to the project if the Secretary determines such costs are for work that is compatible with and integral to the project.

SEC. 350. RAYSTOWN LAKE, PENNSYLVANIA.

(a) RECREATION PARTNERSHIP INITIATIVE.—Section 519(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3765) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

''(3) ENGINEERING AND DESIGN SERVICES.—The Secretary may perform, at full Federal expense, engineering and design services for project infrastructure expected to be associated with the development of the site at Raystown Lake, Hesston, Pennsylvania.''.

(b) CONSTRUCTION ASSISTANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Consistent with the master plan described in section 318 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4848), the Secretary may provide a grant to Juniata College for the construction of facilities and structures at Raystown Lake, Pennsylvania, to interpret and understand environmental conditions and trends. As a condition of the receipt of such financial assistance, officials at Juniata College shall coordinate with the Baltimore District of the Army Corps of Engineers.

(2) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated $5,000,000 for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1998, to carry out this subsection.

SEC. 351. SOUTH CENTRAL PENNSYLVANIA.

Section 313(g)(1) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4846) is amended by striking ''$80,000,000'' and inserting ''$180,000,000''.

SEC. 352. COOPER RIVER, CHARLESTON HARBOR, SOUTH CAROLINA.

The project for rediversion, Cooper River, Charleston Harbor, South Carolina, authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1968 (82 Stat. 731) and modified by title I of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 1992 (105 Stat. 516), is further modified to authorize the Secretary to pay to the State of South Carolina not more than $3,750,000 if the Secretary and the State enter into a binding agreement for the State to perform all future operation of, including associated studies to assess the efficacy of, the St. Stephen, South Carolina, fish lift. The agreement must specify the terms and conditions under which payment will be made and the rights of, and remedies available to, the Federal Government to recover all or a portion of such payment in the event the State suspends or terminates operation of the fish lift or fails to operate the fish lift in a manner satisfactory to the Secretary. Maintenance of the fish lift shall remain a Federal responsibility.

SEC. 353. BOWIE COUNTY LEVEE, TEXAS.

The project for flood control, Red River Below Denison Dam, Texas and Oklahoma, authorized by section 10 of the Flood Control Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 647), is modified to direct the Secretary to implement the Bowie County Levee feature of the project in accordance with the plan defined as Alternative B in the draft document entitled ''Bowie County Local Flood Protection, Red River, Texas Project Design Memorandum No. 1, Bowie County Levee'', dated April 1997. In evaluating and implementing this modification, the Secretary shall allow the non-Federal interest to participate in the financing of the project in accordance with section 903(c) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4184) to the extent that the Secretary's evaluation indicates that applying such section is necessary to implement the project.

SEC. 354. CLEAR CREEK, TEXAS.

Section 575 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3789) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(c) CLEAR CREEK, TEXAS.—In any evaluation of economic benefits and costs for the project for flood control, Clear Creek, Texas, authorized by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1968 (82 Stat. 742) that occurs after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Secretary shall include the costs and benefits of nonstructural measures undertaken, including any buyout or relocation actions, of non-Federal interests within the drainage area of such project before the date of the evaluation in the determination of conditions existing before the construction of the project.''.

SEC. 355. CYPRESS CREEK, TEXAS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The project for flood control, Cypress Creek, Texas, authorized by section 3(a)(13) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1988 (102 Stat. 4014), is modified to authorize the Secretary to carry out a nonstructural flood control project at a total cost of $5,000,000.

(b) REIMBURSEMENT FOR WORK.—The Secretary may reimburse the non-Federal interest for the Cypress Creek project for work done by the non-Federal interest on the nonstructural flood control project in an amount equal to the estimate of the Federal share, without interest, of the cost of such work—

(1) if, after authorization and before initiation of construction of such nonstructural project, the Secretary approves the plans for construction of such nonstructural project by the non-Federal interest; and

(2) if the Secretary finds, after a review of studies and design documents prepared to carry

out such nonstructural project, that construction of such nonstructural project is economically justified and environmentally acceptable.

SEC. 356. DALLAS FLOODWAY EXTENSION, DALLAS, TEXAS.

The project for flood control, Dallas Floodway Extension, Dallas, Texas, authorized by section 301 of the River and Harbor Act of 1965 (79 Stat. 1091) and modified by section 351 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3724), is further modified—

(1) to add environmental restoration and recreation as project purposes; and

(2) to authorize the Secretary to construct the project substantially in accordance with the Chain of Wetlands Plan in the report of the Corps of Engineers at a total cost of $123,200,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $80,000,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $43,200,000.

SEC. 357. UPPER JORDAN RIVER, UTAH.

The project for flood control, Upper Jordan River, Utah, authorized by section 101(a)(23) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (104 Stat. 4610) and modified by section 301(a)(14) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3709), is further modified to direct the Secretary to carry out the locally preferred project, entitled ''Upper Jordan River Flood Control Project, Salt Lake County, Utah—Supplemental Information'' and identified in the document of Salt Lake County, Utah, dated July 30, 1998, at a total cost of $12,870,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $8,580,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $4,290,000.

SEC. 358. ELIZABETH RIVER, CHESAPEAKE, VIRGINIA.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, after September 30, 1999, the city of Chesapeake, Virginia, shall not be obligated to make the annual cash contribution required under paragraph 1(9) of the Local Cooperation Agreement dated December 12, 1978, between the Government and the city for the project for navigation, southern branch of Elizabeth River, Chesapeake, Virginia.

SEC. 359. BLUESTONE LAKE, OHIO RIVER BASIN, WEST VIRGINIA.

Section 102(ff) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4810) is amended by striking ''take such measures as are technologically feasible'' and inserting ''implement Plan C/G, as defined in the Evaluation Report of the District Engineer, dated December 1996,''.

SEC. 360. GREENBRIER BASIN, WEST VIRGINIA.

Section 579(c) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3790) is amended by striking ''$12,000,000'' and inserting ''$73,000,000.''

SEC. 361. MOOREFIELD, WEST VIRGINIA.

Effective October 1, 1999, the project for flood control, Moorefield, West Virginia, authorized by section 101(a)(25) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (104 Stat. 4610-4611), is modified to provide that the non-Federal interest shall not be required to pay the unpaid balance, including interest, of the non-Federal share of the cost of the project.

SEC. 362. WEST VIRGINIA AND PENNSYLVANIA FLOOD CONTROL.

Section 581(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3790) is amended to read as follows:

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may design and construct—

''(1) flood control measures in the Cheat and Tygart River basins, West Virginia, at a level of protection that is sufficient to prevent any future losses to these communities from flooding such as occurred in January 1996 but no less than a 100-year level of protection; and

''(2) structural and nonstructural flood control, streambank protection, stormwater management, and channel clearing and modification measures in the Lower Allegheny, Lower Monongahela, West Branch Susquehanna, and Juniata River basins, Pennsylvania, at a level of protection that is sufficient to prevent any future losses to communities in these basins from flooding such as occurred in January 1996, but no less than a 100-year level of flood protection with respect to those measures that incorporate levees or floodwalls.''.

SEC. 363. PROJECT REAUTHORIZATIONS.

(a) LEE CREEK, ARKANSAS AND OKLAHOMA.—The project for flood protection on Lee Creek, Arkansas and Oklahoma, authorized by section 204 of the Flood Control Act of 1965 (79 Stat. 1078) and deauthorized pursuant to section 1001(b)(1) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 579a(b)(1)), is authorized to be carried out by the Secretary.

(b) INDIAN RIVER COUNTY, FLORIDA.—The project for shore protection, Indian River County, Florida, authorized by section 501 of the Water Resources and Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4134) and deauthorized pursuant to section 1001(b)(1) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 579a(b)(1)), is authorized to be carried out by the Secretary.

(c) LIDO KEY, FLORIDA.—The project for shore protection, Lido Key, Florida, authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1970 (84 Stat. 1819) and deauthorized pursuant to section 1001(b)(2) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C 579a(b)(2)), is authorized to be carried out by the Secretary.

(d) ST. AUGUSTINE, ST. JOHNS COUNTY, FLORIDA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The project for shore protection and storm damage reduction, St. Augustine, St. Johns County, Florida, authorized by section 501 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 and deauthorized pursuant to section 1001(a) of such Act (33 U.S.C. 579a(a)), is authorized to include navigation mitigation as a project purpose and to be carried out by the Secretary substantially in accordance with the General Reevaluation Report dated November 18, 1998, at a total cost of $16,086,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $12,949,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $3,137,000.

(2) PERIODIC NOURISHMENT.—The Secretary is authorized to carry out periodic nourishment for the project for a 50-year period at an estimated average annual cost of $1,251,000, with an estimated annual Federal cost of $1,007,000 and an estimated annual non-Federal cost of $244,000.

(e) CASS RIVER, MICHIGAN (VASSAR).—The project for flood protection, Cass River, Michigan (Vassar), authorized by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 311) and deauthorized pursuant to section 1001(b)(2) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 579a(b)(2)), is authorized to be carried out by the Secretary.

(f) SAGINAW RIVER, MICHIGAN (SHIAWASSEE FLATS).—The project for flood control, Saginaw River, Michigan (Shiawassee Flats), authorized by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 311) and deauthorized pursuant to section 1001(b)(2) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 579a(b)(2)), is authorized to be carried out by the Secretary.

(g) PARK RIVER, GRAFTON, NORTH DAKOTA.—The project for flood control, Park River, Grafton, North Dakota, authorized by section 401(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4121) and deauthorized pursuant to section 1001(a) of such Act (33 U.S.C. 579a(a)), is authorized to be carried out by the Secretary.

(h) MEMPHIS HARBOR, MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE.—The project for navigation, Memphis Harbor, Memphis, Tennessee, authorized by section 601(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4145) and deauthorized pursuant to 1001(a) of such Act (33 U.S.C 579a(a)), is authorized to be carried out by the Secretary.

SEC. 364. PROJECT DEAUTHORIZATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The following projects or portions of projects are not authorized after the date of enactment of this Act:

(1) BRIDGEPORT HARBOR, CONNECTICUT.—That portion of the project for navigation, Bridgeport Harbor, Connecticut, authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 297), consisting of a 2.4-acre anchorage area, 9 feet deep, and an adjacent 0.6-acre anchorage, 6 feet deep, located on the west side of Johnsons River.

(2) CLINTON HARBOR, CONNECTICUT.—That portion of the project for navigation, Clinton Harbor, Connecticut, authorized by the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1945, House Document 240, 76th Congress, 1st Session, lying upstream of a line designated by the 2 points N158,592.12, E660,193.92 and N158,444.58, E660,220.95.

(3) BASS HARBOR, MAINE.—The following portions of the project for navigation, Bass Harbor, Maine, authorized on May 7, 1962, under section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 577):

(A) Beginning at a bend in the project, N149040.00, E538505.00, thence running easterly about 50.00 feet along the northern limit of the project to a point N149061.55, E538550.11, thence running southerly about 642.08 feet to a point, N14877.64, E538817.18, thence running southwesterly about 156.27 feet to a point on the westerly limit of the project, N148348.50, E538737.02, thence running northerly about 149.00 feet along the westerly limit of the project to a bend in the project, N148489.22, E538768.09, thence running northwesterly about 610.39 feet along the westerly limit of the project to the point of origin.

(B) Beginning at a point on the westerly limit of the project, N148118.55, E538689.05, thence running southeasterly about 91.92 feet to a point, N148041.43, E538739.07, thence running southerly about 65.00 feet to a point, N147977.86, E538725.51, thence running southwesterly about 91.92 feet to a point on the westerly limit of the project, N147927.84, E538648.39, thence running northerly about 195.00 feet along the westerly limit of the project to the point of origin.

(4) BOOTHBAY HARBOR, MAINE.—The project for navigation, Boothbay Harbor, Maine, authorized by the River and Harbor Act of 1912 (37 Stat. 201).

(5) BUCKSPORT HARBOR, MAINE.—That portion of the project for navigation, Bucksport Harbor, Maine, authorized by the River and Harbor Act of 1902, consisting of a 16-foot deep channel beginning at a point N268.748.16, E423.390.76, thence running north 47 degrees 02 minutes 23 seconds east 51.76 feet to a point N268.783.44, E423.428.64, thence running north 67 degrees 54 minutes 32 seconds west 1513.94 feet to a point N269.352.81, E422.025.84, thence running south 47 degrees 02 minutes 23 seconds west 126.15 feet to a point N269.266.84, E421.933.52, thence running south 70 degrees 24 minutes 28 seconds east 1546.79 feet to the point of origin.

(6) EAST BOOTHBAY HARBOR, MAINE.—The project for navigation, East Boothbay Harbor, Maine, authorized by the first section of the Act entitled, ''An Act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes'', approved June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 631).

(7) WELLS HARBOR, MAINE.—The following portions of the project for navigation, Wells Harbor, Maine, authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (74 Stat. 480):

(A) The portion of the 6-foot channel the boundaries of which begin at a point with coordinates N177,992.00, E394,831.00, thence running south 83 degrees 58 minutes 14.8 seconds west 10.38 feet to a point N177,990.91, E394,820.68, thence running south 11 degrees 46 minutes 47.7 seconds west 991.76 feet to a point N177,020.04, E394,618.21, thence running south 78 degrees 13 minutes 45.7 seconds east 10.00 feet to a point N177,018.00, E394,628.00, thence running north 11 degrees 46 minutes 22.8 seconds east 994.93 feet to the point of origin.

(B) The portion of the 6-foot anchorage the boundaries of which begin at a point with coordinates N177,778.07, E394,336.96, thence running south 51 degrees 58 minutes 32.7 seconds west 15.49 feet to a point N177,768.53, E394,324.76, thence running south 11 degrees 46 minutes 26.5 seconds west 672.87 feet to a point N177,109.82, E394,187.46, thence running south 78 degrees 13 minutes 45.7 seconds east 10.00 feet to a point N177,107.78, E394,197.25, thence running north 11 degrees 46 minutes 25.4 seconds east 684.70 feet to the point of origin.

(C) The portion of the 10-foot settling basin the boundaries of which begin at a point with coordinates N177,107.78, E394,197.25, thence running north 78 degrees 13 minutes 45.7 seconds west 10.00 feet to a point N177,109.82, E394,187.46, thence running south 11 degrees 46 minutes 15.7 seconds west 300.00 feet to a point N176,816.13, E394,126.26, thence running south 78 degrees 12 minutes 21.4 seconds east 9.98 feet to a point N176,814.09, E394,136.03, thence running north 11 degrees 46 minutes 29.1 seconds east 300.00 feet to the point of origin.

(D) The portion of the 10-foot settling basin the boundaries of which begin at a point with coordinates N177,018.00, E394,628.00, thence running north 78 degrees 13 minutes 45.7 seconds west 10.00 feet to a point N177,020.04, E394,618.21, thence running south 11 degrees 46 minutes 44.0 seconds west 300.00 feet to a point N176,726.36, E394,556.97, thence running south 78 degrees 12 minutes 30.3 seconds east 10.03 feet to a point N176,724.31, E394,566.79, thence running north 11 degrees 46 minutes 22.4 seconds east 300.00 feet to the point of origin.

(8) FALMOUTH HARBOR, MASSACHUSETTS.—That portion of the project for navigation, Falmouth Harbor, Massachusetts, authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1948 lying southeasterly of a line commencing at a point N199,286.41, E844,394.91, thence running north 66 degrees 52 minutes 3.31 seconds east 472.95 feet to a point N199,472.21, E844,829.83, thence running north 43 degrees 9 minutes 28.3 seconds east 262.64 feet to a point N199,633.80, E845,009.48, thence running north 21 degrees 40 minutes 11.26 seconds east 808.38 feet to a point N200,415.05, E845,307.98, thence running north 32 degrees 25 minutes 29.01 seconds east 160.76 feet to a point N200,550.75, E845,394.18, thence running north 24 degrees 56 minutes 42.29 seconds east 1,410.29 feet to a point N201,829.48, E845,988.97.

(9) GREEN HARBOR, MASSACHUSETTS.—That portion of the project for navigation, Green Harbor, Massachusetts, undertaken pursuant to section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 577), consisting of the 6-foot deep channel beginning at a point along the west limit of the existing project, North 395990.43, East 831079.16, thence running northwesterly about 752.85 feet to a point, North 396722.80, East 830904.76, thence running northwesterly about 222.79 feet to a point along the west limit of the existing project, North 396844.34, East 830718.04, thence running southwesterly about 33.72 feet along the west limit of the existing project to a point, North 396810.80, East 830714.57, thence running southeasterly about 195.42 feet along the west limit of the existing project to a point, North 396704.19, East 830878.35, thence running about 544.66 feet along the west limit of the existing project to a point, North 396174.35, East 831004.52, thence running southeasterly about 198.49 feet along the west limit of the existing project to the point of beginning.

(10) NEW BEDFORD AND FAIRHAVEN HARBOR, MASSACHUSETTS.—The following portions of the project for navigation, New Bedford and Fairhaven Harbor, Massachusetts:

(A) A portion of the 25-foot spur channel leading to the west of Fish Island, authorized by the River and Harbor Act of 3 March 1909, beginning at a point with coordinates N232,173.77, E758,791.32, thence running south 27 degrees 36 minutes 52.8 seconds west 38.2 feet to a point N232,139.91, E758,773.61, thence running south 87 degrees 35 minutes 31.6 seconds west 196.84 feet to a point N232,131.64, E758,576.94, thence running north 47 degrees 47 minutes 48.4 seconds west 502.72 feet to a point N232,469.35, E758,204.54, thence running north 10 degrees 10 minutes 20.3 seconds west 438.88 feet to a point N232,901.33, E758,127.03, thence running north 79 degrees 49 minutes 43.1 seconds east 121.69 feet to a point N232,922.82, E758,246.81, thence running south 04 degrees 29 minutes 17.6 seconds east 52.52 feet to a point N232,870.46, E758,250.92, thence running south 23 degrees 56 minutes 11.2 seconds east 49.15 feet to a point N323,825.54, E758,270.86, thence running south 79 degrees 49 minutes 27.0 seconds west 88.19 feet to a point N232,809.96, E758,184.06, thence running south 10 degrees 10 minutes 25.7 seconds east 314.83 feet to a point N232,500.08, E758,239.67, thence running south 56 degrees 33 minutes 56.1 seconds east 583.07 feet to a point N232,178.82, E758,726.25, thence running south 85 degrees 33 minutes 16.0 seconds east to the point of origin.

(B) A portion of the 30-foot west maneuvering basin, authorized by the River and Harbor Act of 3 July 1930, beginning at a point with coordinates N232,139.91, E758,773.61, thence running north 81 degrees 49 minutes 30.1 seconds east 160.76 feet to a point N232,162.77, E758.932.74, thence running north 85 degrees 33 minutes 16.0 seconds west 141.85 feet to a point N232,173.77, E758,791.32, thence running south 27 degrees 36 minutes 52.8 seconds west to the point of origin.

(b) ANCHORAGE AREA, CLINTON HARBOR, CONNECTICUT.—That portion of the Clinton Harbor, Connecticut, navigation project referred to in subsection (a)(2) beginning at a point beginning: N158,444.58, E660,220.95, thence running north 79 degrees 37 minutes 14 seconds east 833.31 feet to a point N158,594.72, E661,040.67, thence running south 80 degrees 51 minutes 53 seconds east 181.21 feet to a point N158,565.95, E661,219.58, thence running north 57 degrees 38 minutes 04 seconds west 126.02 feet to a point N158,633.41, E660,113.14, thence running south 79 degrees 37 minutes 14 seconds west 911.61 feet to a point N158,469.17, E660,216.44, thence running south 10 degrees 22 minutes 46 seconds east 25 feet returning to a point N158,444.58, E660,220.95 is redesignated as an anchorage area.

(c) WELLS HARBOR, MAINE.—

(1) PROJECT MODIFICATION.—The project for navigation, Wells Harbor, Maine, navigation project referred to in subsection (a)(7) is modified to authorize the Secretary to realign the channel and anchorage areas based on a harbor design capacity of 150 craft.

(2) REDESIGNATIONS.—

(A) 6-FOOT ANCHORAGE.—The following portions of the project for navigation, Wells Harbor, Maine, navigation project referred to in subsection (a)(7) shall be redesignated as part of the 6-foot anchorage:

(i) The portion of the 6-foot channel the boundaries of which begin at a point with coordinates N177,990.91, E394,820.68, thence running south 83 degrees 58 minutes 40.8 seconds west 94.65 feet to a point N177,980.98, E394,726.55, thence running south 11 degrees 46 minutes 22.4 seconds west 962.83 feet to a point N177,038.40, E394,530.10, thence running south 78 degrees 13 minutes 45.7 seconds east 90.00 feet to a point N177,020.04, E394,618.21, thence running north 11 degrees 46 minutes 47.7 seconds east 991.76 feet to the point of origin.

(ii) The portion of the 10-foot inner harbor settling basin the boundaries of which begin at a point with coordinates N177,020.04, E394,618.21, thence running north 78 degrees 13 minutes 30.5 seconds west 160.00 feet to a point N177,052.69, E394,461.58, thence running south 11 degrees 46 minutes 45.4 seconds west 299.99 feet to a point N176,759.02, E394,400.34, thence running south 78 degrees 13 minutes 17.9 seconds east 160 feet to a point N176,726.36, E394,556.97, thence running north 11 degrees 46 minutes 44.0 seconds east 300.00 feet to the point of origin.

(B) 6-FOOT CHANNEL.—The following portion of the project for navigation, Wells Harbor, Maine, navigation project referred to in subsection (a)(7) shall be redesignated as part of the 6-foot channel: the portion of the 6-foot anchorage the boundaries of which begin at a point with coordinates N178,102.26, E394,751.83, thence running south 51 degrees 59 minutes 42.1 seconds west 526.51 feet to a point N177,778.07, E394,336.96, thence running south 11 degrees 46 minutes 26.6 seconds west 511.83 feet to a point N177,277.01, E394,232.52, thence running south 78 degrees 13 minutes 17.9 seconds east 80.00 feet to a point N177,260.68, E394,310.84, thence running north 11 degrees 46 minutes 24.8 seconds east 482.54 feet to a point N177,733.07, E394,409.30, thence running north 51 degrees 59 minutes 41.0 seconds east 402.63 feet to a point N177,980.98, E394,726.55, thence running north 11 degrees 46 minutes 27.6 seconds east 123.89 feet to the point of origin.

(3) REALIGNMENT.—The 6-foot anchorage area described in paragraph (2)(B) shall be realigned to include the area located south of the inner harbor settling basin in existence on the date of enactment of this Act beginning at a point with coordinates N176,726.36, E394,556.97, thence running north 78 degrees 13 minutes 17.9 seconds west 160.00 feet to a point N176,759.02, E394,400.34, thence running south 11 degrees 47 minutes 03.8 seconds west 45 feet to a point N176,714.97, E394,391.15, thence running south 78 degrees 13 minutes 17.9 seconds 160.00 feet to a point N176,682.31, E394,547.78, thence running north 11 degrees 47 minutes 03.8 seconds east 45 feet to the point of origin.

(4) RELOCATION.—The Secretary may relocate the settling basin feature of the project for navigation, Wells Harbor, Maine, navigation project referred to in subsection (a)(7) to the outer harbor between the jetties.

(d) ANCHORAGE AREA, GREEN HARBOR, MASSACHUSETTS.—The portion of the Green Harbor, Massachusetts, navigation project referred to in subsection (a)(9) consisting of a 6-foot deep channel that lies northerly of a line whose coordinates are North 394825.00, East 831660.00 and North 394779.28, East 831570.64 is redesignated as an anchorage area.

SEC. 365. AMERICAN AND SACRAMENTO RIVERS, CALIFORNIA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The project for flood damage reduction, American and Sacramento Rivers, California, authorized by section 101(a)(1) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3662–3663), is modified to direct the Secretary to include the following improvements as part of the overall project:

(1) Raising the left bank of the non-Federal levee upstream of the Mayhew Drain for a distance of 4,500 feet by an average of 2.5 feet.

(2) Raising the right bank of the American River levee from 1,500 feet upstream to 4,000 feet downstream of the Howe Avenue bridge by an average of 1 feet.

(3) Modifying the south levee of the Natomas Cross Canal for a distance of 5 miles to ensure that the south levee is consistent with the level of protection provided by the authorized levee along the east bank of the Sacramento River.

(4) Modifying the north levee of the Natomas Cross Canal for a distance of 5 miles to ensure that the height of the levee is equivalent to the height of the south levee as authorized by paragraph (3).

(5) Installing gates to the existing Mayhew Drain culvert and pumps to prevent backup of floodwater on the Folsom Boulevard side of the gates.

(6) Installation of a slurry wall in the north levee of the American River from the east levee of the Natomas east Main Drain upstream for a distance of approximately 1.2 miles.

(7) Installation of a slurry wall in the north levee of the American River from 300 feet west of Jacob Lane north for a distance of approximately 1 mile to the end of the existing levee.

(b) COST LIMITATIONS.—Section 101(a)(1)(A) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996

(110 Stat. 3662) is amended by striking ''at a total cost of'' and all that follows through ''$14,225,000,'' and inserting the following: ''at a total cost of $91,900,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $68,925,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $22,975,000,''.

(c) COST SHARING.—For purposes of section 103 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2213), the modifications authorized by this section shall be subject to the same cost sharing in effect for the project for flood damage reduction, American and Sacramento Rivers, California, authorized by section 101(a)(1) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3662).

SEC. 366. MARTIN, KENTUCKY.

The project for flood control, Martin, Kentucky, authorized by section 202(a) of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 1981 (94 Stat. 1339) is modified to authorize the Secretary to take all necessary measures to prevent future losses that would occur from a flood equal in magnitude to a 100-year frequency event.

TITLE IV—STUDIES

SEC. 401. UPPER MISSISSIPPI AND ILLINOIS RIVERS LEVEES AND STREAMBANKS PROTECTION.

The Secretary shall conduct a study of erosion damage to levees and infrastructure on the upper Mississippi and Illinois Rivers and the impact of increased barge and pleasure craft traffic on deterioration of levees and other flood control structures on such rivers.

SEC. 402. UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMPREHENSIVE PLAN.

(a) DEVELOPMENT.—The Secretary shall develop a plan to address water and related land resources problems and opportunities in the Upper Mississippi and Illinois River Basins, extending from Cairo, Illinois, to the headwaters of the Mississippi River, in the interest of systemic flood damage reduction by means of a mixture of structural and nonstructural flood control and floodplain management strategies, continued maintenance of the navigation project, management of bank caving and erosion, watershed nutrient and sediment management, habitat management, recreation needs, and other related purposes.

(b) CONTENTS.—The plan shall contain recommendations on future management plans and actions to be carried out by the responsible Federal and non-Federal entities and shall specifically address recommendations to authorize construction of a systemic flood control project in accordance with a plan for the Upper Mississippi River. The plan shall include recommendations for Federal action where appropriate and recommendations for follow-on studies for problem areas for which data or current technology does not allow immediate solutions.

(c) CONSULTATION AND USE OF EXISTING DATA.—The Secretary shall consult with appropriate State and Federal agencies and shall make maximum use of existing data and ongoing programs and efforts of States and Federal agencies in developing the plan.

(d) COST SHARING.—Development of the plan under this section shall be at Federal expense. Feasibility studies resulting from development of such plan shall be subject to cost sharing under section 105 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2215).

(e) REPORT.—The Secretary shall submit a report that includes the comprehensive plan to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 403. EL DORADO, UNION COUNTY, ARKANSAS.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of improvements to regional water supplies for El Dorado, Union County, Arkansas.

SEC. 404. SWEETWATER RESERVOIR, SAN DIEGO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA.

The Secretary shall conduct a study of the potential water quality problems and pollution abatement measures in the watershed in and around Sweetwater Reservoir, San Diego County, California.

SEC. 405. WHITEWATER RIVER BASIN, CALIFORNIA.

The Secretary shall undertake and complete a feasibility study for flood damage reduction in the Whitewater River basin, California, and, based upon the results of such study, give priority consideration to including the recommended project, including the Salton Sea wetlands restoration project, in the flood mitigation and riverine restoration pilot program authorized in section 214 of this Act.

SEC. 406. LITTLE ECONLACKHATCHEE RIVER BASIN, FLORIDA.

The Secretary shall conduct a study of pollution abatement measures in the Little Econlackhatchee River basin, Florida.

SEC. 407. PORT EVERGLADES INLET, FLORIDA.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a sand bypass project at Port Everglades Inlet, Florida.

SEC. 408. UPPER DES PLAINES RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, ILLINOIS AND WISCONSIN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary is directed to conduct a study of the upper Des Plaines River and tributaries, Illinois and Wisconsin, upstream of the confluence with Salt Creek at Riverside, Illinois, to determine the feasibility of improvements in the interests of flood damage reduction, environmental restoration and protection, water quality, recreation, and related purposes.

(b) SPECIAL RULE.—In conducting the study, the Secretary may not exclude from consideration and evaluation flood damage reduction measures based on restrictive policies regarding the frequency of flooding, drainage area, and amount of runoff.

SEC. 409. CAMERON PARISH WEST OF CALCASIEU RIVER, LOUISIANA.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for storm damage reduction and environmental restoration, Cameron Parish west of Calcasieu River, Louisiana.

SEC. 410. GRAND ISLE AND VICINITY, LOUISIANA.

In carrying out a study of the storm damage reduction benefits to Grand Isle and vicinity, Louisiana, the Secretary shall include benefits that a storm damage reduction project for Grand Isle and vicinity, Louisiana, may have on the mainland coast of Louisiana as project benefits attributable to the Grand Isle project.

SEC. 411. LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN SEAWALL, LOUISIANA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall complete a post-authorization change report on the project for hurricane-flood protection, Lake Pontchartrain, Louisiana, and vicinity, authorized by section 204 of the Flood Control Act of 1965 (79 Stat. 1077), to incorporate and accomplish structural modifications to the seawall fronting protection along the south shore of Lake Pontchartrain from the New Basin Canal on the west to the Inner harbor Navigation Canal on the east.

(b) REPORT.—The Secretary shall ensure expeditious completion of the post-authorization change report required by subsection (a) not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this section.

SEC. 412. WESTPORT, MASSACHUSETTS.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a navigation project for the town of Westport, Massachusetts, and the possible beneficial uses of dredged material for shoreline protection and storm damage reduction in the area. In determining the benefits of the project, the Secretary shall include the benefits derived from using dredged material for shoreline protection and storm damage reduction.

SEC. 413. SOUTHWEST VALLEY, ALBUQUERQUE, NEW MEXICO.

The Secretary shall undertake and complete a feasibility study for flood damage reduction in the Southwest Valley, Albuquerque, New Mexico, and, based upon the results of such study, give priority consideration to including the recommended project in the flood mitigation and riverine restoration pilot program authorized in section 214 of this Act.

SEC. 414. CAYUGA CREEK, NEW YORK.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood control for Cayuga Creek, New York.

SEC. 415. ARCOLA CREEK WATERSHED, MADISON, OHIO.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of a project to provide environmental restoration and protection for the Arcola Creek watershed, Madison, Ohio.

SEC. 416. WESTERN LAKE ERIE BASIN, OHIO, INDIANA, AND MICHIGAN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to develop measures to improve flood control, navigation, water quality, recreation, and fish and wildlife habitat in a comprehensive manner in the western Lake Erie basin, Ohio, Indiana, and Michigan, including watersheds of the Maumee, Ottawa, and Portage Rivers.

(b) COOPERATION.—In carrying out the study, the Secretary shall cooperate with interested Federal, State, and local agencies and nongovernmental organizations and consider all relevant programs of such agencies.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the results of the study, including findings and recommendations.

SEC. 417. SCHUYLKILL RIVER, NORRISTOWN, PENNSYLVANIA.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood control for Schuylkill River, Norristown, Pennsylvania, including improvement to existing stormwater drainage systems.

SEC. 418. LAKES MARION AND MOULTRIE, SOUTH CAROLINA.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for Lakes Marion and Moultrie to provide water supply, treatment, and distribution to Calhoun, Clarendon, Colleton, Dorchester, Orangeburg, and Sumter Counties, South Carolina.

SEC. 419. DAY COUNTY, SOUTH DAKOTA.

The Secretary shall conduct an investigation of flooding and other water resources problems between the James River and Big Sioux watersheds in South Dakota and an assessment of flood damage reduction needs of the area.

SEC. 420. CORPUS CHRISTI, TEXAS.

The Secretary shall include, as part of the study authorized in a resolution of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation of the House of Representatives, dated August 1, 1990, a review of two 175-foot-wide barge shelves on either side of the navigation channel at the Port of Corpus Christi, Texas.

SEC. 421. MITCHELL'S CUT CHANNEL (CANEY FORK CUT), TEXAS.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for navigation, Mitchell's Cut Channel (Caney Fork Cut), Texas.

SEC. 422. MOUTH OF COLORADO RIVER, TEXAS.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for navigation at the mouth of the Colorado River, Texas, to provide a minimum draft navigation channel extending from the Colorado River through Parkers Cut (also known as ''Tiger Island Cut''), or an acceptable alternative, to Matagorda Bay.

SEC. 423. KANAWHA RIVER, FAYETTE COUNTY, WEST VIRGINIA.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of developing a public port along the Kanawha River in Fayette County, West Virginia, at a site known as ''Longacre''.

SEC. 424. WEST VIRGINIA PORTS.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of expanding public port development in West Virginia along the Ohio River and navigable portion of the Kanawha River from its mouth to river mile 91.0

SEC. 425. GREAT LAKES REGION COMPREHENSIVE STUDY.

(a) STUDY.—The Secretary shall conduct a comprehensive study of the Great Lakes region to ensure the future use, management, and protection of water and related resources of the Great Lakes basin. Such study shall include a comprehensive management plan specifically for St. Clair River and Lake St. Clair.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 4 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report that includes the strategic plan for Corps of Engineers programs in the Great Lakes basin and details of proposed Corps of Engineers environmental, navigation, and flood damage reduction projects in the region.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $1,400,000 for fiscal years 2000 through 2003.

SEC. 426. NUTRIENT LOADING RESULTING FROM DREDGED MATERIAL DISPOSAL.

(a) STUDY.—The Secretary shall conduct a study of nutrient loading that occurs as a result of discharges of dredged material into open-water sites in the Chesapeake Bay.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall transmit to Congress a report on the results of the study.

SEC. 427. SANTEE DELTA FOCUS AREA, SOUTH CAROLINA.

The Secretary shall conduct a study of the Santee Delta focus area, South Carolina, to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for enhancing wetlands values and public recreational opportunities in the area.

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 501. CORPS ASSUMPTION OF NRCS PROJECTS.

(a) LLAGAS CREEK, CALIFORNIA.—The Secretary is authorized to complete the remaining reaches of the Natural Resources Conservation Service's flood control project at Llagas Creek, California, undertaken pursuant to section 5 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (16 U.S.C. 1005), substantially in accordance with the Natural Resources Conservation Service watershed plan for Llagas Creek, Department of Agriculture, and in accordance with the requirements of local cooperation as specified in section 4 of such Act, at a total cost of $45,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $21,800,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $23,200,000.

(b) THORNTON RESERVOIR, COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Thornton Reservoir project, an element of the project for flood control, Chicagoland Underflow Plan, Illinois, authorized by section 3(a)(5) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1988 (102 Stat. 4013), is modified to authorize the Secretary to include additional permanent flood control storage attributable to the Natural Resources Conservation Service Thornton Reservoir (Structure 84), Little Calumet River Watershed, Illinois, approved under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (16 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.).

(2) COST SHARING.—Costs for the Thornton Reservoir project shall be shared in accordance with section 103 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2213).

(3) TRANSITIONAL STORAGE.—The Secretary of Agriculture may cooperate with non-Federal interests to provide, on a transitional basis, flood control storage for the Natural Resources Conservation Service Thornton Reservoir (Structure 84) in the west lobe of the Thornton quarry in advance of Corps' construction.

(4) CREDITING.—The Secretary may credit against the non-Federal share of the Thornton Reservoir project all design, lands, easements, rights-of-way (as of the date of authorization), and construction costs incurred by the non-Federal interests before the signing of the project cooperation agreement.

(5) REEVALUATION REPORT.—The Secretary shall determine the credits authorized by paragraph (4) that are integral to the Thornton Reservoir project and the current total project costs based on a limited reevaluation report.

SEC. 502. CONSTRUCTION ASSISTANCE.

Section 219(e) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4836–4837) is amended by striking paragraphs (5) and (6) and inserting the following:

''(5) $25,000,000 for the project described in subsection (c)(2);

''(6) $20,000,000 for the project described in subsection (c)(9);

''(7) $30,000,000 for the project described in subsection (c)(16); and

''(8) $30,000,000 for the project described in subsection (c)(17).''.

SEC. 503. CONTAMINATED SEDIMENT DREDGING TECHNOLOGY.

(a) CONTAMINATED SEDIMENT DREDGING PROJECT.—

(1) REVIEW.—The Secretary shall conduct a review of innovative dredging technologies designed to minimize or eliminate contamination of a water column upon removal of contaminated sediments. The Secretary shall complete such review by June 1, 2001.

(2) TESTING.—After completion of the review under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall select the technology of those reviewed that the Secretary determines will increase the effectiveness of removing contaminated sediments and significantly reduce contamination of the water column. Not later than December 31, 2001, the Secretary shall enter into an agreement with a public or private entity to test such technology in the vicinity of Peoria Lakes, Illinois.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $2,000,000.

SEC. 504. DAM SAFETY.

(a) ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary is authorized to provide assistance to enhance dam safety at the following locations:

(1) Healdsburg Veteran's Memorial Dam, California

(2) Felix Dam, Pennsylvania

(3) Kehly Run Dam, Pennsylvania

(4) Owl Creek Reservoir, Pennsylvania

(5) Sweet Arrow Lake Dam, Pennsylvania

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated $6,000,000 to carry out this section.

SEC. 505. GREAT LAKES REMEDIAL ACTION PLANS.

Section 401(a)(2) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (110 Stat. 3763) is amended by adding at the end the following: ''Nonprofit public or private entities may contribute all or a portion of the non-Federal share.''.

SEC. 506. SEA LAMPREY CONTROL MEASURES IN THE GREAT LAKES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In conjunction with the Great Lakes Fishery Commission, the Secretary is authorized to undertake a program for the control of sea lampreys in and around waters of the Great Lakes. The program undertaken pursuant to this section may include projects which consist of either structural or nonstructural measures or a combination thereof.

(b) COST SHARING.—Projects carried out under this section on lands owned by the United States shall be carried out at full Federal expense. The non-Federal share of the cost of any such project undertaken on lands not in Federal ownership shall be 35 percent.

(c) NON-FEDERAL INTERESTS.—Notwithstanding section 221(b) of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b(b)), the Secretary, after coordination with the appropriate State and local government officials having jurisdiction over an area in which a project under this section will be carried out, may allow a non-profit entity to serve as the non-Federal interest for the project.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $2,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2000 through 2005.

SEC. 507. MAINTENANCE OF NAVIGATION CHANNELS.

Section 509(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3759) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(12) Acadiana Navigation Channel, Louisiana.

''(13) Contraband Bayou, Louisiana, as part of the Calcasieu River and Pass Ship Channel.

''(14) Lake Wallula Navigation Channel, Washington.

''(15) Wadley Pass (also known as McGriff Pass), Suwanee River, Florida.''.

SEC. 508. MEASUREMENT OF LAKE MICHIGAN DIVERSIONS.

Section 1142(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–20 note; 100 Stat. 4253) is amended by striking ''$250,000'' and inserting ''$1,250,000''.

SEC. 509. UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PROGRAM.

(a) AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES.—Section 1103(e)(1) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 652(e)(1)) is amended—

(1) by inserting ''and'' at the end of subparagraph (A);

(2) in subparagraph (B) by striking ''long-term resource monitoring program; and'' and inserting ''long-term resource monitoring, computerized data inventory and analysis, and applied research program.''; and

(3) by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following:

''In carrying out subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall establish an independent technical advisory committee to review projects, monitoring plans, and habitat and natural resource needs assessments.''.

(b) REPORTS.—Section 1103(e)(2) of such Act (33 U.S.C. 652(e)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

''(2) REPORTS.—Not later than December 31, 2004, and not later than December 31st of every sixth year thereafter, the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of the Interior and the States of Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, and Wisconsin, shall transmit to Congress a report that—

''(A) contains an evaluation of the programs described in paragraph (1);

''(B) describes the accomplishments of each of such programs;

''(C) provides updates of a systemic habitat needs assessment; and

''(D) identifies any needed adjustments in the authorization.''.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 1103(e) of such Act (33 U.S.C. 652(e)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3) by striking ''not to exceed'' and all that follows before the period at the end and inserting ''$22,750,000 for fiscal year 1999 and each fiscal year thereafter'';

(2) in paragraph (4) by striking ''not to exceed'' and all that follows before the period at the end and inserting ''$10,420,000 for fiscal year 1999 and each fiscal year thereafter''; and

(3) by striking paragraph (5) and inserting the following:

''(5) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out paragraph (1)(A) $350,000 for each of fiscal years 1999 through 2009.''.

(d) TRANSFER OF AMOUNTS.—Section 1103(e)(6) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

''(6) TRANSFER OF AMOUNTS.—For fiscal year 1999, and each fiscal year thereafter, the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of the Interior and the States of Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, and Wisconsin, may transfer not to exceed 20 percent of the amounts appropriated to carry out subparagraph (A) or (B) of paragraph (1) to the amounts appropriated to carry out the other of such subparagraphs.''.

(e) HABITAT NEEDS ASSESSMENT.—Section 1103(h)(2) of such Act (33 U.S.C. 652(h)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following: ''The Secretary shall complete the on-going habitat needs assessment conducted under this paragraph not later than September 30, 2000, and shall include in each report required by subsection (e)(2) the most recent habitat needs assessment conducted under this paragraph.''.

(f) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 1103 of such Act (33 U.S.C. 652) is amended—

(1) in subsection (e)(7) by striking ''paragraphs (1)(B) and (1)(C)'' and inserting ''paragraph (1)(B)''; and

(2) in subsection (f)(2)—

(A) by striking ''(2)(A)'' and inserting ''(2)''; and

(B) by striking subparagraph (B).

SEC. 510. ATLANTIC COAST OF NEW YORK MONITORING.

Section 404(c) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4863) is amended by striking ''1993, 1994, 1995, 1996, and 1997'' and inserting ''1993 through 2003''.

SEC. 511. WATER CONTROL MANAGEMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In evaluating potential improvements for water control management activities and consolidation of water control management centers, the Secretary may consider a regionalized water control management plan but may not implement such a plan until the date on which a report is transmitted under subsection (b).

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall transmit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate a report containing the following:

(1) A description of the primary objectives of streamlining water control management activities.

(2) A description of the benefits provided by streamlining water control management activities through consolidation of centers for such activities.

(3) A determination of whether or not benefits to users of regional water control management centers will be retained in each district office of the Corps of Engineers that does not have a regional center.

(4) A determination of whether or not users of such regional centers will receive a higher level of benefits from streamlining water management control management activities.

(5) A list of the Members of Congress who represent a district that currently includes a water control management center that is to be eliminated under a proposed regionalized plan.

SEC. 512. BENEFICIAL USE OF DREDGED MATERIAL.

The Secretary is authorized to carry out the following projects under section 204 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (33 U.S.C. 2326):

(1) BODEGA BAY, CALIFORNIA.—A project to make beneficial use of dredged materials from a Federal navigation project in Bodega Bay, California.

(2) SABINE REFUGE, LOUISIANA.—A project to make beneficial use of dredged materials from Federal navigation projects in the vicinity of Sabine Refuge, Louisiana.

(3) HANCOCK, HARRISON, AND JACKSON COUNTIES, MISSISSIPPI.—A project to make beneficial use of dredged material from a Federal navigation project in Hancock, Harrison, and Jackson Counties, Mississippi.

(4) ROSE CITY MARSH, ORANGE COUNTY, TEXAS.—A project to make beneficial use of dredged material from a Federal navigation project in Rose City Marsh, Orange County, Texas.

(5) BESSIE HEIGHTS MARSH, ORANGE COUNTY, TEXAS.—A project to make beneficial use of dredged material from a Federal navigation project in Bessie Heights Marsh, Orange County, Texas.

SEC. 513. DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION ASSISTANCE.

Section 507(2) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3758) is amended to read as follows:

''(2) Expansion and improvement of Long Pine Run Dam and associated water infrastructure in accordance with the requirements of subsections (b) through (e) of section 313 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4845) at a total cost of $20,000,000.''.

SEC. 514. LOWER MISSOURI RIVER AQUATIC RESTORATION PROJECTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after funds are made available for such purposes, the Secretary shall complete a comprehensive report—

(1) identifying a general implementation strategy and overall plan for environmental restoration and protection along the Lower Missouri River between Gavins Point Dam and the confluence of the Missouri and Mississippi Rivers; and

(2) recommending individual environmental restoration projects that can be considered by the Secretary for implementation under section 206 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (33 U.S.C. 2330; 110 Stat. 3679–3680).

(b) SCOPE OF PROJECTS.—Any environmental restoration projects recommended under subsection (a) shall provide for such activities and measures as the Secretary determines to be necessary to protect and restore fish and wildlife habitat without adversely affecting private property rights or water related needs of the region surrounding the Missouri River, including flood control, navigation, and enhancement of water supply, and shall include some or all of the following components:

(1) Modification and improvement of navigation training structures to protect and restore fish and wildlife habitat.

(2) Modification and creation of side channels to protect and restore fish and wildlife habitat.

(3) Restoration and creation of fish and wildlife habitat.

(4) Physical and biological monitoring for evaluating the success of the projects.

(c) COORDINATION.—To the maximum extent practicable, the Secretary shall integrate projects carried out in accordance with this section with other Federal, tribal, and State restoration activities.

(d) COST SHARING.—The report under subsection (a) shall be undertaken at full Federal expense.

SEC. 515. AQUATIC RESOURCES RESTORATION IN THE NORTHWEST.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In cooperation with other Federal agencies, the Secretary is authorized to develop and implement projects for fish screens, fish passage devices, and other similar measures agreed to by non-Federal interests and relevant Federal agencies to mitigate adverse impacts associated with irrigation system water diversions by local governmental entities in the States of Oregon, Washington, Montana, and Idaho.

(b) PROCEDURE AND PARTICIPATION.—

(1) CONSULTATION REQUIREMENT; USE OF EXISTING DATA.—In providing assistance under subsection (a), the Secretary shall consult with other Federal, State, and local agencies and make maximum use of data and studies in existence on the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) PARTICIPATION BY NON-FEDERAL INTERESTS.—Participation by non-Federal interests in projects under this section shall be voluntary. The Secretary shall not take any action under this section that will result in a non-Federal interest being held financially responsible for an action under a project unless the non-Federal interest has voluntarily agreed to participate in the project.

(c) COST SHARING.—Projects carried out under this section on lands owned by the United States shall be carried out at full Federal expense. The non-Federal share of the cost of any such project undertaken on lands not in Federal ownership shall be 35 percent.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $10,000,000 for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1999.

SEC. 516. INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGIES FOR WATERSHED RESTORATION.

The Secretary shall use, and encourage the use of, innovative treatment technologies, including membrane technologies, for watershed and environmental restoration and protection projects involving water quality.

SEC. 517. ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION.

(a) ATLANTA, GEORGIA.—Section 219(c)(2) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835) is amended by inserting before the period ''and watershed restoration and development in the regional Atlanta watershed, including Big Creek and Rock Creek''.

(b) PATERSON AND PASSAIC VALLEY, NEW JERSEY.—Section 219(c)(9) of such Act (106 Stat. 4836) is amended to read as follows:

''(9) PATERSON, PASSAIC COUNTY, AND PASSAIC VALLEY, NEW JERSEY.—Drainage facilities to alleviate flooding problems on Getty Avenue in the vicinity of St. Joseph's Hospital for the City of Paterson, New Jersey, and Passaic County, New Jersey, and innovative facilities to manage and treat additional flows in the Passaic Valley, Passaic River basin, New Jersey.''.

SEC. 518. EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN PROJECTS.

The Secretary shall expedite completion of the reports for the following projects and proceed directly to project planning, engineering, and design:

(1) Arroyo Pasajero, San Joaquin River basin, California, project for flood control.

(2) Success Dam, Tule River, California, project for flood control and water supply.

(3) Alafia Channel, Tampa Harbor, Florida, project for navigation.

SEC. 519. DOG RIVER, ALABAMA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary is authorized to establish, in cooperation with non-Federal interests, a pilot project to restore natural water depths in the Dog River, Alabama, between its mouth and the Interstate Route 10 crossing, and in the downstream portion of its principal tributaries.

(b) FORM OF ASSISTANCE.—Assistance provided under subsection (a) shall be in the form of design and construction of water-related resource protection and development projects affecting the Dog River, including environmental restoration and recreational navigation.

(c) NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—The non-Federal share of the cost of the project carried out with assistance under this section shall be 90 percent.

(d) LANDS, EASEMENTS, AND RIGHTS-OF-WAY.—The non-Federal sponsor provide all lands, easements, rights of way, relocations, and dredged material disposal areas including retaining dikes required for the project.

(e) OPERATION MAINTENANCE.—The non-Federal share of the cost of operation, maintenance, repair, replacement, or rehabilitation of the project carried out with assistance under this section shall be 100 percent.

(f) CREDIT TOWARD NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—The value of the lands, easements, rights of way, relocations, and dredged material disposal areas, including retaining dikes, provided by the non-Federal sponsor shall be credited toward the non-Federal share.

SEC. 520. ELBA, ALABAMA.

The Secretary is authorized to repair and rehabilitate a levee in the city of Elba, Alabama at a total cost of $12,900,000.

SEC. 521. GENEVA, ALABAMA.

The Secretary is authorized to repair and rehabilitate a levee in the city of Geneva, Alabama at a total cost of $16,600,000.

SEC. 522. NAVAJO RESERVATION, ARIZONA, NEW MEXICO, AND UTAH.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In cooperation with other appropriate Federal and local agencies, the Secretary shall undertake a survey of, and provide technical, planning, and design assistance for, watershed management, restoration, and development on the Navajo Indian Reservation, Arizona, New Mexico, and Utah.

(b) COST SHARING.—The Federal share of the cost of activities carried out under this section shall be 75 percent. Funds made available under the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450 et seq.) may be used by the Navajo Nation in meeting the non-Federal share of the cost of such activities.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $12,000,000 for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1999.

SEC. 523. AUGUSTA AND DEVALLS BLUFF, ARKANSAS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary is authorized to perform operations, maintenance, and rehabilitation on 37 miles of levees in and around Augusta and Devalls Bluff, Arkansas.

(b) REIMBURSEMENT.—After performing the operations, maintenance, and rehabilitation under subsection (a), the Secretary shall seek reimbursement from the Secretary of the Interior of an amount equal to the costs allocated to benefits to a Federal wildlife refuge of such operations, maintenance, and rehabilitation.

SEC. 524. BEAVER LAKE, ARKANSAS.

(a) WATER SUPPLY STORAGE REALLOCATION.—The Secretary shall reallocate approximately 31,000 additional acre-feet at Beaver Lake, Arkansas, to water supply storage at no additional cost to the Beaver Water District or the Carroll-Boone Water District above the amount that has already been contracted for. At no time may the bottom of the conservation pool be at an elevation that is less than 1,076 feet NGVD.

(b) CONTRACT PRICING.—The contract price for additional storage for the Carroll-Boone Water District beyond that which is provided for in subsection (a) shall be based on the original construction cost of Beaver Lake and adjusted to the 1998 price level net of inflation between the date of initiation of construction and the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 525. BEAVER LAKE TROUT PRODUCTION FACILITY, ARKANSAS.

(a) EXPEDITED CONSTRUCTION.—The Secretary shall construct, under the authority of section 105 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1976 (90 Stat. 2921) and section 1135 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4251–4252), the Beaver Lake trout hatchery as expeditiously as possible, but in no event later than September 30, 2002.

(b) MITIGATION PLAN.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in conjunction with the State of Arkansas, shall prepare a plan for the mitigation of effects of the Beaver Dam project on Beaver Lake. Such plan shall provide for construction of the Beaver Lake trout production facility and related facilities.

SEC. 526. CHINO DAIRY PRESERVE, CALIFORNIA.

(a) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary, in coordination with the heads of other Federal agencies, shall provide technical assistance to State and local agencies in the study, design, and implementation of measures for flood damage reduction and environmental restoration and protection in the Santa Ana River watershed, California, with particular emphasis on structural and nonstructural measures in the vicinity of the Chino Dairy Preserve.

(b) COMPREHENSIVE STUDY.—The Secretary shall conduct a feasibility study to determine the most cost-effective plan for flood damage reduction and environmental restoration and protection in the vicinity of the Chino Dairy Preserve, Santa Ana River watershed, Orange County and San Bernardino County, California.

SEC. 527. NOVATO, CALIFORNIA.

The Secretary shall carry out a project for flood control under section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 (33 U.S.C. 701s) at Rush Creek, Novato, California.

SEC. 528. ORANGE AND SAN DIEGO COUNTIES, CALIFORNIA.

The Secretary, in cooperation with local governments, may prepare special area management plans in Orange and San Diego Counties, California, to demonstrate the effectiveness of using such plans to provide information regarding aquatic resources. The Secretary may use such plans in making regulatory decisions and issue permits consistent with such plans.

SEC. 529. SALTON SEA, CALIFORNIA.

(a) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary, in coordination with other Federal agencies, shall provide technical assistance to Federal, State, and local agencies in the study, design, and implementation of measures for the environmental restoration and protection of the Salton Sea, California.

(b) STUDY.—The Secretary, in coordination with other Federal, State, and local agencies, shall conduct a study to determine the most effective plan for the Corps of Engineers to assist in the environmental restoration and protection of the Salton Sea, California.

SEC. 530. SANTA CRUZ HARBOR, CALIFORNIA.

The Secretary is authorized to modify the cooperative agreement with the Santa Cruz Port District, California, to reflect unanticipated additional dredging effort and to extend such agreement for 10 years.

SEC. 531. POINT BEACH, MILFORD, CONNECTICUT.

(a) MAXIMUM FEDERAL EXPENDITURE.—The maximum amount of Federal funds that may be expended for the project for hurricane and storm damage reduction, Point Beach, Milford, Connecticut, shall be $3,000,000.

(b) REVISION OF PROJECT COOPERATION AGREEMENT.—The Secretary shall revise the project cooperation agreement for the project referred to in subsection (a) to take into account the change in the Federal participation in such project.

(c) COST SHARING.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to affect any cost-sharing requirement applicable to the project referred to in subsection (a) under section 101 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (31 U.S.C. 2211).

SEC. 532. LOWER ST. JOHNS RIVER BASIN, FLORIDA.

(a) COMPUTER MODEL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may apply the computer model developed under the St. Johns River basin feasibility study to assist non-Federal interests in developing strategies for improving water quality in the Lower St. Johns River basin, Florida.

(2) COST SHARING.—The non-Federal share of the cost of assistance provided under this subsection shall be 50 percent.

(b) TOPOGRAPHIC SURVEY.—The Secretary is authorized to provide 1-foot contour topographic survey maps of the Lower St. Johns River basin, Florida, to non-Federal interests for analyzing environmental data and establishing benchmarks for subbasins.

SEC. 533. SHORELINE PROTECTION AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, LAKE ALLATOONA, GEORGIA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in cooperation with the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, is authorized to carry out the following water-related environmental restoration and resource protection activities to restore Lake Allatoona and the Etowah River in Georgia:

(1) LAKE ALLATOONA/ETOWAH RIVER SHORELINE RESTORATION DESIGN.—Develop pre-construction design measures to alleviate shoreline erosion and sedimentation problems.

(2) LITTLE RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION.—Conduct a feasibility study to evaluate environmental problems and recommend environmental infrastructure restoration measures for the Little River within Lake Allatoona, Georgia.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1999—

(1) $850,000 to carry out subsection (a)(1); and

(2) $250,000 to carry out subsection (a)(2).

SEC. 534. MAYO'S BAR LOCK AND DAM, COOSA RIVER, ROME, GEORGIA.

The Secretary is authorized to provide technical assistance, including planning, engineering, and design assistance, for the reconstruction of the Mayo's Bar Lock and Dam, Coosa River, Rome, Georgia. The non-Federal share of assistance under this section shall be 50 percent.

SEC. 535. COMPREHENSIVE FLOOD IMPACT RESPONSE MODELING SYSTEM, CORALVILLE RESERVOIR AND IOWA RIVER WATERSHED, IOWA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in cooperation with the University of Iowa, shall conduct a study and develop a Comprehensive Flood Impact Response Modeling System for Coralville Reservoir and the Iowa River watershed, Iowa.

(b) CONTENTS OF STUDY.—The study shall include—

(1) an evaluation of the combined hydrologic, geomorphic, environmental, economic, social, and recreational impacts of operating strategies within the Iowa River watershed;

(2) development of an integrated, dynamic flood impact model; and

(3) development of a rapid response system to be used during flood and other emergency situations.

(c) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall transmit to Congress a report containing the results of the study and modeling system together with such recommendations as the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $900,000 for each of fiscal years 2000 through 2004.

SEC. 536. ADDITIONAL CONSTRUCTION ASSISTANCE IN ILLINOIS.

The Secretary may carry out the project for Georgetown, Illinois, and the project for Olney, Illinois, referred to in House Report Number 104–741, accompanying Public Law 104–182.

SEC. 537. KANOPOLIS LAKE, KANSAS.

(a) WATER STORAGE.—The Secretary shall offer to the State of Kansas the right to purchase water storage in Kanopolis Lake, Kansas, at a price calculated in accordance with and in a manner consistent with the terms of the memorandum of understanding entitled ''Memorandum of Understanding Between the State of Kansas and the U.S. Department of the Army Concerning the Purchase of Municipal and Industrial Water Supply Storage'', dated December 11, 1985.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—For the purposes of this section, the effective date of that memorandum of understanding shall be deemed to be the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 538. SOUTHERN AND EASTERN KENTUCKY.

Section 531(h) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3774) is amended

by striking ''$10,000,000'' and inserting ''$25,000,000''.

SEC. 539. SOUTHEAST LOUISIANA.

Section 533(c) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3775) is amended by striking ''$100,000,000'' and inserting ''$200,000,000''.

SEC. 540. SNUG HARBOR, MARYLAND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in coordination with the Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, is authorized—

(1) to provide technical assistance to the residents of Snug Harbor, in the vicinity of Berlin, Maryland, for purposes of flood damage reduction;

(2) to conduct a study of a project for nonstructural measures for flood damage reduction in the vicinity of Snug Harbor, Maryland, taking into account the relationship of both the Ocean City Inlet and Assateague Island to the flooding; and

(3) after completion of the study, to carry out the project under the authority of section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 (33 U.S.C. 701s).

(b) FEMA ASSISTANCE.—The Director, in coordination with the Secretary and under the authorities of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 note), may provide technical assistance and nonstructural measures for flood damage mitigation in the vicinity of Snug Harbor, Maryland.

(c) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of the cost of assistance under this section shall not exceed $3,000,000. The non-Federal share of such cost shall be determined in accordance with the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 or the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act, as appropriate.

SEC. 541. WELCH POINT, ELK RIVER, CECIL COUNTY, AND CHESAPEAKE CITY, MARYLAND.

(a) SPILLAGE OF DREDGED MATERIALS.—The Secretary shall carry out a study to determine if the spillage of dredged materials that were removed as part of the project for navigation, Inland Waterway from Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay, Delaware and Maryland, authorized by the first section of the Act of August 30, 1935 (49 Stat. 1030), is a significant impediment to vessels transiting the Elk River near Welch Point, Maryland. If the Secretary determines that the spillage is an impediment to navigation, the Secretary may conduct such dredging as may be required to permit navigation on the river.

(b) DAMAGE TO WATER SUPPLY.—The Secretary shall carry out a study to determine if additional compensation is required to fully compensate the city of Chesapeake, Maryland, for damage to the city's water supply resulting from dredging of the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal project. If the Secretary determines that such additional compensation is required, the Secretary may provide the compensation to the city of Chesapeake.

SEC. 542. WEST VIEW SHORES, CECIL COUNTY, MARYLAND.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall carry out an investigation of the contamination of the well system in West View Shores, Cecil County, Maryland. If the Secretary determines that the disposal site from any Federal navigation project has contributed to the contamination of the wells, the Secretary may provide alternative water supplies, including replacement of wells, at full Federal expense.

SEC. 543. RESTORATION PROJECTS FOR MARYLAND, PENNSYLVANIA, AND WEST VIRGINIA.

Section 539 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3776–3777) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1) by striking ''technical'';

(2) in subsection (a)(1) by inserting ''(or in the case of projects located on lands owned by the United States, to Federal interests)'' after ''interests'';

(3) in subsection (a)(3) by inserting ''or in conjunction'' after ''consultation''; and

(4) by inserting at the end of subsection (d) the following: ''Funds authorized to be appropriated to carry out section 340 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4856) are authorized for projects undertaken under subsection (a)(1)(B).''.

SEC. 544. CAPE COD CANAL RAILROAD BRIDGE, BUZZARDS BAY, MASSACHUSETTS.

(a) ALTERNATIVE TRANSPORTATION.—The Secretary is authorized to provide up to $300,000 for alternative transportation that may arise as a result of the operation, maintenance, repair, and rehabilitation of the Cape Cod Canal Railroad Bridge.

(b) OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE CONTRACT RENEGOTIATION.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall enter into negotiation with the owner of the railroad right-of-way for the Cape Cod Canal Railroad Bridge for the purpose of establishing the rights and responsibities for the operation and maintenance of the Bridge. The Secretary is authorized to include in any new contract the termination of the prior contract numbered ER–W175–ENG–1.

SEC. 545. ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI.

(a) DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.—The Secretary, in consultation with local officials, shall conduct a demonstration project to improve water quality in the vicinity of St. Louis, Missouri.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated $1,700,000 to carry out this section.

SEC. 546. BEAVER BRANCH OF BIG TIMBER CREEK, NEW JERSEY.

Upon request of the State of New Jersey or a political subdivision thereof, the Secretary may compile and disseminate information on floods and flood damages, including identification of areas subject to inundation by floods, and provide technical assistance regarding floodplain management for Beaver Branch of Big Timber Creek, New Jersey.

SEC. 547. LAKE ONTARIO AND ST. LAWRENCE RIVER WATER LEVELS, NEW YORK.

Upon request, the Secretary shall provide technical assistance to the International Joint Commission and the St. Lawrence River Board of Control in undertaking studies on the effects of fluctuating water levels on the natural environment, recreational boating, property flooding, and erosion along the shorelines of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River in New York. The Commission and Board are encouraged to conduct such studies in a comprehensive and thorough manner before implementing any change to water regulation Plan 1958–D.

SEC. 548. NEW YORK-NEW JERSEY HARBOR, NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY.

The Secretary may enter into cooperative agreements with non-Federal interests to investigate, develop, and support measures for sediment management and reduction of contaminant sources which affect navigation in the Port of New York-New Jersey and the environmental conditions of the New York-New Jersey Harbor estuary. Such investigation shall include an analysis of the economic and environmental benefits and costs of potential sediment management and contaminant reduction measures.

SEC. 549. SEA GATE REACH, CONEY ISLAND, NEW YORK, NEW YORK.

The Secretary is authorized to construct a project for shoreline protection which includes a beachfill with revetment and T-groin for the Sea Gate Reach on Coney Island, New York, as identified in the March 1998 report prepared for the Corps of Engineers, New York District, entitled ''Field Data Gathering, Project Performance Analysis and Design Alternative Solutions to Improve Sandfill Retention'', at a total cost of $9,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $5,850,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $3,150,000.

SEC. 550. WOODLAWN, NEW YORK.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall provide planning, design, and other technical assistance to non-Federal interests for identifying and mitigating sources of contamination at Woodlawn Beach in Woodlawn, New York.

(b) COST SHARING.—The non-Federal share of the cost of assistance provided under this section shall be 50 percent.

SEC. 551. FLOODPLAIN MAPPING, NEW YORK.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall provide assistance for a project to develop maps identifying 100- and 500-year flood inundation areas in the State of New York.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—Maps developed under the project shall include hydrologic and hydraulic information and shall accurately show the flood inundation of each property by flood risk in the floodplain. The maps shall be produced in a high resolution format and shall be made available to all flood prone areas in the State of New York in an electronic format.

(c) PARTICIPATION OF FEMA.—The Secretary and the non-Federal sponsor of the project shall work with the Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to ensure the validity of the maps developed under the project for flood insurance purposes.

(d) FORMS OF ASSISTANCE.—In carrying out the project, the Secretary may enter into contracts or cooperative agreements with the non-Federal sponsor or provide reimbursements of project costs.

(e) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of the cost of the project shall be 75 percent.

(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $12,000,000 for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1998.

SEC. 552. WHITE OAK RIVER, NORTH CAROLINA.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine if water quality deterioration and sedimentation of the White Oak River, North Carolina, are the result of the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway navigation project. If the Secretary determines that the water quality deterioration and sedimentation are the result of the project, the Secretary shall take appropriate measures to mitigate the deterioration and sedimentation.

SEC. 553. TOUSSAINT RIVER, CARROLL TOWNSHIP, OTTAWA COUNTY, OHIO.

The Secretary is authorized to provide technical assistance for the removal of military ordnance from the Toussaint River, Carroll Township, Ottawa County, Ohio.

SEC. 554. SARDIS RESERVOIR, OKLAHOMA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall accept from the State of Oklahoma or an agent of the State an amount, as determined under subsection (b), as prepayment of 100 percent of the water supply cost obligation of the State under Contract No. DACW56–74–JC–0314 for water supply storage at Sardis Reservoir, Oklahoma.

(b) DETERMINATION OF AMOUNT.—The amount to be paid by the State of Oklahoma under subsection (a) shall be subject to adjustment in accordance with accepted discount purchase methods for Federal Government properties as determined by an independent accounting firm designated by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget. The cost of such determination shall be paid for by the State of Oklahoma or an agent of the State.

(c) EFFECT.—Nothing in this section affects any of the rights or obligations of the parties to the contract referred to in subsection (a).

SEC. 555. WAURIKA LAKE, OKLAHOMA, WATER CONVEYANCE FACILITIES.

For the project for construction of the water conveyances authorized by the first section of Public Law 88–253 (77 Stat. 841), the requirement for the Waurika Project Master Conservancy District to repay the $2,900,000 in costs (including interest) resulting from the October 1991 settlement of the claim before the United States Claims Court, and the payment of $1,190,451 of the final cost representing the difference between the 1978 estimate of cost and the actual

cost determined after completion of such project in 1991, are waived.

SEC. 556. SKINNER BUTTE PARK, EUGENE, OREGON.

(a) STUDY.—The Secretary shall conduct a study of the south bank of the Willamette River, in the area of Skinner Butte Park from Ferry Street Bridge to the Valley River footbridge, to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project to stabilize the river bank, and to restore and enhance riverine habitat, using a combination of structural and bioengineering techniques.

(b) CONSTRUCTION.—If, upon completion of the study, the Secretary determines that the project is feasible, the Secretary shall participate with non-Federal interests in the construction of the project.

(c) COST SHARE.—The non-Federal share of the cost of the project shall be 35 percent.

(d) LANDS, EASEMENTS, AND RIGHTS-OF-WAY.—The non-Federal interest shall provide lands, easements, rights-of-way, relocations, and dredged material disposal areas necessary for construction of the project. The value of such items shall be credited toward the non-Federal share of the cost of the project.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $1,000,000 for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1999.

SEC. 557. WILLAMETTE RIVER BASIN, OREGON.

The Secretary, Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, and heads of other appropriate Federal agencies shall, using existing authorities, assist the State of Oregon in developing and implementing a comprehensive basin-wide strategy in the Willamette River basin of Oregon for coordinated and integrated management of land and water resources to improve water quality, reduce flood hazards, ensure sustainable economic activity, and restore habitat for native fish and wildlife. The heads of such Federal agencies may provide technical assistance, staff and financial support for development of the basin-wide management strategy. The heads of Federal agencies shall seek to exercise flexibility in administrative actions and allocation of funding to reduce barriers to efficient and effective implementing of the strategy.

SEC. 558. BRADFORD AND SULLIVAN COUNTIES, PENNSYLVANIA.

The Secretary is authorized to provide assistance for water-related environmental infrastructure and resource protection and development projects in Bradford and Sullivan Counties, Pennsylvania, using the funds and authorities provided in title I of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 1999 (Public Law 105–245) under the heading ''CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL'' (112 Stat. 1840) for similar projects in Lackawanna, Lycoming, Susquehanna, Wyoming, Pike, and Monroe Counties, Pennsylvania.

SEC. 559. ERIE HARBOR, PENNSYLVANIA.

The Secretary may reimburse the appropriate non-Federal interest not more than $78,366 for architect and engineering costs incurred in connection with the Erie Harbor basin navigation project, Pennsylvania.

SEC. 560. POINT MARION LOCK AND DAM, PENNSYLVANIA.

The project for navigation, Point Marion Lock and Dam, Borough of Point Marion, Pennsylvania, as authorized by section 301(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4110), is modified to direct the Secretary, in the operation and maintenance of the project, to mitigate damages to the shoreline, at a total cost of $2,000,000. The cost of the mitigation shall be allocated as an operation and maintenance cost of a Federal navigation project.

SEC. 561. SEVEN POINTS' HARBOR, PENNSYLVANIA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary is authorized, at full Federal expense, to construct a breakwater-dock combination at the entrance to Seven Points' Harbor, Pennsylvania.

(b) OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE COSTS.—All operation and maintenance costs associated with the facility constructed under this section shall be the responsibility of the lessee of the marina complex at Seven Points' Harbor.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated $850,000 to carry out this section.

SEC. 562. SOUTHEASTERN PENNSYLVANIA.

Section 566(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3786) is amended by inserting ''environmental restoration,'' after ''water supply and related facilities,''.

SEC. 563. UPPER SUSQUEHANNA-LACKAWANNA WATERSHED RESTORATION INITIATIVE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in cooperation with appropriate Federal, State, and local agencies and nongovernmental institutions, is authorized to prepare a watershed plan for the Upper Susquehanna-Lackawanna Watershed (USGS Cataloguing Unit 02050107). The plan shall utilize geographic information system and shall include a comprehensive environmental assessment of the watershed's ecosystem, a comprehensive flood plain management plan, a flood plain protection plan, water resource and environmental restoration projects, water quality improvement, and other appropriate infrastructure and measures.

(b) NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—The non-Federal share of the cost of preparation of the plan under this section shall be 50 percent. Services and materials instead of cash may be credited toward the non-Federal share of the cost of the plan.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $5,000,000 for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1999.

SEC. 564. AGUADILLA HARBOR, PUERTO RICO.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine if erosion and additional storm damage risks that exist in the vicinity of Aguadilla Harbor, Puerto Rico, are the result of a Federal navigation project. If the Secretary determines that such erosion and additional storm damage risks are the result of the project, the Secretary shall take appropriate measures to mitigate the erosion and storm damage.

SEC. 565. OAHE DAM TO LAKE SHARPE, SOUTH DAKOTA, STUDY.

Section 441 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3747) is amended—

(1) by inserting ''(a) INVESTIGATION.—'' before ''The Secretary''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(b) REPORT.—Not later than September 30, 1999, the Secretary shall transmit to Congress a report on the results of the investigation under this section. The report shall include the examination of financing options for regular maintenance and preservation of the lake. The report shall be prepared in coordination and cooperation with the Natural Resources Conservation Service, other Federal agencies, and State and local officials.''.

SEC. 566. INTEGRATED WATER MANAGEMENT PLANNING, TEXAS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in cooperation with other Federal agencies and the State of Texas, shall provide technical, planning, and design assistance to non-Federal interests in developing integrated water management plans and projects that will serve the cities, counties, water agencies, and participating planning regions under the jurisdiction of the State of Texas.

(b) PURPOSES OF ASSISTANCE.—Assistance provided under subsection (a) shall be in support of non-Federal planning and projects for the following purposes:

(1) Plan and develop integrated, near- and long-term water management plans that address the planning region's water supply, water conservation, and water quality needs.

(2) Study and develop strategies and plans that restore, preserve, and protect the State's and planning region's natural ecosystems.

(3) Facilitate public communication and participation.

(4) Integrate such activities with other ongoing Federal and State projects and activities associated with the State of Texas water plan and the State of Texas legislation.

(c) COST SHARING.—The non-Federal share of the cost of assistance provided under subsection (a) shall be 50 percent, of which up to ½ of the non-Federal share may be provided as in kind services.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section, $10,000,000 for the fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1999.

SEC. 567. BOLIVAR PENINSULA, JEFFERSON, CHAMBERS, AND GALVESTON COUNTIES, TEXAS.

(a) SHORE PROTECTION PROJECT.—The Secretary is authorized to design and construct a shore protection project between the south jetty of the Sabine Pass Channel and the north jetty of the Galveston Harbor Entrance Channel in Jefferson, Chambers, and Galveston Counties, Texas, including beneficial use of dredged material from Federal navigation projects.

(b) APPLICABILITY OF BENEFIT-COST RATIO WAIVER AUTHORITY.—In evaluating and implementing the project, the Secretary shall allow the non-Federal interest to participate in the financing of the project in accordance with section 903(c) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4184), notwithstanding any limitation on the purpose of projects to which such section applies, to the extent that the Secretary's evaluation indicates that applying such section is necessary to implement the project.

SEC. 568. GALVESTON BEACH, GALVESTON COUNTY, TEXAS.

The Secretary is authorized to design and construct a shore protection project between the Galveston South Jetty and San Luis Pass, Galveston County, Texas, using innovative nourishment techniques, including beneficial use of dredged material from Federal navigation projects.

SEC. 569. PACKERY CHANNEL, CORPUS CHRISTI, TEXAS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall construct a navigation and storm protection project at Packery Channel, Mustang Island, Texas, consisting of construction of a channel and a channel jetty and placement of sand along the length of the seawall.

(b) ECOLOGICAL AND RECREATIONAL BENEFITS.—In evaluating the project, the Secretary shall include the ecological and recreational benefits of reopening the Packery Channel.

(c) APPLICABILITY OF BENEFIT-COST RATIO WAIVER AUTHORITY.—In evaluating and implementing the project, the Secretary shall allow the non-Federal interest to participate in the financing of the project in accordance with section 903(c) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4184), notwithstanding any limitation on the purpose of projects to which such section applies, to the extent that the Secretary's evaluation indicates that applying such section is necessary to implement the project.

SEC. 570. NORTHERN WEST VIRGINIA.

The projects described in the following reports are authorized to be carried out by the Secretary substantially in accordance with the plans, and subject to the conditions, recommended in such reports:

(1) PARKERSBURG, WEST VIRGINIA.—Report of the Corps of Engineers entitled ''Parkersburg/Vienna Riverfront Park Feasibility Study'', dated June 1998, at a total cost of $8,400,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $4,200,000, and an estimated non-Federal cost of $4,200,000.

(2) WEIRTON, WEST VIRGINIA.—Report of the Corps of Engineers entitled ''Feasibility Master Plan for Weirton Port and Industrial Center,

West Virginia Public Port Authority'', dated December 1997, at a total cost of $18,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $9,000,000, and an estimated non-Federal cost of $9,000,000.

(3) ERICKSON/WOOD COUNTY, WEST VIRGINIA.—Report of the Corps of Engineers entitled ''Feasibility Master Plan for Erickson/Wood County Port District, West Virginia Public Port Authority'', dated July 7, 1997, at a total cost of $28,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $14,000,000, and an estimated non-Federal cost of $14,000,000.

(4) MONONGAHELA RIVER, WEST VIRGINIA.—Monongahela River, West Virginia, Comprehensive Study Reconnaissance Report, dated September 1995, consisting of the following elements:

(A) Morgantown Riverfront Park, Morgantown, West Virginia, at a total cost of $1,600,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $800,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $800,000.

(B) Caperton Rail to Trail, Monongahela County, West Virginia, at a total cost of $4,425,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $2,212,500 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $2,212,500.

(C) Palatine Park, Fairmont, West Virginia, at a total cost of $1,750,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $875,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $875,000.

SEC. 571. URBANIZED PEAK FLOOD MANAGEMENT RESEARCH.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall develop and implement a research program to evaluate opportunities to manage peak flood flows in urbanized watersheds located in the State of New Jersey.

(b) SCOPE OF RESEARCH.—The research program authorized by subsection (a) shall be accomplished through the New York District. The research shall specifically include the following:

(1) Identification of key factors in urbanized watersheds that are under development and impact peak flows in the watersheds and downsteam of the watersheds.

(2) Development of peak flow management models for 4 to 6 watersheds in urbanized areas located with widely differing geology, areas, shapes, and soil types that can be used to determine optimal flow reduction factors for individual watersheds.

(3) Utilization of such management models to determine relationships between flow and reduction factors and change in imperviousness, soil types, shape of the drainage basin, and other pertinent parameters from existing to ultimate conditions in watersheds under consideration for development.

(4) Development and validation of an inexpensive accurate model to establish flood reduction factors based on runoff curve numbers, change in imperviousness, the shape of the basin, and other pertinent factors.

(c) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary shall evaluate policy changes in the planning process for flood control projects based on the results of the research authorized by this section and transmit to Congress a report not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry-out this section $3,000,000 for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1999.

(e) FLOW REDUCTION FACTORS DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''flow reduction factors'' means the ratio of estimated allowable peak flows of stormwater after projected development when compared to pre-existing conditions.

SEC. 572. MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION.

Section 8 of the Flood Control Act of May 15, 1928 (Public Law 391, 70th Congress), is amended by striking ''$7,500'' and inserting ''$21,500.''

SEC. 573. COASTAL AQUATIC HABITAT MANAGEMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may cooperate with the Secretaries of Agriculture and the Interior, the Administrators of the Environmental Protection Agency and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, other appropriate Federal, State, and local agencies, and affected private entities, in the development of a management strategy to address problems associated with toxic microorganisms and the resulting degradation of ecosystems in the tidal and nontidal wetlands and waters of the United States for the States along the Atlantic Ocean. As part of such management strategy, the Secretary may provide planning, design, and other technical assistance to each participating State in the development and implementation of non-regulatory measures to mitigate environmental problems and restore aquatic resources.

(b) COST SHARING.—The Federal share of the cost of measures undertaken under this section shall not exceed 65 percent.

(c) OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.—The non-Federal share of operation and maintenance costs for projects constructed with assistance provided under this section shall be 100 percent.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATION.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $7,000,000 for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1999.

SEC. 574. ABANDONED AND INACTIVE NONCOAL MINE RESTORATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary is authorized to provide technical, planning, and design assistance to Federal and non-Federal interests for carrying out projects to address water quality problems caused by drainage and related activities from abandoned and inactive noncoal mines.

(b) SPECIFIC MEASURES.—Assistance provided under subsection (a) may be in support of projects for the following purposes:

(1) Management of drainage from abandoned and inactive noncoal mines.

(2) Restoration and protection of streams, rivers, wetlands, other waterbodies, and riparian areas degraded by drainage from abandoned and inactive noncoal mines.

(3) Demonstration of management practices and innovative and alternative treatment technologies to minimize or eliminate adverse environmental effects associated with drainage from abandoned and inactive noncoal mines.

(c) NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—The non-Federal share of the cost of assistance under subsection (a) shall be 50 percent; except that the Federal share with respect to projects located on lands owned by the United States shall be 100 percent.

(d) EFFECT ON AUTHORITY OF THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as affecting the authority of the Secretary of the Interior under title IV of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 (30 U.S.C. 1231 et seq.).

(e) TECHNOLOGY DATABASE FOR RECLAMATION OF ABANDONED MINES.—The Secretary is authorized to provide assistance to non-Federal and non-profit entities to develop, manage, and maintain a database of conventional and innovative, cost-effective technologies for reclamation of abandoned and inactive noncoal mine sites. Such assistance shall be provided through the rehabilitation of abandoned mine sites program, managed by the Sacramento District Office of the Corps of Engineers.

(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $5,000,000.

SEC. 575. BENEFICIAL USE OF WASTE TIRE RUBBER.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary is authorized to conduct pilot projects to encourage the beneficial use of waste tire rubber, including crumb rubber, recycled from tires. Such beneficial use may include marine pilings, underwater framing, floating docks with built-in flotation, utility poles, and other uses associated with transportation and infrastructure projects receiving Federal funds. The Secretary shall, when appropriate, encourage the use of waste tire rubber, including crumb rubber, in such federally funded projects.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $5,000,000 for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1998.

SEC. 576. SITE DESIGNATION.

Section 102(c)(4) of the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1972 (33 U.S.C. 1412(c)(4)) is amended by striking ''January 1, 2000'' and inserting ''January 1, 2005''.

SEC. 577. LAND CONVEYANCES.

(a) EXCHANGE OF LAND IN PIKE COUNTY, MISSOURI.—

(1) EXCHANGE OF LAND.—Subject to paragraphs (3) and (4), at such time as Holnam Inc. conveys all right, title, and interest in and to the land described in paragraph (2)(A) to the United States, the Secretary shall convey all right, title, and interest in the land described in paragraph (2)(B) to Holnam Inc.

(2) DESCRIPTION OF LANDS.—The lands referred to in paragraph (1) are the following:

(A) NON-FEDERAL LAND.—152.45 acres with existing flowage easements situated in Pike County, Missouri, described a portion of Government Tract Number FM–9 and all of Government Tract Numbers FM–11, FM–10, FM–12, FM–13, and FM–16, owned and administered by the Holnam Inc.

(B) FEDERAL LAND.—152.61 acres situated in Pike County, Missouri, known as Government Tract Numbers FM–17 and a portion of FM–18, administered by the Corps of Engineers.

(3) CONDITIONS OF EXCHANGE.—The exchange of land authorized by paragraph (1) shall be subject to the following conditions:

(A) DEEDS.—

(i) FEDERAL LAND.—The instrument of conveyance used to convey the land described in paragraph (2)(B) to Holnam Inc. shall contain such reservations, terms, and conditions as the Secretary considers necessary to allow the United States to operate and maintain the Mississippi River 9-Foot Navigation Project.

(ii) NON-FEDERAL LAND.—The conveyance of the land described in paragraph (2)(A) to the Secretary shall be by a warranty deed acceptable to the Secretary.

(B) REMOVAL OF IMPROVEMENTS.—Holnam Inc. may remove any improvements on the land described in paragraph (2)(A). The Secretary may require Holnam Inc. to remove any improvements on the land described in paragraph (2)(A). In either case, Holnam Inc. shall hold the United States harmless from liability, and the United States shall not incur cost associated with the removal or relocation of any such improvements.

(C) TIME LIMIT FOR EXCHANGE.—The land exchange authorized by paragraph (1) shall be completed not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

(D) LEGAL DESCRIPTION.—The Secretary shall provide the legal description of the land described in paragraph (2). The legal description shall be used in the instruments of conveyance of the land.

(E) ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—The Secretary shall require Holnam Inc. to pay reasonable administrative costs associated with the exchange.

(4) VALUE OF PROPERTIES.—If the appraised fair market value, as determined by the Secretary, of the land conveyed to Holnam Inc. by the Secretary under paragraph (1) exceeds the appraised fair market value, as determined by the Secretary, of the land conveyed to the United States by Holnam Inc. under paragraph (1), Holnam Inc. shall make a payment equal to the excess in cash or a cash equivalent to the United States.

(b) CANDY LAKE PROJECT, OSAGE COUNTY, OKLAHOMA.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection, the following definitions apply:

(A) FAIR MARKET VALUE.—The term ''fair market value'' means the amount for which a willing buyer would purchase and a willing seller would sell a parcel of land, as determined by a qualified, independent land appraiser.

(B) PREVIOUS OWNER OF LAND.—The term ''previous owner of land'' means a person (including a corporation) that conveyed, or a descendant of a deceased individual who conveyed, land to the Corps of Engineers for use in the Candy Lake project in Osage County, Oklahoma.

(2) LAND CONVEYANCES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall convey, in accordance with this subsection, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the land acquired by the United States for the Candy Lake project in Osage County, Oklahoma.

(B) PREVIOUS OWNERS OF LAND.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall give a previous owner of land the first option to purchase the land described in subparagraph (A).

(ii) APPLICATION.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—A previous owner of land that desires to purchase the land described in subparagraph (A) that was owned by the previous owner of land, or by the individual from whom the previous owner of land is descended, shall file an application to purchase the land with the Secretary not later than 180 days after the official date of notice to the previous owner of land under paragraph (3).

(II) FIRST TO FILE HAS FIRST OPTION.—If more than 1 application is filed to purchase a parcel of land described in subparagraph (A), the first option to purchase the parcel of land shall be determined in the order in which applications for the parcel of land were filed.

(iii) IDENTIFICATION OF PREVIOUS OWNERS OF LAND.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall, to the extent practicable, identify each previous owner of land.

(iv) CONSIDERATION.—Consideration for land conveyed under this paragraph shall be the fair market value of the land.

(C) DISPOSAL.—Any land described in subparagraph (A) for which an application to purchase the land has not been filed under subparagraph (B)(ii) within the applicable time period shall be disposed of in accordance with law.

(D) EXTINGUISHMENT OF EASEMENTS.—All flowage easements acquired by the United States for use in the Candy Lake project in Osage County, Oklahoma, are extinguished.

(3) NOTICE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall notify—

(i) each person identified as a previous owner of land under paragraph (2)(B)(iii), not later than 90 days after identification, by United States mail; and

(ii) the general public, not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, by publication in the Federal Register.

(B) CONTENTS OF NOTICE.—Notice under this paragraph shall include—

(i) a copy of this subsection;

(ii) information sufficient to separately identify each parcel of land subject to this subsection; and

(iii) specification of the fair market value of each parcel of land subject to this subsection.

(C) OFFICIAL DATE OF NOTICE.—The official date of notice under this paragraph shall be the later of—

(i) the date on which actual notice is mailed; or

(ii) the date of publication of the notice in the Federal Register.

(c) LAKE HUGO, OKLAHOMA, AREA LAND CONVEYANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall convey at fair market value to Choctaw County Industrial Authority, Oklahoma, the property described in paragraph (2).

(2) DESCRIPTION.—The property to be conveyed under paragraph (1) is—

(A) that portion of land at Lake Hugo, Oklahoma, above elevation 445.2 located in the N½ of the NW¼ of Section 24, R 18 E, T 6 S, and the S½ of the SW¼ of Section 13, R 18 E, T 6 S bounded to the south by a line 50 north on the centerline of Road B of Sawyer Bluff Public Use Area and to the north by the ½ quarter section line forming the south boundary of Wilson Point Public Use Area; and

(B) a parcel of property at Lake Hugo, Oklahoma, commencing at the NE corner of the SE¼ SW¼ of Section 13, R 18 E, T 6 S, 100 feet north, then east approximately ½ mile to the county line road between Section 13, R 18 E, T 6 S, and Section 18, R 19 E, T 6 S.

(3) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The conveyances under this subsection shall be subject to such terms and conditions, including payment of reasonable administrative costs and compliance with applicable Federal floodplain management and flood insurance programs, as the Secretary considers necessary and appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

(d) CONVEYANCE OF PROPERTY IN MARSHALL COUNTY, OKLAHOMA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall convey to the State of Oklahoma all right, title, and interest of the United States to real property located in Marshall County, Oklahoma, and included in the Lake Texoma (Denison Dam), Oklahoma and Texas, project consisting of approximately 1,580 acres and leased to the State of Oklahoma for public park and recreation purposes.

(2) CONSIDERATION.—Consideration for the conveyance under paragraph (1) shall be the fair market value of the real property, as determined by the Secretary. All costs associated with the conveyance under paragraph (1) shall be paid by the State of Oklahoma.

(3) DESCRIPTION.—The exact acreage and legal description of the real property to be conveyed under paragraph (1) shall be determined by a survey satisfactory to the Secretary. The cost of the survey shall be paid by the State of Oklahoma.

(4) ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE.—Before making the conveyance under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall—

(A) conduct an environmental baseline survey to determine if there are levels of contamination for which the United States would be responsible under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.); and

(B) ensure that the conveyance complies with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

(5) OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The conveyance under paragraph (1) shall be subject to such other terms and conditions as the Secretary considers necessary and appropriate to protect the interests of the United States, including reservation by the United States of a flowage easement over all portions of the real property to be conveyed that are at or below elevation 645.0 NGVD.

(e) SUMMERFIELD CEMETERY ASSOCIATION, OKLAHOMA, LAND CONVEYANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall transfer to the Summerfield Cemetery Association, Oklahoma, all right, title, and interest of the United State in and to the land described in paragraph (3) for use as a cemetery.

(2) REVERSION.—If the land to be transferred under this subsection ever cease to be used as a not-for-profit cemetery or for other public purposes the land shall revert to the United States.

(3) DESCRIPTION.—The land to be conveyed under this subsection is the approximately 10 acres of land located in Leflore County, Oklahoma, and described as follows:

INDIAN BASIN MERIDIAN

Section 23, Township 5 North, Range 23 East

SW SE SW NW

NW NE NW SW

N½ SW SW NW.

(4) CONSIDERATION.—The conveyance under this subsection shall be without consideration. All costs associated with the conveyance shall be paid by the Summerfield Cemetery Association, Oklahoma.

(5) OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The conveyance under this subsection shall be subject to such other terms and conditions as the Secretary considers necessary and appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

(f) DEXTER, OREGON.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall convey to the Dexter Sanitary District all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a parcel of land consisting of approximately 5 acres located at Dexter Lake, Oregon, under lease to the Dexter Sanitary District.

(2) CONSIDERATION.—Land to be conveyed under this section shall be conveyed without consideration. If the land is no longer held in public ownership or no longer used for wastewater treatment purposes, title to the land shall revert to the Secretary.

(3) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The conveyance by the United States shall be subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

(4) DESCRIPTION.—The exact acreage and description of the land to be conveyed under paragraph (1) shall be determined by such surveys as the Secretary considers necessary. The cost of the surveys shall be borne by the Dexter Sanitary District.

(g) RICHARD B. RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, SOUTH CAROLINA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Upon execution of an agreement under paragraph (4) and subject to the requirements of this subsection, the Secretary shall convey, without consideration, to the State of South Carolina all right, title, and interest of the United States to the lands described in paragraph (2) that are managed, as of the date of enactment of this Act, by the South Carolina Department of Natural Resources for fish and wildlife mitigation purposes in connection with the Richard B. Russell Dam and Lake, South Carolina, project.

(2) DESCRIPTION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the lands to be conveyed under paragraph (1) are described in Exhibits A, F, and H of Army Lease Number DACW21–1–93–0910 and associated Supplemental Agreements or are designated in red in Exhibit A of Army License Number DACW21–3–85–1904; except that all designated lands in the license that are below elevation 346 feet mean sea level or that are less than 300 feet measured horizontally from the top of the power pool are excluded from the conveyance. Management of the excluded lands shall continue in accordance with the terms of Army License Number DACW21–3–85–1904 until the Secretary and the State enter into an agreement under paragraph (4).

(B) SURVEY.—The exact acreage and legal description of the lands to be conveyed under paragraph (1) shall be determined by a survey satisfactory to the Secretary, with the cost of the survey to be paid by the State. The State shall be responsible for all other costs, including real estate transaction and environmental compliance costs, associated with the conveyance.

(3) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—

(A) MANAGEMENT OF LANDS.—All lands that are conveyed under paragraph (1) shall be retained in public ownership and shall be managed in perpetuity for fish and wildlife mitigation purposes in accordance with a plan approved by the Secretary. If the lands are not managed for such purposes in accordance with the plan, title to the lands shall revert to the United States. If the lands revert to the United States under this subparagraph, the Secretary shall manage the lands for such purposes.

(B) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with the conveyance as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

(4) PAYMENTS.—

(A) AGREEMENTS.—The Secretary is authorized to pay to the State of South Carolina not more than $4,850,000 if the Secretary and the State enter into a binding agreement for the State to manage for fish and wildlife mitigation purposes, in perpetuity, the lands conveyed under this subsection and the lands not covered by the conveyance that are designated in red in Exhibit A of Army License Number DACW21–3–85–1904.

(B) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The agreement shall specify the terms and conditions under which the payment will be made and the rights of, and remedies available to, the Federal Government to recover all or a portion of the payment in the event the State fails to manage the lands in a manner satisfactory to the Secretary.

(h) CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA.—The Secretary is authorized to convey the property of the Corps of Engineers known as the ''Equipment and Storage Yard'', located on Meeting Street in Charleston, South Carolina, in as-is condition for fair-market value with all proceeds from the conveyance to be applied by the Corps of Engineers, Charleston District, to offset a portion of the costs of moving or leasing (or both) an office facility in the city of Charleston.

(i) CLARKSTON, WASHINGTON.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall convey to the Port of Clarkston, Washington, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a portion of the land described in Army Lease Number DACW68–1–97–22, consisting of approximately 31 acres, the exact boundaries of which shall be determined by the Secretary and the Port of Clarkston.

(2) ADDITIONAL LAND.—The Secretary may convey to the Port of Clarkston, Washington, at fair market value as determined by the Secretary, such additional land located in the vicinity of Clarkston, Washington, as the Secretary determines to be excess to the needs of the Columbia River Project and appropriate for conveyance.

(3) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The conveyances made under paragraphs (1) and (2) shall be subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines to be necessary to protect the interests of the United States, including a requirement that the Port of Clarkston pay all administrative costs associated with the conveyances (including the cost of land surveys and appraisals and costs associated with compliance with applicable environmental laws, including regulations).

(4) USE OF LAND.—The Port of Clarkston shall be required to pay the fair market value, as determined by the Secretary, of any land conveyed pursuant to paragraph (1) that is not retained in public ownership or is used for other than public park or recreation purposes, except that the Secretary shall have a right of reverter to reclaim possession and title to any such land.

(j) LAND CONVEYANCE TO MATEWAN, WEST VIRGINIA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The United States shall convey by quit claim deed to the Town of Matewan, West Virginia, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to four parcels of land deemed excess by the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, to the structural project for flood control constructed by the Corps of Engineers along the Tug Fork River pursuant to section 202 of Public Law 96–367.

(2) PROPERTY DESCRIPTION.—The parcels of land referred to in paragraph (1) are as follows:

(A) A certain parcel of land in the State of West Virginia, Mingo County, Town of Matewan, and being more particularly bounded and described as follows:

Beginning at a point on the southerly right-of-way line of a 40-foot-wide street right-of-way (known as McCoy Alley), having an approximate coordinate value of N228,695, E1,662,397, in the line common to the land designated as U.S.A. Tract No. 834, and the land designated as U.S.A. Tract No. 837, said point being South 51°52′ East 81.8 feet from an iron pin and cap marked M–12 on the boundary of the Matewan Area Structural Project, on the north right-of-way line of said street, at a corner common to designated U.S.A. Tracts Nos. 834 and 836; thence, leaving the right-of-way of said street, with the line common to the land of said Tract No. 834, and the land of said Tract No. 837.

South 14°37′ West 46 feet to the corner common to the land of said Tract No. 834, and the land of said Tract No. 837; thence, leaving the land of said Tract No. 837, severing the lands of said Project.

South 14°37′ West 46 feet.

South 68°07′ East 239 feet.

North 26°05′ East 95 feet to a point on the southerly right-of-way line of said street; thence, with the right-of-way of said street, continuing to sever the lands of said Project.

South 63°55′ East 206 feet; thence, leaving the right-of-way of said street, continuing to sever the lands of said Project.

South 26°16′ West 63 feet; thence, with a curve to the left having a radius of 70 feet, a delta of 33°58′, an arc length of 41 feet, the chord bearing.

South 09°17′ West 41 feet; thence, leaving said curve, continuing to sever the lands of said Project.

South 07°42′ East 31 feet to a point on the right-of-way line of the floodwall; thence, with the right-of-way of said floodwall, continuing to sever the lands of said Project.

South 77°04′ West 71 feet.

North 77°10′ West 46 feet.

North 67°07′ West 254 feet.

North 67°54′ West 507 feet.

North 57°49′ West 66 feet to the intersection of the right-of-way line of said floodwall with the southerly right-of-way line of said street; thence, leaving the right-of-way of said floodwall and with the southerly right-of-way of said street, continuing to sever the lands of said Project.

North 83°01′ East 171 feet.

North 89°42′ East 74 feet.

South 83°39′ East 168 feet.

South 83°38′ East 41 feet.

South 77°26′ East 28 feet to the point of beginning, containing 2.59 acres, more or less. The bearings and coordinate used herein are referenced to the West Virginia State Plane Coordinate System, South Zone.

(B) A certain parcel of land in the State of West Virginia, Mingo County, Town of Matewan, and being more particularly bounded and described as follows:

Beginning at an iron pin and cap designated Corner No. M2–2 on the southerly right-of-way line of the Norfolk and Western Railroad, having an approximate coordinate value of N228,755 E1,661,242, and being at the intersection of the right-of-way line of the floodwall with the boundary of the Matewan Area Structural Project; thence, leaving the right-of-way of said floodwall and with said Project boundary, and the southerly right-of-way of said Railroad.

North 59°45′ East 34 feet.

North 69°50′ East 44 feet.

North 58°11′ East 79 feet.

North 66°13′ East 102 feet.

North 69°43′ East 98 feet.

North 77°39′ East 18 feet.

North 72°39′ East 13 feet to a point at the intersection of said Project boundary, and the southerly right-of-way of said Railroad, with the westerly right-of-way line of State Route 49/10; thence, leaving said Project boundary, and the southerly right-of-way of said Railroad, and with the westerly right-of-way of said road.

South 03°21′ East 100 feet to a point at the intersection of the westerly right-of-way of said road with the right-of-way of said floodwall; thence, leaving the right-of-way of said road, and with the right-of-way line of said floodwall.

South 79°30′ West 69 feet.

South 78°28′ West 222 feet.

South 80°11′ West 65 feet.

North 38°40′ West 14 feet to the point of beginning, containing 0.53 acre, more or less. The bearings and coordinate used herein are referenced to the West Virginia State Plane Coordinate System, South Zone.

(C) A certain parcel of land in the State of West Virginia, Mingo County, Town of Matewan, and being more particularly bounded and described as follows:

Beginning at a point on the southerly right-of-way line of the Norfolk and Western Railroad, having an approximate coordinate value of N228,936 E1,661,672, and being at the intersection of the easterly right-of-way line of State Route 49/10 with the boundary of the Matewan Area Structural Project; thence, leaving the right-of-way of said road, and with said Project boundary, and the southerly right-of-way of said Railroad.

North 77°49′ East 89 feet to an iron pin and cap designated as U.S.A. Corner No. M–4.

North 79°30′ East 74 feet to an iron pin and cap designated as U.S.A. Corner No. M–5–1; thence, leaving the southerly right-of-way of said Railroad, and continuing with the boundary of said Project.

South 06°33′ East 102 to an iron pipe and cap designated U.S.A. Corner No. M–6–1 on the northerly right-of-way line of State Route 49/28; thence, leaving the boundary of said Project, and with the right-of-way of said road, severing the lands of said Project.

North 80°59′ West 171 feet to a point at the intersection of the Northerly right-of-way line of said State Route 49/28 with the easterly right-of-way line of said State Route 49/10; thence, leaving the right-of-way of said State Route 49/28 and with the right-of-way of said State Route 49/10.

North 03°21′ West 42 feet to the point of beginning, containing 0.27 acre, more or less. The bearings and coordinate used herein are referenced to the West Virginia State Plane Coordinate System, South Zone.

(D) A certain parcel of land in the State of West Virginia, Mingo County, Town of Matewan, and being more particularly bounded and described as follows:

Beginning at a point at the intersection of the easterly right-of-way line of State Route 49/10 with the right-of-way line of the floodwall, having an approximate coordinate value of N228,826 E1,661,679; thence, leaving the right-of-way of said floodwall, and with the right-of-way of said State Route 49/10.

North 03°21′ West 23 feet to a point at the intersection of the easterly right-of-way line of said State Route 49/10 with the southerly right-of-way line of State Route 49/28; thence, leaving the right-of-way of said State Route 49/10 and with the right-of-way of said State Route 49/28.

South 80°59′ East 168 feet.

North 82°28′ East 45 feet to an iron pin and cap designated as U.S.A. Corner No. M–8–1 on the boundary of the Western Area Structural Project; thence, leaving the right-of-way of said State Route 49/28, and with said Project boundary.

South 08°28′ East 88 feet to an iron pin and cap designated as U.S.A. Corner No. M–9–1 point on the northerly right-of-way line of a street (known as McCoy Alley); thence, leaving said Project boundary and with the northerly right-of-way of said street.

South 83°01′ West 38 feet to a point on the right-of-way line of said floodwall; thence, leaving the right-of-way of said street, and with the right-of-way of said floodwall.

North 57°49′ West 180 feet.

South 79°30′ West 34 feet to a point of beginning, containing 0.24 acre, more or less. The bearings and coordinate used herein are referenced to the West Virginia State Plane Coordinate System, South Zone.

SEC. 578. NAMINGS.

(a) FRANCIS BLAND FLOODWAY DITCH, ARKANSAS.—

(1) DESIGNATION.—8-Mile Creek in Paragould, Arkansas, shall be known and designated as the ''Francis Bland Floodway Ditch''.

(2) LEGAL REFERENCE.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the creek referred to in paragraph (1) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Francis Bland Floodway Ditch''.

(b) LAWRENCE BLACKWELL MEMORIAL BRIDGE, ARKANSAS.—

(1) DESIGNATION.—The bridge over lock and dam numbered 4 on the Arkansas River, Arkansas, constructed as part of the project for navigation on the Arkansas River and tributaries, shall be known and designated as the ''Lawrence Blackwell Memorial Bridge''.

(2) LEGAL REFERENCE.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the bridge referred to in paragraph (1) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Lawrence Blackwell Memorial Bridge''.

SEC. 579. FOLSOM DAM AND RESERVOIR ADDITIONAL STORAGE AND ADDITIONAL FLOOD CONTROL STUDIES.

(a) FOLSOM FLOOD CONTROL STUDIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in consultation with the State of California and local water resources agencies, shall undertake a study of increasing surcharge flood control storage at the Folsom Dam and Reservoir.

(2) LIMITATIONS.—The study of the Folsom Dam and Reservoir undertaken under paragraph (1) shall assume that there is to be no increase in conservation storage at the Folsom Reservoir.

(3) REPORT.—Not later than March 1, 2000, the Secretary shall transmit to Congress a report on the results of the study under this subsection.

(b) AMERICAN AND SACRAMENTO RIVERS FLOOD CONTROL STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall undertake a study of all levees on the American River and on the Sacramento River downstream and immediately upstream of the confluence of such Rivers to access opportunities to increase potential flood protection through levee modifications.

(2) DEADLINE FOR COMPLETION.—Not later than March 1, 2000, the Secretary shall transmit to Congress a report on the results of the study undertaken under this subsection.

SEC. 580. WALLOPS ISLAND, VIRGINIA.

(a) EMERGENCY ACTION.—The Secretary shall take emergency action to protect Wallops Island, Virginia, from damaging coastal storms, by improving and extending the existing seawall, replenishing and renourishing the beach, and constructing protective dunes.

(b) REIMBURSEMENT.—The Secretary shall seek reimbursement from other Federal agencies whose resources are protected by the emergency action taken under subsection (a).

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $8,000,000.

SEC. 581. DETROIT RIVER, DETROIT, MICHIGAN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary is authorized to repair and rehabilitate the seawalls on the Detroit River in Detroit, Michigan.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1999, $1,000,000 to carry out this section.

The CHAIRMAN. No amendment shall be in order except those printed in part 2 of that report. Each amendment may be offered only in the order specified, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone a request for a recorded vote on any amendment and may reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the time for voting on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote, provided that the time for voting on the first question shall be a minimum of 15 minutes.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part 2 of House Report 106–120.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. SHUSTER

Mr. SHUSTER. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 1 printed in part 2 of House Report 106–120 offered by Mr. SHUSTER:

In section 101(a)(6) of the bill, strike ''at a total cost of'' and all that follows and insert the following:

at a total cost of $140,328,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $70,164,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $70,164,000.

In section 101(a)(8) of the bill, strike all after ''$3,375,000'' and insert a period.

In section 101(a)(9) of the bill, strike all after ''$2,675,000'' and insert a period.

In section 101(a)(10) of the bill, strike all after ''$773,000'' and insert a period.

In section 101(a)(18) of the bill, strike all after ''$3,834,000'' and insert a period.

In section 101(a)(19) of the bill, strike all after ''$19,776,000'' and insert a period.

In section 101(a) of the bill, after paragraph (4) insert the following:

(5) OAKLAND HARBOR, CALIFORNIA.—The project for navigation, Oakland Harbor, California: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated April 21, 1999, at a total cost of $252,290,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $128,081,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $124,209,000.

In section 101(a) of the bill, after paragraph (10) insert the following:

(11) DELAWARE BAY COASTLINE, DELAWARE AND NEW JERSEY-VILLAS AND VICINITY, NEW JERSEY.—The project for shore protection and ecosystem restoration, Delaware Bay coastline, Delaware and New Jersey-Villas and vicinity, New Jersey: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated April 21, 1999, at a total cost of $7,520,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $4,888,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $2,632,000.

(12) DELAWARE COAST FROM CAPE HENELOPEN TO FENWICK ISLAND, BETHANY BEACH/SOUTH BETHANY BEACH, DELAWARE.—The project for hurricane and storm damage reduction, Delaware Coast from Cape Henelopen to Fenwick Island, Bethany Beach/South Bethany Beach, Delaware: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated April 21, 1999, at a total cost of $22,205,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $14,433,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $7,772,000.

In section 101(a) of the bill, insert after paragraph (17) the following (and redesignate paragraphs accordingly):

(18) TURKEY CREEK BASIN, KANSAS CITY, MISSOURI, AND KANSAS CITY, KANSAS.—The project for flood damage reduction, Turkey Creek Basin, Kansas City, Missouri, and Kansas City, Kansas: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated April 21, 1999, at a total cost of $42,875,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $25,596,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $17,279,000.

In section 101(b)(7) of the bill, strike all after ''$7,772,000'' and insert a period.

In section 101(b)(12) of the bill, strike all after ''$1,740,000'' and insert a period.

In section 101(b) of the bill, strike paragraph (4) and insert the following:

(4) DELAWARE BAY COASTLINE, DELAWARE AND NEW JERSEY: OAKWOOD BEACH, NEW JERSEY.—The project for shore protection, Delaware Bay Coastline, Delaware and New Jersey: Oakwood Beach, New Jersey, at a total cost of $3,360,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $2,184,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $1,176,000.

In section 101(b) of the bill, strike paragraphs (6) and (7) and redesignate accordingly.

At the end of section 104 of the bill, insert the following:

(18) FAIRPORT HARBOR, OHIO.—Project for navigation, Fairport Harbor, Ohio, including a recreation channel.

At the end of title II of the bill, insert the following:

SEC. 229. WETLANDS MITIGATION.

In carrying out a water resources project that involves wetlands mitigation and that has an impact that occurs within the service area of a mitigation bank, the Secretary, to the maximum extent practicable and where appropriate, shall give preference to the use of the mitigation bank if the bank contains sufficient available credits to offset the impact and the bank is approved in accordance with the Federal Guidance for the Establishment, Use and Operation of Mitigation Banks (60 Fed. Reg. 58605 (November 28, 1995)) or other applicable Federal law (including regulations).

Conform the table of contents of the bill accordingly.

In section 304 of the bill, insert ''River'' after ''St. Francis''.

In section 310 of the bill—

(1) insert '', Potomac River, Washington, District of Columbia,'' after ''for flood control'';

(2) strike ''as'' and insert ''and''; and

(3) strike ''$5,965,000'' and insert ''$6,129,000''.

In section 326 of the bill, strike ''cannal'' and insert ''Canal''.

In section 351 of the bill—

(1) insert ''(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—'' before ''Section''; and

(2) add at the end the following:

(b) CORPS OF ENGINEERS EXPENSES.—Section 313(g) of such Act (106 Stat. 4846) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(4) CORPS OF ENGINEERS EXPENSES.—10 percent of the amounts appropriated to carry out this section for each of fiscal years 2000 through 2002 may be used by the Corps of Engineers district offices to administer and implement projects under this section at 100 percent Federal expense.''.

Strike section 354 of the bill and insert the following:

SEC. 354. CLEAR CREEK, TEXAS.

Section 575 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3789) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by inserting ''or nonstructural (buyout) actions'' after ''flood control works constructed''; and

(B) by inserting ''or nonstructural (buyout) actions'' after ''construction of the project''; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (3);

(B) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (3) and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(4) the project for flood control, Clear Creek, Texas, authorized by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1968 (82 Stat. 742).''.

In section 356 of the bill, strike ''modified—'' and all that follows and insert the following:

modified to add environmental restoration and recreation as project purposes.

In section 363(d) of the bill, strike ''(1) IN GENERAL.—''.

In section 363(d) of the bill, strike paragraph (2).

In section 364(a) of the bill, after paragraph (5) insert the following (and redesignate paragraph (6) as paragraph (7)):

(6) CARVERS HARBOR, VINALHAVEN, MAINE.—That portion of the project for navigation, Carvers Harbor, Vinalhaven, Maine, authorized by the Act of June 3, 1896 (commonly known as the ''River and Harbor Appropriations Act of 1896'') (29 Stat. 202, chapter 314), consisting of the 16-foot anchorage beginning at a point with coordinates N137,502.04, E895,156.83, thence running south 6 degrees 34 minutes 57.6 seconds west 277.660 feet to a point N137,226.21, E895,125.00, thence running north 53 degrees, 5 minutes 42.4 seconds west 127.746 feet to a point N137,302.92, E895022.85, thence running north 33 degrees 56 minutes 9.8 seconds east 239.999 feet to the point of origin.

In section 364(a) of the bill, after paragraph (7), (as so redesignated) insert the following (redesignate subsequent paragraphs accordingly):

(8) SEARSPORT HARBOR, SEARSPORT, MAINE.—That portion of the project for navigation, Searsport Harbor, Searsport, Maine, authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1173), consisting of the 35-foot turning basin beginning at a point with coordinates N225,008.38, E395,464.26, thence running north 43 degrees 49 minutes 53.4 seconds east 362.001 feet to a point N225,269.52, E395,714.96, thence running south 71 degrees 27 minutes 33.0 seconds east 1,309.201 feet to a point N224,853.22, E396,956.21, thence running north 84 degrees 3 minutes 45.7 seconds west 1,499.997 feet to the point of origin.

In section 364(c) of the bill—

(1) strike ''(a)(7)'' each place it appears and insert ''(a)(9)'';

(2) strike ''project for navigation,'' each place it appears; and

(3) add at the end the following:

(5) ADDITIONAL ACTIONS.—In carrying out the operation and the maintenance of the Wells Harbor, Maine, navigation project referred to in subsection (a)(9), the Secretary shall undertake each of the actions of the Corps of Engineers specified in section IV(B) of the memorandum of agreement relating to the project dated January 20, 1998, including those actions specified in such section IV(B) that the parties agreed to ask the Corps of Engineers to undertake.

In section 364(d) of the bill, strike ''(a)(9)'' and insert ''(a)(11)''.

At the end of title III of the bill, add the following (and conform the table of contents of the bill accordingly):

SEC. 367. SOUTHERN WEST VIRGINIA PILOT PROGRAM.

Section 340(g) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4856) is amended to read as follows:

''(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out the pilot program under this section $40,000,000 for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1992. Such sums shall remain available until expended.''.

SEC. 368. BLACK WARRIOR AND TOMBIGBEE RIVERS, JACKSON, ALABAMA.

The project for navigation, Black Warrior and Tombigbee Rivers, vicinity of Jackson, Alabama, as authorized by section 106 of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 1987 (100 Stat. 3341–199), is modified to authorize the Secretary to acquire lands for mitigation of the habitat losses attributable to the project, including the navigation channel, dredged material disposal areas, and other areas directly impacted by construction of the project. Notwithstanding section 906 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2283), the Secretary may construct the project prior to acquisition of the mitigation lands if the Secretary takes such actions as may be necessary to ensure that any required mitigation lands will be acquired not later than 2 years after initiation of construction of the new channel and such acquisition will fully mitigate any adverse environmental impacts resulting from the project.

SEC. 369. TROPICANA WASH AND FLAMINGO WASH, NEVADA.

Any Federal costs associated with the Tropicana and Flamingo Washes, Nevada, authorized by section 101(13) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4803), incurred by the non-Federal interest to accelerate or modify construction of the project, in cooperation with the Corps of Engineers, shall be considered to be eligible for reimbursement by the Secretary.

SEC. 370. COMITE RIVER, LOUISIANA.

The Comite River Diversion Project for flood control, authorized as part of the project for flood control, Amite River and Tributaries, Louisiana, by section 101(11) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4802–4803) and modified by section 301(b)(5) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3709–3710), is further modified to authorize the Secretary to include the costs of highway relocations to be cost shared as a project construction feature if the Secretary determines that such treatment of costs is necessary to facilitate construction of the project.

SEC. 371. ST. MARY'S RIVER, MICHIGAN.

The project for navigation, St. Mary's River, Michigan, is modified to direct the Secretary to provide an additional foot of overdraft between Point Louise Turn and the Locks and Sault Saint Marie, Michigan, consistent with the channels upstream of Point Louise Turn. The modification shall be carried out as operation and maintenance to improve navigation safety.

At the end of section 408 of the bill, add the following:

(c) CONSULTATION AND USE OF EXISTING DATA.—The Secretary shall consult with appropriate State and Federal agencies and shall make maximum use of existing data and ongoing programs and efforts of States and Federal agencies in conducting the study.

In section 425(a) of the bill, strike ''Such study'' and all that follows.

In section 425(c) of the bill, strike ''$1,400,000'' and insert ''$1,000,000''.

At the end of title IV of the bill, insert the following (and conform the table of contents of the bill accordingly):

SEC. 428. DEL NORTE COUNTY, CALIFORNIA.

The Secretary shall undertake and complete a feasibility study for designating a permanent disposal site for dredged materials from Federal navigation projects in Del Norte County, California.

SEC. 429. ST. CLAIR RIVER AND LAKE ST. CLAIR, MICHIGAN.

(a) PLAN.—The Secretary, in coordination with State and local governments and appropriate Federal and provincial authorities of Canada, shall develop a comprehensive management plan for St. Clair River and Lake St. Clair. Such plan shall include the following elements:

(1) The causes and sources of environmental degradation.

(2) Continuous monitoring of organic, biological, metallic, and chemical contamination levels.

(3) Timely dissemination of information of such contamination levels to public authorities, other interested parties, and the public.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall transmit to Congress a report that includes the plan developed under subsection (a), together with recommendations of potential restoration measures.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $400,000.

SEC. 430. CUMBERLAND COUNTY, TENNESSEE.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of improvements to regional water supplies for Cumberland County, Tennessee.

In the matter proposed to be inserted in section 219(e) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 by section 502 of the bill, strike ''and'' at the end of paragraph (7) and all that follows through paragraph (8) and insert the following:

''(8) $30,000,000 for the project described in subsection (c)(17);

''(9) $20,000,000 for the project described in subsection (c)(19);

''(10) $15,000,000 for the project described in subsection (c)(20);

''(11) $11,000,000 for the project described in subsection (c)(21);

''(12) $2,000,000 for the project described in subsection (c)(22);

''(13) $3,000,000 for the project described in subsection (c)(23);

''(14) $1,500,000 for the project described in subsection (c)(24);

''(15) $2,000,000 for the project described in subsection (c)(25);

''(16) $8,000,000 for the project described in subsection (c)(26);

''(17) $8,000,000 for the project described in subsection (c)(27), of which $3,000,000 shall be available only for providing assistance for the Montoursville Regional Sewer Authority, Lycoming County;

''(18) $10,000,000 for the project described in subsection (c)(28); and

''(19) $1,000,000 for the project described in subsection (c)(29).''.

At the end of section 517 of the bill, insert the following:

(c) NASHUA, NEW HAMPSHIRE.—Section 219(c) of such Act is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(19) NASHUA, NEW HAMPSHIRE.—A sewer and drainage system separation and rehabiliation program for Nashua, New Hampshire.''.

(d) FALL RIVER AND NEW BEDFORD, MASSACHUSETTS.—Section 219(c) of such Act is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(20) FALL RIVER AND NEW BEDFORD, MASSACHUSETTS.—Elimination or control of combined sewer overflows in the cities of Fall River and New Bedford, Massachusetts.''.

(e) ADDITIONAL PROJECT DESCRIPTIONS.—Section 219(c) of such Act is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(21) FINDLAY TOWNSHIP, PENNSYLVANIA.—Water and sewer lines in Findlay Township, Allegheny County, Pennsylvania.

''(22) DILLSBURG BOROUGH AUTHORITY, PENNSYLVANIA.—Water and sewer systems in Franklin Township, York County, Pennsylvania.

''(23) HAMPTON TOWNSHIP, PENNSYLVANIA.—Water, sewer, and stormsewer improvements in Hampton Township, Cumberland County, Pennsylvania.

''(24) TOWAMENCIN TOWNSHIP, PENNSYLVANIA.—Sanitary sewer and water lines in Towamencin Township, Montgomery County, Pennsylvania.

''(25) DAUPHIN COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA.—Combined sewer and water system rehabilitation for the City of Harrisburg, Dauphin County, Pennsylvania.

''(26) LEE, NORTON, WISE, AND SCOTT COUNTIES, VIRGINIA.—Water supply and wastewater treatment in Lee, Norton, Wise, and Scott Counties, Virginia.

''(27) NORTHEAST PENNSYLVANIA.—Water-related infrastructure in Lackawanna, Lycoming, Susquehanna, Wyoming, Pike, and Monroe Counties, Pennsylvania, including assistance for the Montoursville Regional Sewer Authority, Lycoming County.

''(28) CALUMET REGION, INDIANA.—Water-related infrastructure in Lake and Porter Counties, Indiana.

''(29) CLINTON COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA.—Water-related infrastructure in Clinton County, Pennsylvania.''.

At the end of section 518 of the bill, insert the following:

(4) Columbia Slough, Portland, Oregon, project for ecosystem restoration.

(5) Ohio River Greenway, Indiana, project for environmental restoration and recreation.

In section 523(b) of the bill, strike ''the Secretary shall'' and insert ''the Secretary may''.

After section 573 of the bill, insert the following:

SEC. 574. WEST BATON ROUGE PARISH, LOUISIANA.

The Secretary shall expedite completion of the report for the West Baton Rouge Parish, Louisiana, project for waterfront and riverine preservation, restoration, and enhancement modifications along the Mississippi River.

Conform the table of contents of the bill accordingly.

At the end of section 578 of the bill, add the following:

(k) MERRISACH LAKE, ARKANSAS COUNTY, ARKANSAS.—

(1) LAND CONVEYANCE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary shall convey to eligible private property owners at fair market value, as determined by the Secretary, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain lands acquired for Navigation Pool No. 2, McClellan-Kerr Arkansas River Navigation System, Merrisach Lake Project, Arkansas County, Arkansas.

(2) PROPERTY DESCRIPTION.—The lands to be conveyed under paragraph (1) include those lands lying between elevation 163, National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929, and the Federal Government boundary line for Tract Numbers 102, 129, 132–1, 132–2, 132–3, 134, 135, 136–1, 136–2, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, and 145, located in sections 18, 19, 29, 30, 31, and 32, Township 7 South, Range 2 West, and the SE¼ of Section 36, Township 7 South, Range 3 West, Fifth Principal Meridian, with the exception of any land designated for public park purposes.

(3) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—Any lands conveyed under paragraph (1) shall be subject to—

(A) a perpetual flowage easement prohibiting human habitation and restricting construction activities;

(B) the reservation of timber rights by the United States; and

(C) such additional terms and conditions as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

(4) ELIGIBLE PROPERTY OWNER DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ''eligible private property owner'' means the owner of record of land contiguous to lands owned by the United States in connection with the project referred to in paragraph (1).

In section 583(b) of the bill, strike ''The Secretary shall'' and insert ''The Secretary may''.

At the end of title V of the bill, add the following (and conform the table of contents of the bill accordingly):

SEC. 585. NORTHEASTERN MINNESOTA.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.—The Secretary may establish a pilot program for providing environmental assistance to non-Federal interests in northeastern Minnesota.

(b) FORM OF ASSISTANCE.—Assistance under this section may be in the form of design and construction assistance for water-related environmental infrastructure and resource protection and development projects in northeastern Minnesota, including projects for wastewater treatment and related facilities, water supply and related facilities, environmental restoration, and surface water resource protection and development.

(c) PUBLIC OWNERSHIP REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary may provide assistance for a project under this section only if the project is publicly owned.

(d) LOCAL COOPERATION AGREEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Before providing assistance under this section, the Secretary shall enter into a local cooperation agreement with a non-Federal interest to provide for design and construction of the project to be carried out with the assistance.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—Each local cooperation agreement entered into under this subsection shall provide for the following:

(A) PLAN.—Development by the Secretary, in consultation with appropriate Federal and State officials, of a facilities or resource protection and development plan, including appropriate engineering plans and specifications.

(B) LEGAL AND INSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURES.—Establishment of such legal and institutional structures as are necessary to ensure the effective long-term operation of the project by the non-Federal interest.

(3) COST SHARING.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Federal share of project costs under each local cooperation agreement entered into under this subsection shall be 75 percent. The Federal share may be in the form of grants or reimbursements of project costs.

(B) CREDIT FOR DESIGN WORK.—The non-Federal interest shall receive credit for the reasonable costs of design work completed by the non-Federal interest prior to entering into a local cooperation agreement with the Secretary for a project. The credit for the design work shall not exceed 6 percent of the total construction costs of the project.

(C) CREDIT FOR INTEREST.—In the event of a delay in the funding of the non-Federal share of a project that is the subject of an agreement under this section, the non-Federal interest shall receive credit for reasonable interest incurred in providing the non-Federal share of a project's cost.

(D) LAND, EASEMENTS, AND RIGHTS-OF-WAY CREDIT.—The non-Federal interest shall receive credit for land, easements, rights-of-way, and relocations toward its share of project costs (including all reasonable costs associated with obtaining permits necessary for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the project on publicly owned or controlled land), but not to exceed 25 percent of total project costs.

(E) OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.—The non-Federal share of operation and maintenance costs for projects constructed with assistance provided under this section shall be 100 percent.

(e) APPLICABILITY OF OTHER FEDERAL AND STATE LAWS.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as waiving, limiting, or otherwise affecting the applicability of any provision of Federal or State law that would otherwise apply to a project to be carried out with assistance provided under this section.

(f) REPORT.—Not later than December 31, 2001, the Secretary shall transmit to Congress a report on the results of the pilot program carried out under this section, together with recommendations concerning whether or not such program should be implemented on a national basis.

(g) NORTHEASTERN MINNESOTA DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''northeastern Minnesota'' means the counties of Cook, Lake, St. Louis, Koochiching, Itasca, Cass, Crow Wing, Aitkin, Carlton, Pine, Kanabec, Mille Lacs, Morrison, Benton, Sherburne, Isanti, and Chisago, Minnesota.

(h) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $40,000,000 for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1999. Such sums shall remain available until expended.

SEC. 586. ALASKA.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.—The Secretary may establish a pilot program for providing environmental assistance to non-Federal interests in Alaska.

(b) FORM OF ASSISTANCE.—Assistance under this section may be in the form of design and construction assistance for water-related environmental infrastructure and resource protection and development projects in Alaska, including projects for wastewater treatment and related facilities, water supply and related facilities, and surface water resource protection and development.

(c) OWNERSHIP REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary may provide assistance for a project under this section only if the project is publicly owned or is owned by a native corporation as defined by section 1602 of title 43, United States Code.

(d) LOCAL COOPERATION AGREEMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Before providing assistance under this section, the Secretary shall enter into a local cooperation agreement with a non-Federal interest to provide for design and construction of the project to be carried out with the assistance.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—Each local cooperation agreement entered into under this subsection shall provide for the following:

(A) PLAN.—Development by the Secretary, in consultation with appropriate Federal and State officials, of a facilities or resource protection and development plan, including appropriate engineering plans and specifications.

(B) LEGAL AND INSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURES.—Establishment of such legal and institutional structures as are necessary to ensure the effective long-term operation of the project by the non-Federal interest.

(3) COST SHARING.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Federal share of the project costs under each local cooperation agreement entered into under this subsection shall be 75 percent. The Federal share may be in the form of grants or reimbursements of project costs.

(B) CREDIT FOR DESIGN WORK.—The non-Federal interest shall receive credit for the reasonable costs of design work completed by the non-Federal interest prior to entering into a local cooperation agreement with the Secretary for a project. The credit for the design work shall not exceed 6 percent of the total construction costs of the project.

(C) CREDIT FOR INTEREST.—In the event of a delay in the funding of the non-Federal share of a project that is the subject of an agreement under this section, the non-Federal interest shall receive credit for reasonable interest incurred in providing the non-Federal share of a project's cost.

(D) LAND, EASEMENTS, AND RIGHTS-OF-WAY CREDIT.—The non-Federal interest shall receive credit for land, easements, rights-of-way, and relocations toward its share of project costs (including all reasonable costs associated with obtaining permits necessary for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the project on publicly owned or

controlled land), but not to exceed 25 percent of total project costs.

(E) OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.—The non-Federal share of operation and maintenance costs for projects constructed with assistance provided under this section shall be 100 percent.

(e) APPLICABILITY OF OTHER FEDERAL AND STATE LAWS.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as waiving, limiting, or otherwise affecting the applicability of any provision of Federal or State law that would otherwise apply to a project to be carried out with assistance provided under this section.

(f) REPORT.—Not later than December 31, 2001, the Secretary shall transmit to Congress a report on the results of the pilot program carried out under this section, together with recommendations concerning whether or not such program should be implemented on a national basis.

(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $25,000,000 for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1999. Such sums shall remain available until expended.

SEC. 587. CENTRAL WEST VIRGINIA.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.—The Secretary may establish a pilot program for providing environmental assistance to non-Federal interests in central West Virginia.

(b) FORM OF ASSISTANCE.—Assistance under this section may be in the form of design and construction assistance for water-related environmental infrastructure and resource protection and development projects in central West Virginia, including projects for wastewater treatment and related facilities, water supply and related facilities, and surface water resource protection and development.

(c) PUBLIC OWNERSHIP REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary may provide assistance for a project under this section only if the project is publicly owned.

(d) LOCAL COOPERATION AGREEMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Before providing assistance under this section, the Secretary shall enter into a local cooperation agreement with a non-Federal interest to provide for design and construction of the project to be carried out with the assistance.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—Each local cooperation agreement entered into under this subsection shall provide for the following:

(A) PLAN.—Development by the Secretary, in consultation with appropriate Federal and State officials, of a facilities or resource protection and development plan, including appropriate engineering plans and specifications.

(B) LEGAL AND INSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURES.—Establishment of such legal and institutional structures as are necessary to ensure the effective long-term operation of the project by the non-Federal interest.

(3) COST SHARING.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Federal share of the project costs under each local cooperation agreement entered into under this subsection shall be 75 percent. The Federal share may be in the form of grants or reimbursements of project costs.

(B) CREDIT FOR DESIGN WORK.—The non-Federal interest shall receive credit for the reasonable costs of design work completed by the non-Federal interest prior to entering into a local cooperation agreement with the Secretary for a project. The credit for the design work shall not exceed 6 percent of the total construction costs of the project.

(C) CREDIT FOR INTEREST.—In the event of a delay in the funding of the non-Federal share of a project that is the subject of an agreement under this section, the non-Federal interest shall receive credit for reasonable interest incurred in providing the non-Federal share of a project's cost.

(D) LAND, EASEMENTS, AND RIGHTS-OF-WAY CREDIT.—The non-Federal interest shall receive credit for land, easements, rights-of-way, and relocations toward its share of project costs (including all reasonable costs associated with obtaining permits necessary for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the project on publicly owned or controlled land), but not to exceed 25 percent of total project costs.

(E) OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.—The non-Federal share of operation and maintenance costs for projects constructed with assistance provided under this section shall be 100 percent.

(e) APPLICABILITY OF OTHER FEDERAL AND STATE LAWS.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as waiving, limiting, or otherwise affecting the applicability of any provision of Federal or State law that would otherwise apply to a project to be carried out with assistance provided under this section.

(f) REPORT.—Not later than December 31, 2001, the Secretary shall transmit to Congress a report on the results of the pilot program carried out under this section, together with recommendations concerning whether or not such program should be implemented on a national basis.

(g) CENTRAL WEST VIRGINIA DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''central West Virginia'' means the counties of Mason, Jackson, Putnam, Kanawha, Roane, Wirt, Calhoun, Clay, Nicholas, Braxton, Gilmer, Lewis, Upshur, Randolph, Pendleton, Hardy, Hampshire, Morgan, Berkeley, and Jefferson, West Virginia.

(h) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $10,000,000 for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1999. Such sums shall remain available until expended.

SEC. 588. SACRAMENTO METROPOLITAN AREA WATERSHED RESTORATION, CALIFORNIA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary is authorized to undertake environmental restoration activities included in the Sacramento Metropolitan Water Authority's ''Watershed Management Plan''. These activities shall be limited to cleanup of contaminated groundwater resulting directly from the acts of any Federal agency or Department of the Federal government at or in the vicinity of McClellan Air Force Base, California; Mather Air Force Base, California; Sacramento Army Depot, California; or any location within the watershed where the Federal government would be a responsible party under any Federal environmental law.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $5,000,000 for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1999.

SEC. 589. ONONDAGA LAKE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary is authorized to plan, design, and construct projects for the environmental restoration, conservation, and management of Onondaga Lake, New York, and to provide, in coordination with the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, financial assistance to the State of New York and political subdivisions thereof for the development and implementation of projects to restore, conserve, and manage Onondaga Lake.

(b) PARTNERSHIP.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall establish a partnership with appropriate Federal agencies (including the Environmental Protection Agency) and the State of New York and political subdivisions thereof for the purpose of project development and implementation. Such partnership shall be dissolved not later than 15 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) COST SHARING.—The non-Federal share of the cost of a project constructed under subsection (a) shall be not less than 30 percent of the total cost of the project and may be provided through in-kind services.

(d) EFFECT ON LIABILITY.—Financial assistance provided under this section shall not relieve from liability any person who would otherwise be liable under Federal or State law for damages, response costs, natural resource damages, restitution, equitable relief, or any other relief.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated $10,000,000 to carry out the purposes of this section.

SEC. 590. EAST LYNN LAKE, WEST VIRGINIA.

The Secretary shall defer any decision relating to the leasing of mineral resources underlying East Lynn Lake, West Virginia, project lands to the Federal entity vested with such leasing authority.

SEC. 591. EEL RIVER, CALIFORNIA.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine if flooding in the city of Ferndale, California, is the result of a Federal flood control project on the Eel River. If the Secretary determines that the flooding is the result of the project, the Secretary shall take appropriate measures (including dredging of the Salt River and construction of sediment ponds at the confluence of Francis, Reas, and Williams Creeks) to mitigate the flooding.

SEC. 592. NORTH LITTLE ROCK, ARKANSAS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall review a report prepared by the non-Federal interest concerning flood protection for the Dark Hollow area of North Little Rock, Arkansas. If the Secretary determines that the report meets the evaluation and design standards of the Corps of Engineers and that the project is economically justified, technically sound, and environmentally acceptable, the Secretary shall carry out the project.

(b) TREATMENT OF DESIGN AND PLAN PREPARATION COSTS.—The costs of design and preparation of plans and specifications shall be included as project costs and paid during construction.

SEC. 593. UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MISSISSIPPI PLACE, ST. PAUL, MINNESOTA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may enter into a cooperative agreement to participate in a project for the planning, design, and construction of infrastructure and other improvements at Mississippi Place, St. Paul, Minnesota.

(b) COST SHARING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Federal share of the cost of the project shall be 50 percent. The Federal share may be provided in the form of grants or reimbursements of project costs.

(2) CREDIT FOR NON-FEDERAL WORK.—The non-Federal interest shall receive credit toward the non-Federal share of the cost of the project for reasonable costs incurred by the non-Federal interests as a result of participation in the planning, design, and construction of the project.

(3) LAND, EASEMENTS, AND RIGHTS-OF-WAY CREDIT.—The non-Federal interest shall receive credit toward the non-Federal share of the cost of the project for land, easements, rights-of-way, and relocations provided by the non-Federal interest with respect to the project.

(4) OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.—The non-Federal share of operation and maintenance costs for the project shall be 100 percent.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated $3,000,000 to carry out this section.

MODIFICATION OF AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. SHUSTER

Mr. SHUSTER. Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the manager's amendment be modified with the

modification I have placed at the desk. My modification would correct a technical mistake in the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modification of amendment No. 1 printed in part 2 of House Report 106–120 offered by Mr. SHUSTER:

On page 1, after line 3, strike the next five sentences.

On page 2, line 22, strike the period and add at the end ‘‘, and at an estimated average annual cost of $1,584,000 for periodic nourishment over the 50-year life of the project, with an estimated annual Federal cost of $1,030,000 and an estimated annual non-Federal cost of $554,000.’’

On page 3, after line 8, strike the next two sentences.

On page 5, after ‘‘$6,129,000’’.’’ and before the next sentence, insert the following:

‘‘In section 314 of the bill, strike ‘‘(Amelia fIsland)’’ and insert ‘‘(Amelia Island)’’.

On page 7, strike the first two sentences.

On page 32, after line 14, insert the following:

(f) REPEAL.—Section 401 of the Great Lakes Critical Programs Act of 1990 (104 Stat 3010) and section 411 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (104 Stat 4648) are repealed as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

At the end of title III of the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. 367. CITY OF CHARLEVOIX REIMBURSEMENT, MICHIGAN.

The Secretary shall review and, if consistent with authorized project purposes, reimburse the city of Charlevoix, Michigan, for the Federal share of costs associated with construction of the new revetment connection to the Federal navigation project at Charlevoix Harbor, Michigan.

Conform the table of contents of the bill accordingly.

Mr. SHUSTER (during the reading). Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the modification be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chairman, reserving the right to object, I do so for the purpose of yielding to the gentleman for an explanation.

Mr. SHUSTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chairman, this amendment corrects provisions in the manager's amendment that were found to have unintended effects. And it adds two other noncontroversial items. The modification has been worked out with the minority.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is modified.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 154, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) each will control 5 minutes.

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. This is a bipartisan, noncontroversial package. It makes technical and conforming changes. It makes modifications to several projects in the reported bill. It includes environmental restoration and infrastructure projects. It includes flood control and navigation projects. It includes studies. It includes provisions based on discussions with other committees.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. The amendment continues the tradition of addressing the urgent concerns of Members by including several high priority, time-sensitive projects and provisions that could not be considered in their ordinary and customary time.

I do want to thank the chairman of the committee for being so fully cooperative and responsive and participating in the time-honored tradition of our committee in a bipartisan manner.

Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me. I wanted to especially on this bill come down here to the floor and compliment the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) and the ranking member, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), for including language in this bill relative to a study by the Corps of Engineers on the Western Lake Erie Basin Watershed at the crossroads of the Great Lakes.

I want to just put on the record, without the help of these two gentlemen, our part of America could not solve the significant water problem that we have crossing several jurisdictions. This bill is so important. I hope every Member understands how hard these men have worked to really help every single corner of America. We have waited for years for this bill as our cities flood and our rural areas get devastated by extra water because of all of the development that has occurred in our region.

We cannot solve this problem without them and without the help of the Corps being the umbrella entity that brings all these multiple jurisdictions together across Indiana, Ohio and Michigan. I just want to thank them for being men of the future and paying attention to places like Toledo, Ohio and the crossroads of the Great Lakes. Our hats are off to them.

Madam Chairman, I include the following memorandum for the RECORD:

MEMORANDUM

To: Marcy.
From: George.
Subject: Western Lake Erie Basin Watershed Study Talking Points.
Date: April 29, 1999.

The 1999 Water Resources Development Act, H.R. 1480, includes a provision authorizing the Western Lake Erie Watershed study.

The Western Lake Erie Basin is the crossroads of the Great Lakes.

The Maumee River, which empties into Lake Erie at Toledo is the largest tributary to the Great Lakes. My District and the City of Toledo sit at the mouth of the Maumee.

The Corps of Engineers and other government agencies have conducted numerous studies in the Western Lake Erie basin, but no one has ever looked at the watershed as a whole.

We understand now the indispensable interrelationship between the various elements of the watershed's ecosystem, the water, the farmland, the cities, the suburbs.

If we are going to sustain the productive resources of the Western Lake Erie Basin, we must understand how all these elements work together.

I hope and expect that this study will lead to an understanding of our region on which we can plan a sustainable future.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chairman, I want to say to the gentlewoman from Ohio, I have not heard such kind words in 6 months. It is good to have those comments.

Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ).

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam Chairman, I thank the distinguished ranking member for yielding me this time.

Let me try to continue the kind words as we go along here. To the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) and to the chairman of the full committee and to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment on which I serve as well as to our ranking member, let me thank them for finally getting this bill to the floor. This is unfinished business from the 105th Congress. It is certainly one that is important to the people I represent and the region in which I come from. I want to thank particularly my side of the aisle for working with me as well as with the majority to make certain that East Coast residents will continue to have access to the goods that ships carry and the jobs our ports produce.

When we talk about international trade, 95 percent of all of the Nation's commerce moves through ports like that of the Port of New York and New Jersey. If we are to take advantage of that trade, then we have to have ocean-going ports that can take care of the next generation of ocean-going ships. This project and the bill that encompasses the project that I am talking about will help my region fight off economic trouble and ensure healthy growth by making the port receptive for more and larger ships for years to come. It will widen, deepen and align the harbor's channels to improve navigational safety to make way for the new generation of ocean-going ships.

The bill also contains important environmental considerations insofar as it contains provisions on sediment decontamination and sediment management which are enormous issues in the Port of New York and New Jersey and for that fact in other parts of the country. And it demonstrates the Federal commitment to deepening our harbors and channels which is unfortunately in direct contrast to some of the signals we have been getting within the region from the Governor of New York who has been holding us hostage on issues not related to the port's mission and the Port Authority.

We believe that it is important for the 20 million consumers in the region to get products that will be cheaper. We believe for the 180,000 jobs and $20 billion of economic activity that the Port of New York and New Jersey presently enjoys and which all the projections are that will grow dramatically, we believe that in essence for all of the economic opportunity yet to come as a result of international trade that this bill, the Water Resources Development Act, is an appropriate Federal response that will inure to the benefit of the region and to our country as this port is one of the vital natural resources that we have in this country in the promotion of international trade.

I want to thank again the chairman of both the full committee and the subcommittee and the ranking member of the full committee and subcommittee for making this a reality.

Mr. SHUSTER. Madam Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), as modified.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is advised that amendment No. 2 will not be offered.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part 2 of House Report 106–120.

Does any Member rise to offer that amendment?

If not, it is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part 2 of House Report 106–120.

Does any Member rise to offer that amendment?

Mr. PICKETT. Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. PICKETT. Madam Chairman, I rise to engage the chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure in a colloquy.

I had intended to offer an amendment today concerning a project at Sandbridge Beach in the City of Virginia Beach, Virginia. I have decided not to offer the amendment if the chairman can assure me that this important project will receive attention by the committee in the future.

Mr. SHUSTER. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PICKETT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SHUSTER. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for withholding his amendment. I will state that it is my intention to consider his proposal on the Sandbridge Beach project as we move forward with water resources legislation including our WRDA 2000 bill which we anticipate moving quickly in the next session.

Mr. PICKETT. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman from Virginia offering amendment No. 5?

Mr. PICKETT. No, Madam Chairman, I am not.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in part 2 of House Report 106–120.

Does any Member rise to offer that amendment?

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chairman, I take this time to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Pennsylvania for the splendid cooperation that we have always enjoyed on this committee in working out matters. But for a little half billion dollar bump in the road over this California project, this bill would have been disposed of 2 years ago.

I appreciate the continuing good will on the part of the gentleman from Pennsylvania and understanding of these problems as well as the chairman of the subcommittee. I also want to express my great appreciation for his patience to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BORSKI).

I do want to cite for extraordinary commendable service Ken Kopocis, our chief staff member on the Subcommittee on Waters Resources and Environment who has done yeoman's service. The chairman was kind enough to mention him, but I want to reinforce my appreciation for Ken's devoted endeavors, and that of Ward McCarragher and Dave Heymsfeld and Art Chan on our committee who all have given such enormous time and effort to the unfolding of this legislation and bringing us to this point today. We can pass this bill relatively uncontroversial.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as modified, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as modified, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HERGER) having assumed the chair, Mrs. EMERSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1480) to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the United States Army Corps of Engineers to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 154, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on the amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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 418, nays 5, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 104]

YEAS—418

Abercrombie	Borski	Cox
Ackerman	Boswell	Coyne
Allen	Boucher	Cramer
Andrews	Boyd	Crane
Archer	Brady (PA)	Crowley
Armey	Brady (TX)	Cubin
Bachus	Brown (FL)	Cummings
Baird	Brown (OH)	Cunningham
Baker	Bryant	Danner
Baldacci	Burr	Davis (FL)
Baldwin	Burton	Davis (IL)
Ballenger	Buyer	Davis (VA)
Barcia	Callahan	Deal
Barr	Calvert	DeFazio
Barrett (NE)	Camp	DeGette
Barrett (WI)	Campbell	Delahunt
Bartlett	Canady	DeLauro
Barton	Cannon	DeLay
Bass	Capps	DeMint
Bateman	Capuano	Deutsch
Becerra	Cardin	Diaz-Balart
Bentsen	Carson	Dickey
Bereuter	Castle	Dicks
Berkley	Chabot	Dingell
Berman	Chambliss	Dixon
Berry	Chenoweth	Doggett
Biggert	Clay	Dooley
Bilbray	Clayton	Doolittle
Bilirakis	Clement	Doyle
Bishop	Clyburn	Dreier
Bliley	Coble	Duncan
Blumenauer	Coburn	Dunn
Blunt	Collins	Edwards
Boehlert	Combest	Ehlers
Boehner	Condit	Ehrlich
Bonilla	Conyers	Emerson
Bonior	Cook	English
Bono	Costello	Eshoo

Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Stupak
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Young (AK)

NAYS—5

Hefley
Paul
Sanford
Sensenbrenner
Sununu

NOT VOTING—11

Aderholt
Blagojevich
Brown (CA)
Cooksey
Engel
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Strickland
Tauzin
Wynn
Young (FL)

□ 1219

Mr. SENSENBRENNER changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I missed the vote on H.R. 1480, the Water Resources Development Act because I was detained away from the Capitol and the vote closed as I returned. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes.''

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be present for rollcall votes 103 and 104.

Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes'' or ''aye'' on rollcall votes 103 and 104.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHUSTER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1480.

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

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam Speaker, I take this time to inquire about next week's schedule from the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ARMEY. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished majority leader for purposes of discussing next week's schedule.

Mr. ARMEY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to announce that we have concluded our legislative business for the week. On Monday, May 3, the House will meet at 2 o'clock p.m. for a pro forma session. There will be no legislative business and no votes on that day.

On Tuesday, May 4, the House will meet at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. The House will consider a number of bills under suspension of the rules, a list of which will be distributed to Members' offices. Members should note that we anticipate votes after 2 p.m. on Tuesday.

On Wednesday, May 5, and Thursday, May 6, the House will take up the following measures, both of which will be subject to rules: The emergency Kosovo supplemental bill for fiscal year 1999 and H.R. 833, the Bankruptcy Reform Act of 1999. It is our hope that the conference report on H.R. 4, the National Missile Defense bill, will also be available next week.

Madam Speaker, we should finish legislative business and have Members on their way home to their families on Thursday, May 6.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam Speaker, if the majority leader would allow a question, could the majority leader tell us on which day next week the Kosovo supplemental will be on the floor and for what amount it will be?

Mr. ARMEY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his inquiry. Let me say I can say with a high degree of certainty that the legislation will be on the floor on Thursday of next week, and, of course, it will be up to the Committee on Appropriations to report it. I cannot give the figure in terms of its amount until after the committee has its markup, I think later today.

Mr. MENENDEZ. If the majority leader would answer one other question: Is it the majority leader's intention, or does he know if that supplemental will include a supplemental for Central America and for the farming community in the country?

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the gentleman for his inquiry. As the gentleman knows, we had that legislation pass through the House. We have gone to conference with the Senate. We wait upon the Senate with respect to that earlier supplemental report that has the inclusions that the gentleman speaks of. It is our anticipation that the week following next we would have that back in conference, as well as the Kosovo work, and we should be able to complete all supplemental work on both bills by the end of the week following next.

Mr. MENENDEZ. I thank the majority leader. For many of us it is a real concern, the Central American farming package. While we face one emergency, we have another emergency with 1 million people to the south of our border who we are concerned about in the context of immigration and in the context of disease and the context of helping to rebuild their countries. We would certainly hope that we could in a bipartisan way work expeditiously to make sure that that emergency is equally as resolved.

Mr. ARMEY. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's remarks.

EXPRESSING SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING SOCIAL PROBLEM OF CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT

Mr. FLETCHER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and the Workforce and the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 93) expressing the sense of the Congress regarding the social problem of child abuse and neglect and supporting efforts to enhance public awareness of this problem, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 93

Whereas each year more than 3,000,000 children in the United States are reported as suspected victims of child abuse and neglect;

Whereas more than 500,000 American children are currently unable to live safely with their families and have been placed in foster homes and institutions;

Whereas it is estimated that more than 1,000 children in the United States, 78 percent of whom are less than 5 years of age and 38 percent of whom are less than 1 year of age, lose their lives each year as a direct result of abuse and neglect;

Whereas the tragic social problem of child abuse and neglect results in human and economic costs due to its relationship to crime and delinquency, drug and alcohol abuse, domestic violence, and welfare dependency; and

Whereas April has been designated by the President as Child Abuse Prevention Month to focus public awareness on this social ill: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That—

(1) it is the sense of the Congress that—

(A) the faith community, nonprofit organizations, State and local officials involved in prevention of child abuse and neglect, and volunteers throughout the United States should recommit themselves and mobilize their resources to assist children in danger of abuse or neglect;

(B) Federal resources should be marshalled in a manner that maximizes their impact on the prevention of child abuse and neglect;

(C) because abuse and neglect of children increases the likelihood that they will later engage in criminal activity, State and local officials should be provided with increased flexibility that allows them to use Federal law enforcement resources in the fight to prevent child abuse and neglect if they consider that use appropriate; and

(D) child protective services agencies, law enforcement agencies, and the judicial system should coordinate their efforts to the maximum extent possible to prevent child abuse and neglect; and

(2) the Congress—

(A) supports efforts in the United States to—

(i) focus the attention of the Nation on the disturbing problem of child abuse;

(ii) demonstrate gratitude to the people in the United States who work to keep children safe; and

(iii) encourage individuals to take action in their own communities to make them healthier places in which children can grow and thrive; and

(B) commends the faith community, nonprofit organizations, State and local officials involved in prevention of child abuse and neglect, and volunteers throughout America for their efforts on behalf of abused and neglected children everywhere.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. FLETCHER) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. FLETCHER. Madam Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. SCOTT. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES) be allowed to manage the time and yield debate time on this side.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FLETCHER. Madam Speaker, I am here today to recognize the continued and very good efforts by the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE) who has offered this resolution, and I stand honored to speak on this very important resolution.

This resolution calls for a greater commitment toward recognizing the problem of child abuse and neglect and encourages more to be done for its prevention. Specifically it promotes greater coordination between child protective services agencies, law enforcement agencies and the judicial system in working to prevent such abuse and neglect. Additionally, it commends the work of those who keep children safe, including those in the faith community, nonprofit organizations, State and local agencies and volunteer organizations.

Madam Speaker, as you know, April is Child Abuse Prevention Month. The estimated number of children seriously injured by all forms of maltreatment quadrupled between 1986 and 1997. The estimated number of sexually abused children increased by 83 percent, the number of physically neglected children rose 102 percent, there was a 333 percent increase in the estimated number of emotionally neglected children, and the estimated number of physically abused children rose 42 percent. Now 500,000 American children are currently unable to live safely with their families and have been placed in foster homes and institutions.

During Child Abuse Prevention Month, we should focus the Nation's attention on this national tragedy and demonstrate gratitude to the people in the United States who work to keep our children safe. Moreover, Congress should continue working to help State and local officials in their effort to prevent child abuse.

With my personal experience I have witnessed this firsthand, and in my practice in caring for patients, I am thinking back of one patient in particular, one small child that we cared for at the University of Kentucky Medical Center.

□ 1230

A child that was abused to the extent that they were comatose. I think, why should this happen in this great United States. I look at the impact that this has on the events that have occurred, and not only that, but we look at what has happened recently as to how much do we really care about our children.

Certainly I am honored to speak on this, the resolution of the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. JONES), and I certainly commend her on this. As we are addressing and focusing more attention on this issue, I hope that we can reduce the number of abused children in this tragedy in the United States and certainly continue to work.

This concurrent resolution will express the growing problem of child abuse and neglect. It also focuses on enhancing public awareness. We believe that the faith community, nonprofit organizations, State and local officials involved in abuse and neglect, and volunteers across America must recommit themselves to ending this alarming trend.

Federal dollars should be used in a constructive manner to maximize the prevention of child abuse in our local communities. It is time for this Nation to focus more attention and resources on the disturbing problem of child abuse. We need to encourage individuals to take actions in their communities to ensure a happy, healthy environment for our children.

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

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

It gives me great pause as I stand in this Chamber this afternoon to bring to the floor this resolution with regard to child abuse in America. The statistics are numbing. In 1997 over 3 million children were reported for child abuse and neglect to child protective agencies. Between 1988 and 1997, child abuse reporting levels increased by 41 percent. Currently, 47 out of every 1,000 children are reported as victims of child mistreatment. In 1997, 1,054,000 children were victims of child abuse, or in other numbers, 15 out of every 1,000 U.S. children.

A child in the United States is twice as likely to be reported as abused or neglected as to be enrolled in Head Start. Mr. Speaker, 37 percent of American parents reported insulting or swearing at their children within the last 12 months. One of three of all Americans have witnessed an adult physically abuse a child, and two out of three have seen an adult emotionally abuse a child.

In 1996, 1,185 child abuse fatalities were reported. Between 1995 and 1997, 78 percent of these children were less than 5 years old at the time of their death. Mr. Speaker, 38 percent were under the age of 1 year old.

It is time that we as a Congress and we as a Nation wake up and understand the impact that child abuse has not

only on the child, but the child who witnesses the abuse; not only on the child as a child, but when he or she becomes a juvenile or becomes an adult and again, on their own become a child abuser. It is time that we figure out how we can prevent child abuse in our country, and how we can marshal the necessary assets for it, in light of the fact that our dollars are innumerable, in order to deal with this issue.

We have all been numbed over the past week, week and a half about the events in Colorado. We are numb today about a similar event in Canada. We are numbed about the use of guns by our children, but contemplate acting out such as these children did with guns could, in fact, be a result of child abuse in their earlier life. Many of the statistics have shown that someone who was an abused child is likely to be an abuser later on in life, is likely to act out in some type of conduct that would be inappropriate.

I am pleased to stand on the floor of this House today to talk about solving the issue of child abuse and neglect in our country.

Prior to coming to Congress, I served for 8 years as the Cuyahoga County prosecutor in Cleveland, Ohio, and it was part of my responsibility to deal with the issue of child abuse and neglect. One of the things that we were able to do in that jurisdiction was to in fact train assistant prosecutors who, in fact, were specially trained to handle child abuse and neglect cases. We found that we had an overwhelming greater success in winning our prosecutions because they were specially trained. In addition, we were able to take the attorneys who represent Cuyahoga County as attorneys in court on the civil side on abuse and neglect, to give them an opportunity to call the shots; in other words, to make the legal determination with regard to when we would proceed with a case of abuse or neglect or when we would not proceed.

I take my hat off today to the workers in the child protection services. I take my hat off today to law enforcement in child protection services, and to the attorneys, because if one does that work day after day and one sees the young people who have been abused and neglected, not only at the hands of their parents or their loved ones but the hands of children in similar age groups, one will understand how it is a profession that causes high burnout.

I am pleased to be a sponsor of a piece of legislation called CAPE, in conjunction with my colleague from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE), and we have other sponsors as well. Under the CAPE Act we are proposing that dollars that are collected from forfeiture in drug cases be allocated to provide for dollars to train child protection workers.

Currently, under the law as it exists, only $10 million is allocated for that purpose. Under the law that we have proposed, $20 million would be allocated to provide additional dollars through the Byrne Grant proposal for training for child protection workers.

In addition, dollars could be allocated to provide for child protection workers to have access to various criminal records, so that when they are making a determination with regard to where young people are assigned or what families they are assigned to, they would take that information into consideration. As I said, it is important.

My colleagues see the blue ribbon that we are all wearing today, all of us throughout the House, all of us all over Capitol Hill. The blue ribbon stands for Child Abuse Prevention Month, but it also stands for the young people who were killed in Colorado. It is time, it is time, it is time that we as a Nation wake up.

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

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE).

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the good doctor, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. FLETCHER) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, for the past few weeks we have all been mourning the loss of the 12 innocent children who were so brutally slain in Littleton, Colorado. Today, we take this time to focus on other innocent children who lose their lives to other inconceivable acts of violence.

As many know, the President declared April as Child Abuse Prevention Month, and we bring this bipartisan resolution to the floor to help focus the Nation's attention on this national tragedy.

During the time which I stand before my colleagues for the next few minutes, at least one child will be reported abused or neglected in my home State of Ohio. By the time this hour of debate is over, 20 children will have been reported abused or neglected, 480 by day's end, and that is just one State, and those are just the reported cases. These statistics are staggering.

But sometimes statistics are too sterile to demonstrate the real tragedy, because child abuse cases are not just statistics. Each case involves an innocent, fragile, living, breathing child who has a name and a face. Each bruise, broken bone, cigarette burn or death not only hurts that child, but also hurts all of us, because it so often means one less bright light for our Nation's future.

A sad fact, Mr. Speaker, is that many child abusers are themselves victims of abuse or neglect, which suggests a vicious cycle of criminality. Aside from its relationship to crime and delinquency, child abuse and neglect is also closely linked to drug and alcohol abuse, domestic violence and welfare dependency. Therefore, in a very real sense child abuse prevention also is crime prevention, drug prevention and welfare dependency prevention.

If we only could have paid more attention up front to prevent the abuse of those who years later will fill our jails or sleep on the streets strung out on drugs, or abuse their own spouse and children. We can make a difference if we stop the abuse now. We can reduce these problems in our future.

We must recognize that our children are our Nation's most precious resource and redouble our efforts to fight child abuse. This is why we are here today.

Throughout this month, a number of us have been wearing blue ribbons, as the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES) referred to, as part of a campaign which is being waged across the Nation during Child Abuse Prevention Month. In fact, I received my blue ribbon from my constituent, Debbie Sendek, Executive Director of the Ohio Committee to Prevent Child Abuse. Debbie Sendek is but one of the thousands of unsung heroes across our Nation who are in our communities on the front lines in the fight to protect our children, and it is all of these unsung heroes that we recognize and commend today through this resolution.

However, I am sure that we would all agree that the most important goal of Child Abuse Prevention Month is to protect our children. With 3 million children in the United States reported as victims of child abuse and neglect every year, we have a lot to do. While April is Child Abuse Prevention Month, I believe Congress must rededicate itself to fighting this national tragedy 12 months a year, and we need to make sure that this resolution is only the beginning and not the end of our efforts.

Congress must continue seeking ways to help those on the State and local level to fight child abuse. To do this, I have joined with colleagues on both sides of the aisle in introducing the Child Abuse Prevention and Enforcement Act, or the CAPE Act. In a nutshell, this bill will provide State and local officials greater flexibility to use existing Federal law enforcement resources for child abuse prevention. Also, the bill would double the earmark from $10 million to $20 million in the crime victims fund for child abuse victims. All of these funds come from forfeited bail bonds, forfeited assets and fines paid to the Federal Government, not from taxpayers' dollars.

The bill has the support of the National Child Abuse Coalition, Prevent Child Abuse America, and the Christian Coalition, just to name a few, and I urge all of my colleagues to sign on.

Mr. Speaker, abused children do not have a powerful voting block; they do not have high-paid lobbyists in Washington to champion their cause. That is why we must take this initiative and work it together in a bipartisan fashion to continue the fight to protect our Nation's children.

Finally, I would like to thank my fellow original cosponsors of this resolution for their support: the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), without whose help we would not be here today; the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE); the gentleman from Florida

(Mr. MCCOLLUM); the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING); the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON); the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EWING); the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD); the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT); and my good friend, the gentlewoman from the great State of Ohio (Mrs. JONES), who has had so much personal experience in this area.

To recognize all of those who work tirelessly in the field who see these tragedies up close, we dedicate this month, and set our sights to do what we can as the United States Congress to stem the tide of one of the saddest, most horrifying aspects of this great country, and that is child abuse.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the resolution.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio for yielding me this time. Let me congratulate both the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE) and the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES) for their leadership, and simply to add my voice in support of H. Con. Res. 93, and particularly emphasizing the need for protecting our children in America.

□ 1245

This is Child Abuse and Neglect Awareness Month, the month of April. I would simply like to say to my colleagues, let us look to the future when such a day will not be needed or such a month will not be needed.

As a cochair of the Congressional Children's Caucus, we have committed ourselves to promoting children as a national agenda. In the last session we were able to secure an additional $11 million to support the Children's Mental Health Services Program under Health and Human Services.

What we find with respect to our children who are abused and neglected are the kinds of devastating numbers that suggest that more than 500,000 American children are currently unable to live safely with their families, and have been placed in foster homes and institutions.

We also find it estimated that more than 1,000 children in the United States, 78 percent of whom are less than 5 years of age and 38 percent of whom are less than 1 year of age, lose their lives each year as a direct result of abuse and neglect.

If any of us can express the priceless feeling of cuddling a 5-year-old, a 1-year-old, maybe a 13-year-old, we are obviously outraged at the thought of those children being abused physically or mentally, and not getting the fullness of what an adult can give, which is loving and nurturing.

This tragic social problem is an epidemic, so I join with my colleagues to ask for and to give encouragement to the faith community, the nonprofit organizations, State and local officials involved in prevention of child abuse and neglect, and volunteers throughout the United States. We ask them to recommit themselves. We also applaud the works that they have done.

In my own hometown in Houston, Harris County, I have had the pleasure of co-chairing a committee that promoted foster parents to encourage them, to recruit more of them, so that in instances of tragic circumstances where we find a child from an abused home, we can immediately transfer that child into a loving foster care circumstance.

How terrible it is to read in our newspapers that a foster care situation was not available, or that a child protection services worker could not find a place for that child, or who had visited that abusive home and had left that child in the abusive home with the hope that it would get better, only to find in the next morning's news, to read that the child is dead because it was left in a home that was abusive and had no support system.

I believe we must promote foster care, parenting and foster care systems, and we should support them, provide the resources for those foster care parents.

Then I think it is imperative, as I wear the ribbon in commemoration of this month, but as well, the tragic killing of those young people in Littleton, Colorado, along with all the other young people who have died at the hands of violence, to know that some of those who were the perpetrators suffered from child abuse and neglect, and we did not intervene at an early age.

I also say we should promote more funding for mental health services for our children, with more funding for school nurses, more funding for guidance counselors.

Most of all, let me say that we all should embrace this month with a recommitment in support of, one, the legislation, the CAPE Act, but as well, a recommitment that maybe in our lifetime we will not celebrate or commemorate, rather, the month that has to bring attention to child abuse and neglect; that we can say we have wiped it out, we have extinguished it, that we really do what this Nation should do, which is to love our children and to save our children.

I thank the gentlewoman for her courtesies for extending me this time.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS).

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 93.

As we have heard, April is Child Abuse Prevention Month. For any parent or adult who has witnessed the despair in a child's eyes after he or she has gone for so long without the love and nurturing that he or she so strongly craves and needs, it is heartwrenching.

Mr. Speaker, we know many of the results that come from child abuse. The majority of juvenile offenders, teenage runaways and adult criminals in this country were abused as children.

In a home for young, unwed troubled mothers in my district in Lancaster, Pennsylvania, called Beth Shalom, I have visited many of these young ladies who have suffered through terrible childhoods full of abuse, and they are now struggling not to repeat the patterns with their own young children.

Mr. Speaker, we also know that the most harsh price of child abuse is death. As we have heard, more than 1,000 children in the United States, 78 percent under the age of 5, 38 percent under the age of 1, lose their lives every year as a direct result of abuse and neglect. This is a tragedy happening in America today.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot call attention to this issue just once a year. Our efforts require a year-round focus and a continuation of our work with State and local officials who are working so hard to prevent child abuse.

This must be a community effort. Our children deserve all of the love and energy we have to keep them safe and healthy. I strongly support this resolution, and urge the Members to vote in favor.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to my colleague from the great State of North Carolina (Mrs. EVA CLAYTON).

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio for yielding me the time, I thank her for her leadership, and I also appreciate the fact that this is a bipartisan effort led by the great State of Ohio and other Members who are joining with us.

Mr. Speaker, this is a time where we recognize child abuse, but hopefully, as the previous speaker said, this is not a one-time-a-year event, but this is a recognition that our children are our most precious gift. They represent our future. They are our hope. Therefore, we should be investing in their healthy existence. We should have been investing in their safe existence, as well.

Child abuse has many aspects to it. First, we do want to support this resolution, which gives public advocacy to it and recognizes the many individuals who are in there professionally doing it every day. It does take a lot for them to stay in that. It takes a continuous commitment to have that energy and not be burned out, so we want to commend those professionals who are in there.

We also want to commend a comprehensive approach. There is obviously a law enforcement part of this, there is a health enforcement part of this, there is a psychological and mental health part of this, there is a spiritual involvement with this, and the community as a whole should be involved. We need to see this as a community response, where all of us have an opportunity to play a part.

I am reminded of a poem that Edward Hale has said, and others have reminded us this week of that. It says, ''I am only one, but I am one. What I can do, I ought to do. By God's grace, I will do it.''

Here is an opportunity where individual actions with a parent who is having problems and struggling with overcoming his or her past of having been an abused child, now trying to struggling to be a decent and honorable parent, we need to engage ourselves as individuals with that.

Again, I commend all of our colleagues to support this resolution, but more than just support this resolution, to be engaged in this worthwhile activity, making sure that our children not only are healthy and safe, but making sure that their lives are the kinds of lives that will be productive and they will make a contribution.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY).

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I commend the leadership of the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. FLETCHER) and the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. TUBBS JONES) in bringing this legislation to the floor.

As people honor April as Child Abuse Prevention Month by wearing blue ribbons, listening to speeches, mourning innocent lives lost or damaged, and celebrating the valiant efforts of those who have made a difference, my prayer is that we as a Nation would recommit ourselves to this issue.

We as parents and Americans must realize our collective responsibility for the well-being of our children. Their future is, indeed, our country's future, and therein lies a moral imperative that we cannot afford to ignore.

The numbers are daunting. In 1997, there were 3 million cases of child abuse and neglect. Today, at least 500,000 American children are in foster care and institutions because they cannot live safely with their own families.

Unfortunately, costs of government programs skyrocket, while there are more broken families, more abused children, more teenaged parents, and more foster children getting bumped around for years without being adopted.

This resolution expresses the sense of Congress that current statistics merit our commitment to intervene in the vicious cycle of child abuse. It says that we need to marshal Federal resources in order to maximize their impact on the prevention of child abuse and neglect. Sometimes it is clear that the most effective reform by the Federal Government is to simply cut red tape and empower local communities.

As with most social problems, government can only do so much to solve them. Local communities, families, and individuals must join together with government agencies to fight and to address the needs of children in the system.

My wife, Christine, and I have two foster kids in our home, and have had over the past 2 years. We have also been involved as volunteers for the Court-Appointed Special Advocates, CASA, and child advocates of Fort Bend County for almost 5 years. We have only recently talked publicly of our family life, in the hopes that others might be encouraged to become involved with the children at risk in their own communities.

The strength of America, the true greatness of America, is not only in the moral fiber of her people and in the integrity of her leaders, but also is revealed by how we treat those who are the most vulnerable.

There are none more vulnerable in our society, none heard less, than the children that suffer from abuse and neglect. We must be their voice. We must speak loudly and speak out with our time and our resources and our love. Get involved. No effort is too small and no child beyond our reach.

Let me just close by commending my colleague, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. DEBORAH PRYCE), one of the best mothers and legislators I know. I so appreciate her efforts on behalf of our Nation's children, and I am honored to join her as an original cosponsor of the child abuse prevention and awareness resolution, as well as the Child Abuse Prevention and Enforcement Act.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to review a few more facts with the Members. As I stated earlier, I served as the Cuyahoga County Prosecutor, prosecuting child abuse in Cuyahoga County and being responsible for abuse and neglect cases.

I also have had the opportunity to serve for 10 years as a judge in Cuyahoga County, where in many instances I was required to listen to testimony and judge the credibility of a young person who was being presented for purposes of testifying with regard to some abuse that he or she had suffered.

To look into the eyes of a child, to require them to walk into a courtroom, to be required to tell the world about terrible incidents of what had occurred to them, I cannot even tell Members how my heart would bleed.

Mr. Speaker, as I stand here this afternoon, as with my other colleagues, I look forward to the time wherein we will not have to celebrate Child Abuse Prevention Month. I look forward to the time where we will not have to celebrate Domestic Violence Month. I look forward to the time where we have created a society wherein people feel good about their relationships, wherein they care about one another, wherein they understand that what goes around comes around, where they understand that what you do to a child at an early age has an indeterminable impact as they go on later on in their lives.

It is important that we let the child protection workers who work in this area every day know how supportive we are of them, how we understand that they are underpaid, overworked, and that many times their caseloads just continue to balloon without any support in sight.

□ 1300

It is important that we let them know that we care about them and that this issue is important to all Americans. It is important that we as a community stop watching child abuse occur and do what the law and morality requires us to do, which is to say something about it, report it, be willing to step forward and tell what we saw happen. It is important that we as a community, as we talk about what it is we can do about child prevention, that we are willing to give not only our personal dollars but be willing to be supportive of the government giving dollars to child abuse prevention. And finally it is important that all of us, those of us that are Members of Congress, sign on not only to the resolution celebrating or bringing to the floor the issues of child abuse, but to also sign on to the CAPE act that will give dollars to local communities to be able to combat child abuse.

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

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON).

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise in strong support of this resolution.

One of my colleagues earlier described as the inconceivable acts of violence some of the things we have witnessed in America's high schools recently, but that people like my colleague from Ohio witnessed day in and day out from adults in America toward children in America. And, indeed, what children in America, what some children in America are suffering at the hands of their own parents can only be described as inconceivable acts of violence.

It took this Nation a number of decades to understand the significance of domestic abuse and to actually change the laws so that beating one's wife was treated under the law exactly the same way as beating a neighbor's wife; that, in fact, assault and battery, whether it was against one's wife or anyone else was equally a crime. And as we came to understand that, we had to change many, many laws and we had to change the way emergency room personnel talked to women who came into emergency rooms and police responded to domestic abuse calls.

We have come a long way now in integrating into our understanding the early warning signs of domestic abuse and we are better at responding and better at early intervention, but we have not done this in the area of child abuse prevention. We have passed laws about mandated reporters, we have tried many things, but we do not integrate into our everyday lives a sensitivity to the needs of families where abuse is brewing or present.

And so this resolution that points to legislation that these leaders are going to bring to this floor and that our Committee on the Judiciary is going to consider and discharge will begin to look at every crime prevention program and assure that crime prevention includes child abuse prevention because, essentially, none of that money is being used for this very, very important purpose. And there are many other things we can do.

This Congress passed the Safe Homes and Adoption Act a year and a half ago. We just had an excellent hearing on that. And it has helped to focus on these families early on and helped the families either deal with their problems or infants to be discharged for adoption where there is no hope that the family can deal with its problems in such a way that abuse will not be recurring in a long-term part of a child's growing up. So we have made progress.

But there is so much more to do, not only in our criminal statutes and in our crime prevention statutes but also in those statutes that govern how this Nation funds child abuse and prevention. As chairman of the committee that has responsibility for those funds for our child protective services program, I can say we have a lot of work to do.

We have got to change the way we fund these services so that money does not follow placement into foster care, which represents failure to prevent, failure to restore, and failure to intervene when a family has an opportunity to become whole not only for that one abused child but for others who may be affected but maybe not as clearly and, therefore, not removed.

So we have to change the way we deal with this problem, to move to a far more holistic approach, and the opportunity is there for us. When we look at what we have done in welfare reform, it is really a model. We have provided more money for services to welfare women coming off welfare than ever in this Nation's history by providing much greater flexibility and a more responsive Federal program. And that is my goal in child protective services funding.

I look forward to working with women of experience and men of experience and deep concern in this body, and I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. TUBBS JONES) for her experience, interest and dedication to this matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILLMOR). Does the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES) wish to reclaim her time?

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. I do, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES) may reclaim her time.

There was no objection.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume only to thank my colleagues who have worked so hard with me on this piece of legislation and this resolution. I am pleased as a brand new Member of Congress to be able to participate in some bipartisan legislation that will impact our entire Nation.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA).

Mr. FOSSELLA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and, Mr. Speaker, I believe there is no greater responsibility that we have as public officials than to protect the innocent. And there is no greater group of innocent people than young children.

Sadly, there are those in this country who are compelled, for whatever reason, unbeknownst to any human being with common sense and decency, to abuse a child, physically and/or mentally scarring the child for life. We see it manifested in many different ways; yet for some reason, whether we are a Democrat or a Republican, when we see a young baby, it always brings a smile to our face. But to know that there are people who would willingly abuse a young innocent child walking the streets of our country is just beyond the bounds of human reasoning.

So I am happy and I compliment the sponsor of this legislation which will at least raise the level of consciousness one more notch. Because we need to stand united and to demonstrate that this great country, with its moral underpinnings, is concerned about every child that walks the face of the Earth, and that we, most importantly, can make a difference.

It is beyond just the abuse itself. We have been successful on Staten Island in developing a child advocacy center. In short, what that means is that the poor child who is abused, sexually, physically, sometimes as young as 6 months old, these poor children who would then have the trauma of repeating this story 8, 10, 15 different times to assistant district attorneys, to police officers, to child welfare workers, will no longer have to do so because what we did is consolidated our operations.

I compliment my predecessor, Susan Molinari, for spearheading this before she left Congress. It is a way of bringing a little reason and comfort to these poor children. I would encourage other communities across this country, if indeed they do not already have them, to explore this option. It minimizes an already tragic situation for a young child and, at the same time, sends a signal to child abusers that this is a zero tolerance policy.

Mr. Speaker, I want to once again compliment the sponsors of this legislation.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EWING).

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

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, the acting chairman, for yielding me this time. I am pleased to come here today and to talk about the resolution honoring child abuse prevention and awareness month and also to speak about a piece of legislation that works into the area of prevention of abuse and child awareness which is called the CAPE Act.

This is a piece of legislation which I originally sponsored with Susan Molinari, and now I am cosponsoring along with the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. DEBORAH PRYCE), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TOM DELAY), and the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. STEPHANIE TUBBS JONES). We are extremely pleased with the reception of this legislation, and we think that it has tremendous ability in a very small way to loosen the bonds or the restrictions that too often are put on local governments who are fighting this battle with the money we send them. That is really basically what we do here. We give breathing room to local governments to fight this problem.

I am not going to go into statistics today. They are pretty gruesome. They are very, very sobering when we think about what is happening in this country. And probably the one statistic that is most alarming is that those children who are abused children themselves become abusers and criminals and addicted to drugs and alcohol and all of the things that we think are bad in our society. They are more susceptible to those things than children that have a healthy environment in which to grow up in.

So I would just ask all of those in the Congress, Mr. Speaker, to join in this bipartisan effort. We can fight crisis around the world, but in child abuse we have a crisis right here in America. It is time to put our best efforts towards solving that problem and moving ahead with new solutions.

I believe that the CAPE Act will allow us just a small step in that direction, and I hope, Mr. Speaker, that we can count on strong support from the Members of this body so that we will send that legislation to the Senate as well as pass this resolution here today on child abuse and awareness month.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN).

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I am pleased to rise today in support of this concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 93, the sense of Congress regarding child abuse and neglect, and enhancing the public's awareness of this problem.

Child abuse, whether sexual, physical or emotional, is a growing problem in this Nation which we should view with a great deal of alarm. Every child has the right to grow up in a safe, well cared for environment. The most tragic thing about child abuse is it is often inflicted by someone close to the child

who should be concerned with that child's welfare rather than inflicting that kind of harm.

Regrettably, far too many families are simply incapable of raising children without resorting to abuse. The end result is that the child often learns violence as an acceptable way to convey ones's feelings and release stress. Thus, the patterns of abuse usually continue with future generations.

In addition to the physical harm imparted on the child from sexual abuse, there is psychological damage which often lasts long into adulthood, affecting the child's future adult relationships.

□ 1315

Even worse, sexual abuse robs a child of his or her innocence long before that innocence should be taken away. And whereas many adults who physically abuse their children can, with the help of extensive counseling, overcome their problems and the dangerous patterns of behavior, that same success does not usually occur with sexual abusers.

All too often, sexual predators of children repeat their acts of abuse even after being punished for earlier actions. Those individuals need to either be deterred from committing their acts or effectively punished for their behavior.

So I want to commend my colleagues, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EWING), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES), for bringing this measure to the floor at this time.

I ask my colleagues to support this measure.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume only to say to all of my colleagues who have appeared here this afternoon that I thank them for coming out in support of our resolution. We look forward to the same support on the CAPE Act when it comes to the floor.

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

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes to close and say certainly it has been a great pleasure to work with the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES) and the other sponsors of this resolution.

Obviously, as this month is Child Abuse Prevention Month, we certainly are encouraged to see the increased effort that Congress will make, that we can make at this national level to work with local folks, work with law enforcement, with health care, with faith communities, as well as all parts of our local communities, to ensure that we provide a safer place for our children, that we continue to increase the awareness of this problem, that we can, as the future goes on, do a better job in making sure that our children are safe.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the resolution calling for public and private resources to prevent child abuse and neglect.

Children are our most precious gifts. We are responsible for their education, their safety, their health, and their lives. We should do everything we can to protect our children and ensure that their lives are safe from harm.

Yet, a sad truth remains that not all children are free from abuse and neglect. In 1997 alone, more than 1 million cases of child abuse and neglect were confirmed by child protective service agencies in the United States. One million children confirmed.

If that statistic wasn't disturbing enough, we know what the results of childhood abuse and neglect can be. We know that abused and neglected children do not perform as well in school. In some cases, physical abuse of children can result in brain damage, cerebral palsy, and learning disorders.

Perhaps most troubling of all, we know that there is a vicious cycle surrounding child abuse. Adults abused as children are at higher risk of arrest for sex crimes.

By recognizing April as Child Abuse Prevention Month, we alert communities all over our country to this tragic social illness that hurts our most precious and vulnerable resource. We recognize that child abuse is a complex problem. The solution requires action from everyone in each city and state. We need to support and expand local officials' efforts to prevent abuse. We need religious leaders to lend a supportive and understanding voice for families. We need to also support programs for families that prepare individuals for the job of parenting.

Most importantly, by recognizing Child Abuse Prevention Month, we also tell victims of child abuse that they are not forgotten. We see you and we will help you. We must remember that truly effective prevention efforts must include treatment for children who have been abused or neglected.

The lingering anguish we feel toward the tragedy in Littleton, Colorado captures how we feel when our children are harmed. We need to break this cycle and prevent child abuse from ever occurring.

I urge my colleagues to support Representative PRYCE's resolution that calls on a collective effort to raise awareness and prevent child abuse and neglect in our communities. I want to thank Representative PRYCE for her work on this important issue.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Mrs. PRYCE's Resolution. This month is Child Abuse Prevention Month and I am pleased to be able to support this resolution which commemorates those who are helping to alleviate the evils of child abuse and neglect.

Together, we can make a difference, one child at a time.

I recently learned about the life of one child and the difference she felt in her life. Three years ago, Shannon was a 16-year-old girl suffering from neglect and despair. She never knew her father. Her sister had been taken away by the state and placed in foster care. Her brother was in state prison for attempted murder. And her mother couldn't seem to help her.

Shannon wasn't interested in life. She was depressed, in and out of psychiatric care between suicide attempts. She was failing in school.

Shannon needed a home. And thanks to the dedication of some very special people at Our Children's Homestead in my Congressional District, that's exactly what Shannon was given.

And what difference did it make? Today Shannon attends College. She plans to go into hotel management.

When she looks back to high school, Shannon sees A's and B's on her report cards; she looks at photos of herself in the sports section of the yearbook; she sees herself on stage at the prom—a member of the prom court.

Shannon is blessed.

But we must also remember how much more we need to do.

In 1992, less than 30,000 children in Illinois were removed from their homes and placed into the child welfare system because they were victims of severe abuse and neglect. Just last year, that number had increased to over 50,000. That's more than a 66 percent increase in only six years. Each one of those numbers may be another Shannon. A child who needs our help—literally needs our help—to survive.

As the numbers of children in need comes close to doubling, we must redouble our efforts to help them. I rise to commemorate the work of those who have done so much. As Shannon's story tells us, we can make a difference for children—one at a time.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the concurrent resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Con. Res. 93.

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

There was no objection.

NATIONAL HOSPITAL WEEK

(Mr. GOODE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GOODE. Mr. Speaker, the week of May 9 is National Hospital Week, when communities across the country celebrate the health care workers, volunteers, and other health professionals. This year's theme for National Hospital Week is ''People Care, Miracles Happen.''

A great example of this theme is an event called Martha's Market at Martha Jefferson Hospital in Charlottesville, Virginia. Martha's Market is a weekend event that transforms an indoor tennis facility into a shopping plaza with 40 unique boutique vendors. The event began as a fund-raiser by a group of enthusiastic volunteers who wanted to raise awareness of breast cancer, and it won the American Hospital Association's prestigious Hospital Award for Volunteer Excellence.

Income for the event comes from corporate sponsors, individual donations and vendor profits. The net profit for the Market grew to more than $150,000 in 1998. The proceeds are used to support the hospital's breast cancer outreach program, provide free or reduced-fee mammograms and health screenings to low-income women, and sponsor free mammography days.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity as National Hospital Week is approaching to congratulate Martha Jefferson Hospital for its award-winning program.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Res. 154.

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

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, MAY 3, 1999

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TUESDAY, MAY 4, 1999

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Monday, May 3, 1999, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, May 4, 1999, for morning hour debates.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

MINIMUM WAGE STIFLES GROWTH, CREATIVE SPIRIT

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

Mr. DICKEY. Madam Speaker, I would like to place in the RECORD an article written by Leo Collins and published in the Pine Bluff Commercial on April 27. Two significant points were made.

First, it stated:

In many ways it seems that the only people who benefit from guaranteed minimum wage are those high school dropouts with lost ambition. We should not promote a permanent minimum wage mentality in anyone by convincing them that they can only expect an increase in wages if the government gives it to them. On the contrary, we should encourage them to look to their willingness to prepare themselves and use their ambition as their ticket to higher prices.

On another subject Mr. Collins talks about good educational programs like Trio being sooner or later: ''Bushwacked and slowly ground into government pork.''

Without his knowing it, the opportunities afforded by Trio to students who want to try are being threatened by a new proposed program called Gear Up. The threatened dilution of Trio has been prophesized in this article. Mr. Collins' wisdom on each of these issues is remarkable.

[From the Pine Bluff Commercial, Apr. 27, 1999]

MINIMUM WAGE STIFLES GROWTH, CREATIVE SPIRIT

(By Leo Collins)

As long as I write an opinion column or do radio commentaries, which I have done 30 years or more, I will from time to time voice an opinion against those who buy into the minimum wage concept.

And I will also get branded from time to time as one of those black conservatives who doesn't want to see all Americans with enough financial resources to sit around the dinner table and feast on pheasant washed down with vintage wine.

Well, those who identify me as a black liberal half of the time are about right. Those who identify me as a black conservative the other half of the time are probably right also.

Some of our well-meant social programs are not much more than social crutches that are both addictive and non-productive and often do nothing more than provide feather bedding posh jobs for those charged with overseeing these types of programs.

But there are many government programs that do tons of good: Headstart, TRIO Programs (Talent Search, Student Support Service and Upward Bound) all come to mind. They help provide all kinds of educational supplements for students who are at a disadvantage or who are educationally abandoned.

We don't want to throw all social programs out the back door. Most government programs start off with all the good intent in the world, but along their voyage down the road of good intentions, these programs get bushwhacked, are slowly ground into government pork and get branded often as government waste.

There are times when our elected officials make political hash out of well-meaning social programs because they seem directed toward a certain racial or ethnic group. So when we evaluate the outcome of these types of programs, they will not have had a national impact on America; but they will have helped a large segment of the populace in certain areas of the country.

Over the years social programs that were designed to help the poor have always been branded as pork. But Pentagon waste and aid to huge corporations have always been labeled as programs aiding America, or it's done under the guise of keeping America strong.

The concept of minimum wage has always sounded like a good idea. No American, according to those who advocate it, should earn less than a set wage.

All of this sounds good, but is it good? Not to me! It stifles individual growth, it dampens the creative spirit and it gives the illusion that your lifelong economic dreams have been fulfilled even though you can never quite figure out why you never seem to take enough pay home to make a down payment on a new car. In many ways it seems that the only people who benefit from guaranteed minimum wage are those high school dropouts with lost ambition.

In a small business the owners may not earn enough to pay minimum wage, but this is an ideal climate for young people to learn something about what it requires to make it in an economy based upon free enterprise. That is more important than earning minimum wage.

No, I don't believe in child labor and slave wages, but I do believe in organized labor, providing that labor leaders require the membership to deliver high quality performance after management concedes to their demands. Wage wise indeed, there ought to be some kind of collective bargaining, but it should be between workers and management, not necessarily between government and management.

The government only needs to raise its powerful fist when management is obviously abusing labor by not providing safe working places, health insurance, etc. It just seems to me that wages ought to coincide with net profits, but there should be no guaranteed minimum or maximum wage. Too frequently, I must admit that management does not pay labor its fair share.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

DECLARING CUSTOMS AND INS INSPECTORS LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the work of the officers and inspectors of the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service and the U.S. Customs Service and other Federal agents and various agencies and ask that they be accorded the full Federal law enforcement status, as outlined in legislation I recently introduced.

This bill will finally grant the same status to the U.S. INS and Customs inspectors as to all other Federal law enforcement officers and fire fighters. It is in the public's interest to end the unfair, unsafe, and expensive practice of excluding these inspectors from the law enforcement category.

Because of the current lopsided law, INS and Customs lose vigorous, trained

professionals to other law enforcement agencies. The agencies also lose millions of dollars, as they have to train other inspectors to take the place of those who have just departed.

Customs and Immigration inspectors are law enforcement officers. They are law enforcement officers. They carry firearms and are the country's first line of defense against terrorism and smuggling of drugs at our borders.

I represent the City of San Diego at the border crossing between Mexico and the United States; and right there in my district, 125,000 people per day, 125,000 people per day cross through the point of entry. It is the busiest border crossing in the world. And inspectors there daily face felons. They disarm people who are carrying sawed-off shotguns, switch-blade knives, and handguns. They have been run over by cars and have had shoot-outs with drug smugglers.

Forty-three courageous U.S. Customs and Immigration and Naturalization Service inspectors have been killed in the line of duty. We owe it to their memory, and to the men and women who now serve in the same dangerous jobs that their predecessors died performing, to provide inspectors with the full law enforcement status.

The sad irony in this fight is that the inspectors who were killed in the line of duty eventually achieved law enforcement status when they died by having their names inscribed in the granite of the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial here in Washington, D.C.

Mr. Speaker, I say this is too long to wait and way too high of a price to pay for law enforcement status for the Customs Service and Immigration and Naturalization Service inspectors. We have the opportunity to provide inspectors parity and recognition now, while they live and protect us from terrorists, drug dealers, and fugitives.

Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Immigration and Customs inspectors daily put their lives on the line. It is time that we value those lives. I urge support of H.R. 1228, legislation to correct the unequal treatment of these Federal law enforcement officers.

SANCTIONS REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, this Chamber has been dominated with discussion over the course of this week dealing with the limitations and the costs of the use of force in trying to secure international peace. Yet, there is another very critical area.

As we attempt to work our will on issues around the globe, we are finding it more and more difficult to gain leverage with other countries as we are dealing with issues that deal with economic sanctions. Our efforts are made all the more difficult by signals coming from inside this Chamber encouraging America to retreat from its role as the world's only remaining superpower.

It is time for us to take a step back and reshape our thinking about how we can apply sanctions that are more in tune with what actually happens in the world. Well-intentioned sanctions are becoming less and less effective if we do it on an unilateral basis. Currently, it is estimated that half the world's population is subject to some sort of sanction on the part of the United States. Yet it is estimated that only one-fifth of the programs that we have applied previously in the last 20 years achieved their intended goals.

The Institute for Economic Analysis estimated that unilateral sanctions have a very real cost for Americans and our businesses, perhaps as much as $20 billion per year in lost opportunities, which translates into a potential job loss of 200,000 American jobs. And those that are in the international arena turn out to be amongst the highest paying American jobs.

We see persuasive evidence that unilateral sanctions simply do not work. The threat of sanctions not only failed to deter what happened in India or Pakistan regarding nuclear testing, but it would have cost people in the region that I represent in the Pacific Northwest a huge wheat sale if Congress had not acted quickly to grant a waiver authority to the President so he would not have to apply the sanction. Well, it rescued a potential loss of business but it made us look foolish, having this sanction out here and then not applying it when the chips were down.

The example of Cuba is perhaps one of the most abject failure, where we have imposed sanctions basically alone in the world. Yet Castro continues to thrive after 40 years and, in fact, perhaps has been even more entrenched by our opposition to his regime.

The simple fact is, if we are going to initiate sanctions, we need to have better information to make better-informed decisions. We need to look in a comprehensive way about what we are trying to achieve. When will we decide whether or not the sanction is effective, and how will we determine whether or not we have met that objective?

I personally am embarrassed in conversations that I have had with people, parliamentarians from other more developed countries who have very thoughtful approaches that allow them to determine when they are going to be involved, how they are going to be successful, and when they conclude that effort.

I was pleased to join former Representative Lee Hamilton and Senator LUGAR, both of Indiana, last session when they introduced comprehensive reform of American sanctions policy. I am pleased that this legislation has been reintroduced in this session.

I would strongly urge my colleagues to look at comprehensive sanction reform as an area for them to be involved. It is an area that we ought to know what we are doing. It will make a big difference for American business, and it will make our foreign policy much more effective in the long-run.

At a time when we are dominated by the threat of war and, in fact, being actively engaged with American fighting men and women overseas, we owe it to them, we owe it to our constituents, we owe it to ourselves to make sure that we have all the tools that are available and that they are used in a thoughtful fashion.

□ 1330

TRAGEDY AT COLORADO HIGH SCHOOL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, as a Congress and as a Nation we are mourning the brave students and teachers whose lives were cut short in the senseless tragedy at Columbine High School.

An overwhelming sense of sadness and grief has spread throughout our Nation as we wonder out loud what led our country to this point. How could two of our children, our Nation's future, who harbored so much anger and resentment, turn to violence before they turned for help? What frightens me even more than the event itself is that it is symptomatic of a Nation rapidly losing sight of the very values this country was built upon: faith, family and freedom.

Mr. Speaker, in the past year and a half, at least 29 people have been killed as a result of school violence. In today's era of virtual reality games and the Internet, children witness gruesome acts of violence on a daily basis and can access pornography on the Internet with ease. And now our Nation's children are a simple click away from directions to build the same pipe bombs that two troubled young men used to wreak devastation on a small Colorado community.

The events of the last week have reminded me of an old Chinese proverb that says, ''If we do not change our direction, we are likely to end up where we are headed.''

Mr. Speaker, we are headed down a dangerous path. Some blame violence in the media, music, the Internet, access to guns and parental neglect. While they all influence our children, the problem is even greater.

In response to the tragedy, President Clinton has proposed more gun control laws. Mr. Speaker, we already have a number of gun control laws on the book. New laws are not the answer. It is not what is in our children's hands, it is what is in their hearts.

Mr. Speaker, one of the students who died last week was killed after proclaiming her belief in God. This young girl herself once struggled with some of

the same issues her killers did. She even subscribed to witchcraft until she chose to embrace God and turn her life around. For this, for her beliefs, she was killed.

Sadly, in the news coverage over the past week, the media has focused on a small group of students who isolated themselves from others because they felt alienated. But we can see by this tragedy at Columbine that when circumstances were dire, students and teachers cast aside their differences and worked together.

As a man of Christian faith, I cannot help but be proud of the number of students recounting stories of being trapped in the school and surrounded by death who found solace in prayer. Yet how ironic that on any other day, our Nation's children cannot pray in school. In fact, children have been barred from bowing their heads in private prayer, from expressing their religious beliefs in school newspapers and even bringing the Bible to school.

Mr. Speaker, can anyone today say that our children are better off than they were 30 years ago when prayer was accepted in our schools? Thirty years ago, teachers were concerned with students smoking in school, skipping class and an occasional fistfight. Today teachers are being asked to deal with teen pregnancy, drug abuse and the physical safety of their students.

Mr. Speaker, let Littleton, Colorado be our wakeup call. Faith is exactly what this country needs. The children in Littleton turned toward God during their time of crisis. We should not force them to turn away from God during their daily lives.

Mr. Speaker, today our Nation is faced with two choices: We can continue down the path we have created for ourselves or we can look to a time in our history when children felt safe in school, and we can learn from our mistakes. This country was founded on Judeo-Christian principles. Yet we have become an America in which children reach for a gun before they reach for their Bible, or turn to violence instead of their parents or their church.

Mr. Speaker, I have the great honor of representing the citizens of eastern North Carolina. What makes me so proud of my constituents is that they, like so many Americans across this Nation, have a great respect for the Bible and the Constitution. They live their lives for God and country and they nurture these beliefs in the lives of their children. These are the values that this country needs.

As Mother Theresa once said, ''If you become a burning light of justice and peace in the world, then really you will be true to what the founders of this country stood for. This is to love one another as God loves each one of us. And where does his love begin? In our home. How does it begin? By praying together.''

Mr. Speaker, how did we ever imagine to lose sight of our founders' intentions? The students and teachers of Columbine High School have shown us that we must join together to return an America that gives families the freedom to raise their children in an environment that is safe, where children are free to live and to learn.

In the words of George Washington, ''The smiles of heaven can never be expected on a nation that disregards the eternal rules of order and right, which heaven itself has ordained.''

Today, my thoughts and prayers are with the community of Littleton, Colorado as they begin their healing process.

As a tribute to the families and friends who lost loved ones, let us turn this tragedy into an opportunity.

We took prayer out of school and we have seen the results.

Let us now change course and return to the values on which this nation was founded.

Please do not allow those who died in Littleton to have died in vain.

TRIBUTE TO SAM GILMAN OF ROCK ISLAND, ILLINOIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to pay tribute to a good friend of mine, Sam Gilman of Illinois. Tonight the Quad Cities Israel Bonds Council will award Sam with the Jerusalem Medal for dedicated service to his community and to Israel. I have learned so much from Sam about public service over the years and I take great joy in seeing him recognized for his outstanding achievements. He knows what it means to give of yourself to help others.

After graduating from college, he served our country in the United States Army during World War II. Following law school at Harvard, Sam returned to the Quad Cities to practice law and later became a director of the Pinnacle Banc Group. He has also helped build enduring institutions that serve the entire community, including founding WQAD and WKPT and serving as chairman of the board of Franciscan Medical Center.

Sam has been instrumental in developing a strong Jewish community and support for Israel in western Illinois. His leadership as a director and past president of the Jewish Federation of the Quad Cities, as founder of the Quad Cities Yom HaShoah Committee, and past director of the Tri-City Jewish Center strengthened those groups and laid a foundation to be erected for an active community for many years to come.

I have witnessed Sam's love for Israel and his dedication to helping Jews in need around the world. In 1986 we went together with a group to Israel and I learned to appreciate the deep affection he has for that land and its people. Two years later, on a journey to the former Soviet Union, I joined Sam as we met with refuseniks and worked to help Soviet Jews fighting for their freedom under a repressive regime.

Sam's work and that of countless others in the Jewish community is directly responsible for securing the right of Jews to emigrate from the former Soviet Union and for helping Israel to resettle this mass exodus of people in a land where they can now be free.

Finally, I have been fortunate to benefit from Sam's wise counsel and support for almost 20 years. He has been a true mentor to me as I first sought to represent western Illinois in Congress, and as treasurer of my campaign, he has always had a critical role in every race that I have run. Most of all, I am proud to call Sam a friend and look forward to many more years of sharing his advice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

KOSOVO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, last night's votes on our war were a wakeup call to our President, to NATO and to the world. The American People's House voted against a declaration of war, against ground troops, and also defeated a resolution on a tie vote, even, in support of the current air war. That should be a clear message to the world that America is in the process of switching the more they learn about this ill-conceived war.

Next week's supplemental defense appropriations bill is in deep trouble. How can a Congress vote against a declaration of war this week and then the next week turn around and fund it? I want to make sure as one of those who is against this war, who started skeptical but has turned into someone who feels it is time to aggressively speak out before American men and women die on a battlefield in an ill-conceived, ill-planned and unwinnable war, that several things are true about this supplemental appropriation. Those of us who oppose it are not unconcerned about the refugees. Two weeks ago when I was privileged to go along with the CODEL over to that area and visited a refugee camp in Macedonia, you cannot help but be moved by the terrible stories that the individuals are telling about how they have been forcibly removed from their country. It is terrible. The question is not whether it should pull at your heart and how terrible it is. The question is what can we do about it and is this unprecedented? It is wrong when the Serbs do it, it is wrong when the Croatians do it, it is wrong when the Bulgarians do it, and it

is wrong when the Bosnian Muslims do it. The question is by inserting ourselves can we stop this? Is this the most effective way? And will we accidentally create a problem potentially bigger than the problem that we went in to solve?

Secondly, this is not about refugee aid. We should be having a separate vote on refugee aid, not refugee aid serving as a cover for military appropriations for a continuing war. All of us agree that the economies of Albania and Macedonia have been devastated by being unable to continue their trade not only with Serbia but the other countries around them, by handling the refugees that come in, by having a general collapse of their economies by their openness. We need to give aid for the refugees, we need to give aid to those countries. That is not what this supplemental appropriations bill is about next week. That is merely wrapping with it. We will give refugee aid, we will give aid to those countries, but I believe it should happen after we have a settlement there.

Thirdly, this is not about replacing military preparedness. This President has already proven that whatever we appropriate, he diverts to the war. We can appropriate it for this or that, but if he wants to continue the war, he is diverting it. We have an obligation if we say we are against this war not to hide behind what we are replacing but understand he has no conscience as far as how he will divert the money, which also leads me to, this is not about military buildup. I am one of those who believes we are at least $20 billion behind in military preparedness and that is why we need to do it and that is why we must as a Republican Congress step up regardless of the budget question and address the defense question. But not here. If we put $12 billion, $6 billion more than he proposed on this bill, what assurances do we have that this is not either going to continue the war or be used, even worse, for the ground war that we voted against last night? Because there are no fire walls that you can put in, particularly if we continue to allow reprogramming of money in our leadership that protects us from having voted the funds next week to go to a ground war.

It is fine to stand up here as we did last night and say we are against a ground war, we are against continuing this air war, we are against a declaration of war, but the real thing comes down to the money. Next week are we going to stand up and say, ''He can't have the money to continue and expand this war. We want to see people come to the table in a livable, workable thing''?

When I was at NATO in Brussels, I had a very weird feeling as I was sitting around the table and hearing how we cannot back up, this could be terrible and devastating for NATO. This is so much like Vietnam where we heard all those things and in fact we got the same deal after we had the loss of American lives that we could have had the first day.

In a very interesting book, ''Taking Charge'' by Michael Beschloss about Lyndon Johnson, actual tapes, this is an exchange of Lyndon Johnson with Dick Russell, head of the Senate Foreign Relations, I believe, at that time.

''LBJ: I spend all my days with Rusk and McNamara and Bundy and Harriman and Vance and all those folks that are dealing with it and I would say it pretty well adds up to them now that we've got to show some power and some force—that they do not believe—they don't believe that the Chinese Communists will come into this thing. But they don't know and nobody can really be sure. But their feeling is that they won't. And in any event, that we haven't got much choice, that we are treaty-bound, that we are there, that there will be a domino that will kick off a whole list of others, that we've got to prepare for the worst.''

That is exactly what we are being told here. That is exactly what I heard at NATO. ''Oh, we can't back up because we are treaty-bound, we are there, it will be a domino.''

In fact, we stayed in Vietnam. We lost many of my friends, thousands of Americans in that battle, and in the end wound up backing up, because the problem here is do not bluff, do not make threats that you cannot follow through. Our generals have told us, this is unwinnable in the air. Those of us who have been over there, those of us who have studied any history realize you cannot do a ground war from the south. A ground war would have to come from the north. Not only are there huge mountains and not only have armies throughout world history been stopped in those mountains, you have to come from the north.

If you come from the north you have Romania and Hungary drawn into the war. You have a problem of coming through Belgrade and northern Yugoslavia and then us owning northern Yugoslavia as well as the autonomous republic of Kosovo.

It is not winnable on the ground. The American people need to be told that if we go to a ground war, between 20 and 50,000 Americans are going to lose their lives. We have to understand what we are faced with here. We bluffed. We should not bluff when we do not have the ability to execute. It is time to cut off the funding for this war.

ILLEGAL IMMIGRANTS IN GUAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, this is the third time in 3 weeks that I have taken the opportunity to give a special order on an ongoing crisis in my home island of Guam, and this pertains to the continuing arrival of illegal immigrants from the People's Republic of China.

During this past week, there was yet another 200, over 200 illegal immigrants who have arrived. On October 23, 175 were apprehended off of Guam's waters and on April 28 another estimated 100 were apprehended near Guam's shores by the U.S. Coast Guard.

□ 1345

The number of apprehended illegal immigrants from the People's Republic caught near Guam is now well over 700 this year. A couple of weeks ago I informed this body and I have informed the administration about the inhuman ramifications of this smuggling trade in human beings into Guam.

These people are being smuggled in by Chinese crime syndicates which charge them anywhere from $10,000 to $30,000 each. They set sail in squalid quarters meant to survive, in a vessel that is meant to survive a one-way trip in open ocean for over 10 days from the Fukien Province inside China to Guam, near Guam, and the Mariana Islands.

Upon successfully completing the trip, they are then, if they are successful and if they land on Guam, invariably they are successful in getting some kind of asylum, they are made into indentured servants for many years to work to pay off their debt to the smugglers who have brought them into the United States.

This is very unlike other economic refugees or even the border crossings that we see on our southern border. This is clearly a smuggling trade in which these people who are making the journey are as much victims as the people of Guam are being victimized by this trade.

According to the INS officer in charge on Guam, Mr. David Johnston, the waves of illegal immigrants will not stop. We are faced with a phenomenon that will not stop unless we change the applicability of Federal law to Guam, in the case of immigration, the application of the Immigration and Naturalization Act, and unless we make it apparent to the Chinese smuggling crime syndicates that this will no longer be a profitable trade for them.

There is a way out which has been utilized by the administration, a process which I fully endorse, and that is to take these people and instead of moving them to Guam, to take them up to the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, another U.S. territory, but interestingly a U.S. territory in which the application of the Immigration and Naturalization Act does not fully apply.

So what that means is that when these people are taken to the Northern Marianas, what happens is that they do not have the right to all the kinds of asylum which is generally available in Guam or any other U.S. territory. It is anticipated that from there they can be repatriated back to China within weeks rather than the 2 years it takes to adjudicate asylee cases, in which case most of the time they are generally released into American society.

So as a consequence of this the Coast Guard has been taking and trying to interdict these vessels in the open ocean and moving them to the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands through the collaboration and cooperation of Governor Tenorio and other officials there, and for that at least the people of Guam are grateful, and we certainly endorse this policy, this practice which has been implemented by the Clinton administration.

Illegal immigration into the United States is a Federal responsibility. Because of Guam's proximity to Asia, it is incumbent that Federal agencies assist the Government of Guam in combating this serious problem on our shores. It is important to understand that Guam is only 212 square miles in size and our population is only 150,000. Any significant increase in the immigrant population on the island has significant social and financial repercussions because of our financial, current financial conditions which are affected by the Asian economic crisis, and because we do not have the alternative resources available for noncriminal alien immigrants that are generally available in the U.S. mainland.

The financial strain on Guam's resources are tremendous. I hope that we can find a way to reprogram some $10 to $15 million to take care of this problem on Guam and to reimburse the Government of Guam for costs that have already been expended on this crisis.

A PEACEFUL RESOLUTION TO THE SITUATION IN THE BALKANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. METCALF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I hope we are all here well informed of the efforts of our colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), to bring about a peaceful solution to the situation in the Balkans. In the light of yesterday's votes on the Balkans, I believe this effort should be immediately embraced by the administration.

Mr. Speaker, I am astounded that the administration choose not to support the attempts of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) at finding a peaceful solution to the crisis in Kosovo. The decision by the administration leads me to reluctantly conclude that they are determined to prosecute a war in Kosovo regardless of costs. The attempt by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) in coordination with the Russian Duma should have been wholeheartedly embraced by this administration as a means to ensure the safety of not only the Kosovars, but our men and women in uniform carrying out the NATO mission. I can think of no reason why the administration would reject the efforts of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) and the members of the Russian Duma. The agreement, if successful, would establish a cease-fire under conditions first proposed by the NATO countries.

Now, if the NATO requirements were dismissed in the proposal and unsatisfactory ones drafted, I could understand that the administration would be unable or unwilling to support it. But a rejection of a potential agreement with the NATO conditions as a prerequisite is unimaginable.

It is essential for this Congress to accept its responsibility to our men and women in uniform and ensure that their safety is the paramount concern of the United States. Unfortunately, with the administration's rejection of the potential peace initiative I cannot be sure that it is theirs.

The United States does not have a vital interest in the Balkans. We have not been presented with clear objectives, any specific mission or even a coherent exit strategy. Now the administration is choosing military action over peace.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage all my colleagues to support the efforts of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) in the Balkans.

THE HIGH TECH ECONOMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the fastest growing segment of our economy has been the high tech segment of our economy driven mostly by computers, software, the Internet, biotech, and also the products that our increasing technology enables us to create. It is what has been most responsible for the strong economy we have enjoyed in the last 7 or 8 years and, more importantly, will be the cornerstone of what the future is going to hold. The more we can do to move the high tech economy forward, the more jobs that we could create and the stronger an economy that we can have.

Now we deal with a lot of complicated issues in Congress. Mostly our goal is to try to improve the lives of the people we represent. There are a lot of very strong difficulties in doing that, but the one thing that most clearly, positively affects the lives of the people all of us represent is a strong economy. That is means opportunity, opportunity for good jobs and a decent wage so that you can take care of your family and build for the future. High tech is critical to that.

That is the first component of what I want to talk about, the high tech economy. The second component is exports and basically creating markets for our goods, specifically for our high tech goods. Ninety-six percent of the people in the world live someplace other than the United States of America.

Now in the U.S. we still manage to consume 20 percent of the world's goods, services and products, so what that means is if we are going to have growth in any aspect of our economy really, not just the high tech aspect, we are going to have to look overseas. We are going to have to look to that other 96 percent of the world out there and increase their consumption of our goods.

Bottom line: Increase exports, and in particular, increase exports of high tech products. Those are the two things that need to come together, the importance of getting at that 96 percent of the rest of the world and the importance of continuing to allow our high tech economy to thrive. If that high tech economy is going to thrive, we are going to have to get access to those other markets. Our companies in this country are going to have to get access to those other markets for one central reason, that we are the leaders in most aspects of the high tech economy.

We are far from alone. Countries throughout the world are developing their own Internet technology, their own telecommunications technology, their own software and hardware technology. We have competitors out there, and if they have access to markets that we do not have access to, that is inevitably going to catch up with us. It is going to give them the ability to grow and prosper and then feed more money back into research and development to develop the next best product, and in the high tech community, as my colleagues know, today's best product could be just totally out the window tomorrow as technology leaps ahead. You have to be the one in the position to leap ahead, and to get there we have to give our high tech products access to those foreign markets, and we are failing in three areas right at the moment.

Number one, we have too many broad based economic sanctions that are unilaterally imposed by our country. We unilaterally decide that our country's companies will not be allowed to do business with dozens of other countries for dozens of other reasons. This does not work because while we make that unilateral decision, our competitors do not. Our competitors sell products to those same countries, so we do not have any impact on the country that we are trying to impact except to force them to buy good goods from our competitors.

But two other areas are specifically problematic for the high tech community. One is encryption software, and skipping a complicated analysis, encryption software is basically the software that enables you to protect whatever is on your computer, to make sure that only you can see it and no one else can. This is very important for a variety of reasons, privacy reasons but also competitive reasons.

Any computer technology, computer product, software product that is sold requires top-of-the-line encryption technology, but our country does not allow our companies to export top-of-

the-line encryption technology. We place caps on how much of it can be sent out, depending on the product and depending on the service. That puts us at a disadvantage with our competitors and gives them a chance to get ahead of us in the high tech economy and jeopardizes future economic growth.

We do this because we are concerned about the national security implications of encryption technology, and they are there, there is no question. The better encryption technology you have, the better you are able to either protect your national security or breach somebody else's. The mistake we made is in assuming that by placing controls on the export of our companies' encryption technology, that somehow stops the rest of the world from getting it.

Encryption technology can be downloaded off the Internet. Dozens of other countries sell and export top-of-the-line encryption technology. All we do is place ourselves at a disadvantage and in the long run hurt our national security interests. We hurt them because we hurt our own companies' ability to be the leaders in leap-ahead technology. There was a great relationship in this country between the National Security Council, the FBI and our high-tech companies. They can work together to develop the best products to help with our national security concerns, but not if the company developing the best technology is from China or Germany or even Canada. They do not have the same cooperative relationship with the FBI that our own companies can have. We need to change encryption technology export, for the good of our economy and for the good of our export sector.

INTERPRETING THE VOTES ON KOSOVO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, the subject that is on all of our minds is the fight in Kosovo, and I would like to focus on properly interpreting the votes of yesterday and looking to what our opportunities for solving this crisis might be tomorrow.

Yesterday was a momentous day in the history of this House. First, we voted with an over 60 percent vote that the President should not send major ground forces into Kosovo without the approval of this House.

Now it is fair to point out that there were those on the other side. They argued that Congress should not have a role in determining whether ground forces are deployed. They argued that our enemies would tremble in fear if they knew that one man, the President of the United States, without the approval of Congress, could deploy 100,000 American soldiers.

Mr. Speaker, I would tremble in fear, and the founders of this republic would tremble in fear if it was thought that one man, without the approval of the representatives of the people, could send 100,000 of our men and women into battle.

□ 1400

But the fact that Congress insists upon approving in advance any deployment of ground troops does not mean that Congress has prejudged the issue.

Whether this country supports ground troops will depend, in my opinion, on what we discover is happening to the men of Kosovo. Because the refugees come out, the women, the children, the old men, but the younger men and the middle-aged men are left behind. They may join the KLA, and that is their right; they may be detained, and that is not something that would cause incredible outrage. But if we discover, as so many fear, that the men of Kosovo are being systematically slaughtered, then there will be an outcry throughout Europe and the United States, and it is possible that this House would authorize the use of ground troops.

Second, and I think most telling, we voted 2-to-1, and that is very rare in this House, by a 2-to-1 majority against ending all hostilities. In doing so, we made it clear that America is not simply going to shrug our shoulders and walk away. This is the most important vote, and the vote that should be focused on by Belgrade.

The third vote, and, unfortunately, the vote that is getting the press, was a vote of 213 to 213 as to whether this House would go on record authorizing the air strikes.

Now, our own press is misinterpreting this vote, for it came just a few hours after, by a 2-to-1 majority, my colleagues and I voted not to stop what is going on now. We are not fools. What is going on now is an air campaign, and our decision not to stop it should have been read as a decision to go forward, at least for the present time.

But our own press, let alone the people in Belgrade, misinterpret the last vote yesterday, because they fail to account for two groups that voted against the resolution. One was a group, unfortunately, of some of my Republican colleagues, who, while they support continuing the air campaign, oppose saying anything good about anything President Clinton has ever done. It is not a secret even in Belgrade that President Clinton is not popular in the Republican Caucus, but that does mean that this people or this Congress wants to stop action and let Milosevic have his way.

Second, there were a group that I respect immensely who looked at some of the hidden possible legal implications of that resolution. They noticed that under the War Powers Act there may be a challenge to any attempt by the President to put in ground troops without the approval of this House, and that there is some judicial writing to the effect that if Congress authorizes any kind of force, that we are in no position to limit any other kind of force.

Properly interpreted, the votes of yesterday are clear: We should proceed to work to put Kosovars back in their homes in security and peace, and I addressed the House earlier on some of the more creative ways to try to accomplish that.

EXEMPTING U.S. FOOD AND MEDICINE FROM UNILATERAL TRADE SANCTIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I want to use these 5 minutes for purposes of commending the administration's announcement of yesterday in which they are exempting food and medicine from unilateral trade sanctions. This has a possible immediate and positive impact on agriculture exports of wheat, rice and corn.

The United States agricultural producers, and we will hear a little bit more about that in the next hour, have faced a lot of problems with trade barriers imposed by other countries; but United States sanctions, when we and some who believe that our own policies can be put forward by denying shipment of food and medicine to countries, that too becomes a sanction or a trade barrier.

We have clearly proven, I think, over the last several years that sanctions do not work; they hurt producers, and they hurt those that we do not intend to hurt. I think that we can find much more effective ways to implement foreign policy.

Therefore, the new policy, which is part of the administration's long-term review of sanctions, which is intended to ensure effectiveness of economic sanctions, is designed to minimize the cost to United States' producers of anything and maintain the reputation of the United States as a reliable supplier, something that often gets overlooked by some who believe that these actions, as they result in what is perceived to be in the best interests of the United States, often do not accomplish that which was intended.

A recent report from the President's Export Council showed that more than 75 countries may be subject to sanctions. In 1995, sanctions cost America $15 billion to $19 billion and affected 200,000 to 250,000 export-related jobs.

Speaking specifically of agriculture, United States agriculture exports account for 30 percent of all U.S. farm cash receipts and 40 percent of all agricultural production. Sanctions and embargoes make it more and more difficult for farmers and ranchers to expand agricultural markets, particularly when the 95–96 farm bill was designed to make us more reliant on foreign markets. It absolutely makes no sense then to deny the market opportunity for our producers.

The Departments of Commerce and Treasury will issue new regulations with regard to Iran, Libya and Sudan. The Departments of State and Treasury must review the pending applications for agricultural sales to Iran.

On January 5, policy changes were made to authorize case-by-case licensing of food and agricultural imports to Cuba. Congress would have to amend current law to change this policy, and it is my sincere hope that Congress will take up through the committee process and hopefully through action on this floor, a sincere and open debate as to whether or not our policy that we have toward Cuba should in fact be revised along the same lines of which we are talking of other countries.

So here today I take this minute, and I will soon yield back if I have any balance of time, to just say let us use this new policy to help our producers, in this case, move wheat, corn and rice and other commodities to our customers overseas, in whatever area is affected by these sanctions.

It is important for this body and for the administration to think long and hard before we impose unilateral sanctions. Unilateral trade sanctions have never proven effective. When we sanction, when we deny markets and our friends take those markets, it only hurts producers and workers in America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. LUTHER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LUTHER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NETHERCUTT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

PASSAGE OF EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDING FOR FARM SERVICE AGENCY NEEDED NOW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MINGE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight the long delay in passing the emergency supplemental funding for the Farm Service Agency lending programs and FSA staffing budget.

This is truly an emergency, in every sense of the word. Tracy Beckman, FSA Director in my state of Minnesota, has told me that he will be forced to lay off FSA employees because of the delay in passing the emergency supplemental. The demand for loans and other FSA services is skyrocketing because of the commercial banks' concern about declining farm incomes. Many producers are having a difficult time securing private sector operating loans. FSA has to step in to fill the gap with guaranteed and direct loans to producers. Demand for loans this year is up 75% from a year ago, the Secretary of Agriculture tells me.

Minnesota FSA will approve more loan applications by the end of the fiscal year than they have funding. If this supplemental is not approved, they will be unable to deliver the funds to farmers because their accounts have run dry. Planting season has arrived, and those farmers without operating loans are going to be left high and dry.

Mr. Speaker, now is the time to approve these truly emergency funds. We must not delay action on this matter because of disputes between Congress and the White House on other matters. The supplemental bill threatens to be bogged down with billions of non-emergency spending, and I worry that this may sink the ship.

The president requested $6 billion to fund the air campaign against Yugoslavia. Some on the other side of the aisle want to pass as much as $20 billion. The Senate majority leader suggested $10 or $11 billion. I do not understand how funds the Administration has not even requested could be remotely considered emergency spending. We must remember these are Social Security funds we are spending here. If we are going to continue to claim to be fiscally responsible, we must be honest with ourselves about what is emergency funding and what is desirable funding. What ever happened to not opening the Social Security lock box unless it is an absolute emergency?

I propose that we develop and pass in the shortest possible time frame a free standing emergency agriculture spending bill to provide critical guaranteed and direct operating loan funds that our farmers need to get into the field and the FSA staff to deliver those programs. These are truly emergency funding needs. We must move forward with a clean bill for agriculture now, and not hold hostage these funds for American farmers in a raid on the Social Security trust fund to benefit non-emergency defense spending.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAVIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DAVIS of Florida addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DOOLEY of California addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. HOLT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. CUMMINGS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

APPROVAL OF FARM SERVICE AGENCY EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDING NEEDED NOW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, it is springtime in America. Normally that means that there is great optimism, great excitement, particularly among our agriculture community. Our farmers know that now is the time to put the seed in the ground and prepare for the fall's harvest, to prepare to feed this country and a good portion of the rest of the world.

But, regrettably, it is a sad time in the farm community this year. Prices are low. We just had terrible disasters last year. We had a bad crop. The agriculture income is down some 28 percent.

As I traveled the First Congressional District that I am privileged to represent over the last few weeks to see the distress, the discouragement, the despair that exists in our agriculture community today, it is a terrible thing.

I rise today to once again ask the Speaker to move our agriculture emergency supplemental appropriations bill and provide the emergency loan money that this House and the Senate have both approved. It is absolutely unbelievable that the Speaker and the Republican leadership would hold America's farmers hostage as they are doing now. It is shameful.

Our farmers are good, honest, hard-working people. They had a farm bill forced upon them in 1996 that they knew was going to be a disaster, and it has been. The administration, as my distinguished colleague from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) just mentioned, made a great step forward yesterday by lifting sanctions on some of our markets, and that is going to be very helpful. But you do not get but one chance a

year to make a crop, and if our farmers are not provided loans and those loans are not provided almost immediately, within the next few weeks, they will not get a chance to make a crop this year. Many of them have already missed that opportunity.

You cannot wait until the middle of the summer to plant a crop. It will be too late. You have to plant it in April and May.

It is time for our farmers to put the seed in the ground. It is time for our Speaker and the Republican leadership to let this emergency supplemental bill be conferenced and give our farmers an even break.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished ranking member of the House Committee on Agriculture, a great friend of America's farmers and a great leader for America and for agriculture, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and would amplify a little more on what he has just said regarding the conference that should be going on between the House and the Senate regarding the emergency agriculture appropriation, a request sent here to this body 62 days ago from the Secretary of Agriculture, acknowledging that we were going to have some credit problems, that the amount budgeted for credit was not going to be sufficient, and, therefore, an emergency supplemental was going to be required.

Everyone knows this. The House Committee on Agriculture, both sides of the aisle, are in agreement that these monies are needed and must be forthcoming, but it is very frustrating when we have already had to have two stopgap proposals in order to just get us to the next point, that we have had to have the Secretary of Agriculture juggling various accounts just to continue to be able to provide the service in our various FSA offices.

But we are now kind of at the end of our rope. The Secretary this morning informed us that at the end of the close of business today there would no longer be the ability to accept applications for loans. This week we have averaged 150 applications per day. This is four times the normal demand for FSA loans.

It is really inexcusable that, for whatever reasons, the conferees have not been able to come up with an acceptable compromise that would allow the House to work its will. I know that there are budget considerations, and I remind everyone, including myself, when we are talking about expenditure of emergency funds, whether it be for agriculture, for Kosovo, or for any other purpose, for Central America, the emergency that has already been created there and which is also pending, something which needs to be taken care of, all of these dollars are Social Security Trust Fund dollars.

□ 1415

I see we have been joined by our friend from Michigan (Mr. SMITH), and he and I and others have been working and trying to come up with proposals in which we might deal with the Social Security problem. I welcome his efforts there, and I appreciate his welcoming of mine.

But when we talk about this particular proposal today and the state of agriculture, we go into it with our eyes open. That is why the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY) and I, and I believe the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) joined us in this, in support of the Blue Dog budget, if memory serves me correctly, and recognizing that there were going to be some additional needs, and we proposed to budget for them. The good news was that we had a majority of Democrat supporters, 26 Republican supporters; the bad news is it takes 218 votes to do it. I understand that.

But having said all of this, that gets us right back to what the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY) was saying a moment ago. We have a crisis, it is really inexcusable, and it is one of the reasons the American people get so frustrated with all of us, because of our seeming inability to make timely decisions.

One of the decisions that could be is that we do not want to fund this. That would be one of the decisions. If a majority of the House say these are monies we should not expend, these are loans we should not make, therefore let us not approve it, I can accept that. Mr. Speaker, a 218-vote decision by this body saying these loans should not be made would be a perfectly logical, legitimate decision of this body to be made. But what is inexcusable is to not make the decision because somebody is not able to please somebody within somebody's conference or caucus, and that is what is going on. We would like to see this come forward, deal with it in an open and honest way.

I yield back now to the gentleman from Arkansas, and if there is any time additionally I will have a few other comments to be made.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from the great State of Texas. I now yield to our distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON).

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for conducting this Special Order. I am delighted to see the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) is joining us, as we work together on a budget on Social Security.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, if the gentlewoman would yield, I just want to say that I come in support of preserving American agriculture, because generally in this Congress, in this Nation, it is not a partisan issue. I say this with some emotion, because we have a serious challenge facing traditional agriculture in the United States.

Other countries are doing everything they can to protect their farmers. We have been somewhat carefree in saying we should go to a market system and therefore, it is up to whatever the market might bear on American farmers. That is fine if the, if you will, playing field were level, but if other countries are going to subsidize their farmers to protect their farmers, that becomes an ultimate competitive disadvantage to our farmers, and then we have to be more aggressive in making sure that we preserve our agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleagues allowing me to interrupt.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments from the distinguished Member from the State of Michigan.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Again, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's leadership in this area and for providing this forum for us to urge the House and the leadership of the House to act.

I think we all recognize that there is an emergency. We all acknowledge that our farmers are very important to us. We all acknowledge that they provide the basics for life, food and fiber, and we know they are suffering. In fact, there is a farm resource center which is a national crisis line for farmers where they call to get help. However, when the farmers call, the line is busy because so many farmers are calling for help. And this Congress also shows a busy signal. We are not listening to our farmers.

I share the observations of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) who said there is a level of frustration and a belief that we are insensitive to their plight. I urge this Congress, I cannot beg any more severely than I know how, that our farmers are hurting, they are hurting. It will be too late to wait until they go out of business to help them. We want to help them to be viable farmers, vigorous, profitable people who can make a contribution.

Farmers do not want to be dependent on the United States; however, they would like to think that the government understands their value in this economy. They would like to think that their government has not turned their back on them. They would like to think that they can prosper in this robust economy, which they are not. All they are asking, all the President has asked is for $1.1 billion to speak to the credit crisis, a credit crisis that will speak to the current need.

Now, I want to tell my colleagues there is a credit crisis even more severe than the current need, and later on I certainly will be considering again a credit provision in the legislation that would speak to some of the disadvantages written into the 1996 farm bill that denies people a second chance, denies that they might have been in a disastrous area, denies them having an opportunity for a direct operational loan, and also to amend the shared appreciation agreement. Those are structural things that we need to do.

But the emergency, the emergency is now, and in fact I was told earlier this morning this is the 62nd day, I say to

my colleagues, that this has been on the floor. The House passed it, the Senate passed it. We just cannot get together. So I want to urge Members of Congress who care about farmers, but if they do not care about farmers, just care about themselves, care about being able to have available food, quality food at an affordable price. These farmers provide that for us. The consumers are interdependent on the survivability of farm families and farm communities. We are one Nation, and food adds to our national security. So we should not be misled.

This is not something we can put under the rug; this is not something we can ignore. Everyday we ignore it, we ignore it at our peril. Certainly our farmers are going under, but we are tied to them, and to the extent we understand that, we would have a chorus of people crying out, saying help our farmers, because when we help our farmers, we help ourselves and we help our Nation.

Again, I say to the gentleman, I just appreciate his leadership and allowing us to cry out to say we really need this emergency supplemental and we need it now. We do not need it 2 months from now. Planting time is going on right now.

I can tell my colleagues, the census was taken recently, the farm census, and in 1997 they found out from a 5-year period in North Carolina, and North Carolina may be handling this crisis a little better than some, but over a 5-year period we were losing one farm per day. That has nothing to do with the suppression and the depression of prices. Add that to the mix.

Then we begin to understand the severity of the problem of big farmers, small farmers, family farmers, individual farmers, young farmers, old farmers, black farmers, minority farmers. All of them are suffering, and to the extent that we can understand that we are tied to their survival or the lack thereof, I think we would be incensed. There is a time when we should be outraged at something, and I am trying to build that outrage in this Congress that we ought to all join together and make sure we have an opportunity to respond.

This is truly a crisis; it is a crisis, it is an emergency. It is truly an emergency. We should treat it as an emergency. We do not just say it in words, we act it out. We say we love our farmers. Well, where is the proof of that? And if it is an emergency, why are we talking about an offset? Why are we putting this emergency behind all of the other emergencies? Now, truly our military and our national defense is an emergency, but I do think that farmers should, which was already on a schedule, should now be set aside for this. We can do both. We have the capacity to respond to both of those. We are not limited. The only thing we are limited by is our political will. The only thing we are limited by is our vision of how we are so tied together.

So I cannot urge my colleagues strongly enough that this is indeed a serious matter and we are all tied to this. Not just those of us who live in rural areas, but our national security is tied to our ability for our farmers to grow and produce very basic food and fiber that they do so well, not only for this country but much of the world.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina, not only for her remarks but for her great leadership as the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Government Operations of the Committee on Agriculture.

I now yield to the distinguished gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY).

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I would echo the comments so ably made in the course of this Special Order about the crisis in agriculture. The crisis is a deep, threatening crisis that will in North Dakota cause more families to leave their farms in search of other work than we have seen in many, many years. I have with me just some photocopies of auction bills.

We are seeing an awful lot of these auction bills, and for those not from farm country, they may not realize that each of these represents the end of a family tradition, heritage, history. Farms that have been in the land and under constant cultivation for more than the last 100 years, farms continuously held by families since the prairie on the Northern Plains was broken, now going under because of inadequate prices, because of a farm program that is not working anywhere near what was promised when it was passed in the 104th Congress. As a result, as a result of the loss of profitability in agriculture, we do not just have people selling out, we have other people knocking on the door of their banks for credit and being turned away.

Now, the funds that are at issue for agriculture lending, that we so critically need in this supplemental appropriation, are required because they are available to guarantee credit privately offered through banks to farmers, as per the Federal programs to provide that kind of credit guarantee, keep the credit available for farmers, or funds directly lent by the farm service agency itself, the lender of last resort for farmers. Well, believe me, this is the last resort, and that is why they are calling, calling to the tune of 150 a week.

In fact, the statistics from the U.S. Department of Agriculture are that they have received more than 8,000 loan applications since the supplemental request for additional loan money was sent up to Congress on February 26, 62 days ago.

Our new Speaker, DENNIS HASTERT, is from Illinois. He knows agriculture. They have an awful lot of agriculture in Illinois. He knows one thing, that between now and February 26 when this first request came up, that has been planting season, a very critical time in a farmer's year. You go to the bank and get the loan, the operating loan. With that loan you buy seed, fertilizer, gas for the tractor. You go and put in the crop, but you can only put in the crop if you get the essential operating capital for the beginning of the crop year. What happens if Congress continues to wait, if Speaker Hastert continues to fail to lead, to bring this bill to the floor so we can get the money out there, is the window will close.

I represent North Dakota. It has one of the latest planting periods in the country because of our northern location, and yet even in North Dakota we are seeing the window come perilously close to shutting altogether because we have failed to act on this supplemental.

□ 1430

I cannot think of a more heedless, tone-deaf signal for the Congress to send to the farmers of this country than to dilly-dally around, play politics, wring our hands so piously during our trips back to the district during the weekend about our concern for farmers, but fail to pass the essential operating loan money they need until after the period has passed and they can no longer get their crops in the ground.

That would really be the limit. Unfortunately, we are reaching the edge of that limit by Congress' failure to bring up the agriculture appropriations supplemental. We are putting farmers, individual families that have farmed for generations, in the circumstance where, even as the clock is tolling relative to making essential spring planting decisions, they do not even know whether they will have the financing capital.

I cannot think of a more cruel hoax to play for farmers, dangling the prospect out there that we will be there to help them, but then somehow getting too politically distracted in our own internal partisan warfare that seems to have taken on its own reality, irrespective of the real needs of this country and the people we represent.

I ask the gentleman from Illinois (Speaker HASTERT), I hope the gentleman is listening, because he owes this body more, he owes our Nation's farmers more. When the gentleman fails to lead, others take over. The way others are running this place, they are not responding to the very real needs of the American people that we represent, and in this case, the needs of the American farmer, farmers that the Speaker knows very well because of his long, distinguished representation of the State of Illinois.

I cannot for the life of me understand what is going on in the Speaker's mind to let this situation linger and to leave our farmers in this kind of predicament.

I have now heard that they are seriously considering bringing funding for the Kosovo campaign to the floor without addressing the needs of our farms.

I think that, without question, the NATO involvement, the expense of U.S. participation in the NATO involvement is a legitimate exercise and obviously requires additional financial support, appropriately passed on an emergency basis.

But this crisis halfway around the world is no more important in the scheme of things to our country than the crisis right here at home on our farms. To leave the plight of our farmers behind as we respond to situations across the world would be the absolute height of foolishness.

I would implore majority leadership to think again and not address Kosovo without addressing our farmers. On April 26 of this year we sent a letter to the Speaker, signed by almost 30 members of both political parties, urging the action on the agriculture supplemental appropriations.

This is a bipartisan appeal from farm country, Mr. Speaker, so that the Speaker might be able to bring up the appropriations so desperately needed by our farmers. Do not leave our farmers out, even while we respond to situations halfway across the world.

I would be happy to entertain a dialogue with the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY), a further discussion on the critical need facing our farmers and why Congress has to act now.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from North Dakota, and I appreciate the comments he just made. Certainly all of us that represent major agriculture-producing areas are mystified by the actions of the Speaker and the Republican leaders on this matter, and hopefully very soon this will be resolved. It is so irresponsible for us to leave America's farmers twisting in the wind while we play partisan politics.

Mr. POMEROY. If the gentleman will yield further, Mr. Speaker, these loan applications have been mounting in the FSA offices in counties across North Dakota. Farmers turn away from their banker, come in to FSA, put in the application, and they evaluate whether the application is creditworthy or not. We cannot make loans that are not creditworthy, but so often the case is they are creditworthy loans that should be financed if the loan money was available.

We now have stockpiled, in other words, applications filed that cannot be funded, $45 million worth of loan requests. If the gentleman wants to calculate how many farmers are waiting, holding their breath, not knowing whether they will be in the field or selling out in just a month, we just have to figure how many loans, how many farmers can be served by $45 million.

Farming is an expensive business, but there are a whole lot of operating loans represented in that size of capital, and that is just North Dakota alone. Across the country, they reckon that this $1.1 billion in additional lending authority that funding the agriculture supplemental will make available will be literally thousands, thousands of family farmers that are either reduced to auction sales, or on with the business of farming, the business that is their profession, the business that has been their family's heritage. That is really what it all comes down to.

Sometimes I think that we get so wrapped up, and in fact, the venal partisanship of this place has absolutely taken over our ability to see reality anymore, and we spend all our time thinking about how we can jam the other side and utterly quit thinking about what ought to be job one for us, and that is serving the interests of the people that elected us to these offices.

There is nothing Republican or Democrat about a farmer being able to get the loan money they need to get in the field. There is not a Republican ideology or a Democrat ideology on this loan request, this funding request sent up by Secretary Glickman in February that would make this funding available for these farm loans.

Why in the world one would take the plight of family farmers and put them in the middle of this vicious, disgusting, unworthy partisan contest is beyond me.

But I will tell the Members this, the gentleman from Illinois (Speaker HASTERT) owes us better. He is the Speaker. He is the leader of this Chamber. He is the leader of the Republican Party, not the majority whip. It is time for this Speaker to stand up and be counted. It is time for this Speaker to lead, and to lead on behalf of the farmers that are in his State of Illinois and in my State of North Dakota and the gentleman's State of Arkansas and all across this country.

Until he does that, every day the planting deadlines are passing for some farmers in more southern latitudes than North Dakota, and if we do not act soon, it is going to be too late for all of us.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from North Dakota knows, I am a farmer myself. There is not a more frustrating time than in the springtime when you cannot get in the field. To be in a position where you have the weather to plant but you cannot plant because you have not got a production loan is the most frustrating situation that a farmer can be in.

I think that for us to allow them to twist in the wind, not be responsive, not fulfill the obligation that this body has to react and take care of the business of the country is highly irresponsible.

As it was just mentioned by our colleague, the gentleman from Texas, it is no wonder that the American people question how responsible the Congress is, because we do things like this.

Mr. POMEROY. If the gentleman will continue to yield, Mr. Speaker, I wish some of the Members that have worked so hard to keep this from coming to the floor would have their own paychecks in the same kind of uncertainty that we have placed these farmers.

I wish they would get up in the morning, sit at the breakfast table drinking coffee with their wives, not knowing whether or not they would be able to get a crop in the field in a few weeks, whether or not they would have their job, whether or not they would be able to provide for their family.

Maybe then some of these Members that are working so hard to ignore the plight of our farmers in favor of partisan games, if they had the same kinds of uncertainties our farmers were dealing with, they would not be quite so cavalier.

Because what we are doing to people is absolutely cruel. We have got people that will not know, they cannot know today whether or not they will be able to keep this farm going, the farm that has not just been their life's work, but was their daddy's before that and their granddaddy's before that; literally generations of family tradition resulting in the livelihood for these farmers, the way they provide for their families and put shoes on their kids' feet, and they do not even know whether they will be able to keep at it one more growing season because this Congress is playing party politics instead of kicking out the loan money as requested by Secretary Glickman. I simply do not understand it.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Dakota, and yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, it sounds like we might have been a little critical of the Speaker and the leadership in the House today. We have. I always believe if we are going to be critical, we ought to offer a suggestion of what should be done. Let me make one observation of what I think should be done. It should have been done today, but we cannot do it today. We are out until next Tuesday.

Next Tuesday, Mr. Speaker, I hope that the Speaker would see fit to bring the Kosovo $6 billion emergency request from the administration to the floor of the House. It is an emergency, and a legitimate one.

I would like to see the Speaker bring the Central American emergency funds in that same package. I would like to see the Speaker include the agricultural fund in that same package, and give this body an opportunity to vote on those as emergency spending, which they are, under the Rules of the House which we agreed to in the 1997 budget agreement.

There is an additional request now for defense funds that I am supportive of, but not as an emergency. I think they ought to be considered in the due process of the appropriations process for this year, but if we see fit, because there might be a need to do it now, do it now, but do not affect the caps. Allow those to be counted against the caps, whether we do it next Tuesday or not.

That would be just my personal suggestion to the leadership of what could

be done that would resolve this issue, and do it in the way in which it ought to be done. Any other spending other than those associated with the agriculture request should not be declared an emergency.

I would again point out that those of us who supported the Blue Dog budget, the majority of Democrats, we budget for this. This is not something that will break the budget, as visioned by the Blue Dog and a majority of the Democrats in this House.

That is a suggestion. I hope the Speaker does it next Tuesday, because if we do, hopefully at that point can move quickly and before the end of next week we can resolve this question and avoid further inconveniencing so many family farmers that will be inconvenienced because we have been unable to deal in a rational way with this situation.

If I might, just for a moment, switch subjects and talk about another very important happening this week for agriculture, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY) and I about a year ago requested a meeting with the Vice President of the United States to express our concern of the implementation of the Food Quality Protection Act, something that deals with the technology that is used by our farmers and ranchers that allows us to always say to the American people and to the world that, are we not blessed to live in a country that has the most abundant food supply, the best quality of food, the safest food supply to our people at the lowest cost of any other country in the world? And we do this because of the utilization of technology.

In our visit with the Vice President, we pointed out that there were some at EPA that were interpreting the law as passed by the Congress in ways that was going to be very detrimental to production agriculture. He agreed, and for the last year we have seen continuous improvement. We have seen EPA and USDA begin to work together, which the Vice President suggested should be done.

It is amazing to me that we would have to have a Vice President of the United States instructing two agencies of the United States government to work together. But he did, they did, they are, and it is working.

There was a track committee put together, a committee of about 54 men and women, producers, chemical companies, environmentalists, consumers, all who have a vested interest in seeing that these decisions are made based on sound science and in the best interests of consumers. This committee has been working until last week, when for some strange reason the environmental community and the consumer community decided to pull out of the discussion.

I encourage them to come back to the table, come back to the table and continue to do as they were doing over the last year, working in a constructive way in order that we might in fact continue to have this most abundant, safe food supply.

Please, do not be, as some are accusing you of, of saying because you cannot have your way, I am going to take my bat and ball and go home. Please come back to the table. Please come back to the discussions, and let us make sure that all decisions, though, are based on sound science, not on an individual interpretation of what is good and bad.

There are those among us who believe that pesticides, those things that kill insects, should not be used because if used improperly, they will kill humans. Everyone agrees to that. But everyone does not agree that we ought to eliminate pesticides, because if we would eliminate the technology, we would not have the best-fed Nation. In fact, we would have a starving world in a very short period of time.

One of the things the Vice President instructed us all to do is to have these discussions in the open, in sunshine, in transparency, as the word is called. Let everyone present their views.

This seems to be what is bugging some folks in the environmental community. They do not want to have to honestly debate their views with others in the scientific community who may have a different view.

□ 1445

I know the gentleman from Arkansas has been a real leader in this effort, for which I have commended him. I was glad to work with him all of last year, and I know he shares this frustration. But it is something that we need to talk about over and over and as openly as we can to make sure that more of the American people understand we cannot have this abundant food supply without using technology.

Both the gentleman from Arkansas and I are farmers in real life. We do not wish to use any product that will do harm to ourselves, our families, those who work for us, and certainly not to those who consume the products which we produce. It is in our best interest that we use sound science.

We were making great progress. I do not understand why some now decide that they do not want to even play anymore, but I hope that they will reconsider that decision. If not, then I certainly hope that the process will go forward without them. But if it goes forward without them, it will not work nearly as smoothly and good for the Nation as a whole as if they come back to the table and work together.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman once again and thank him for his leadership and the great wisdom he brings to this body and the always thoughtful suggestions and effort that he makes.

I would like now to read a statement from our colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MINGE). He says: ''I rise today to highlight the long delay in passing the emergency supplemental funding for the Farm Service Agency lending programs and FSA staffing budget.

''This is truly an emergency in every sense of the word. Tracy Beckman, FSA Director in the State of Minnesota, has told me that he will be forced to lay off FSA employees because of the delay in passing the emergency supplemental. The demand for loans and other FSA services is skyrocketing because of the commercial banks' concern about declining farm incomes. Many producers are having a difficult time securing private sector operating loans. FSA has to step in to fill the gap with guaranteed and direct loans to producers. Demands for loans this year is up 75 percent from a year ago, the Secretary of Agriculture tells me.

''Minnesota FSA will approve more loan applications by the end of the fiscal year than they have funding. If this supplemental is not approved, they will be unable to deliver the funds to the farmers because their accounts can have run dry. Planting season has arrived, and those farmers without operating loans are going to be left high and dry.

''Mr. Speaker, now is the time to approve these truly emergency funds. We must not delay action on this matter because of disputes between Congress and the White House on other matters. The supplemental bill threatens to be bogged down with millions of nonemergency spending, and I worry that this may sink the ship.

''The President requested $6 billion to fund the air campaign against Yugoslavia. Some on the other side of the aisle want to pass as much as $20 billion. The Senate majority leader suggested $10 or $11 billion. I do not understand how funds the administration has not even requested could be remotely considered emergency spending. We must remember these are Social Security funds that we are spending. If we are going to continue to claim to be fiscally responsible, we must be honest with ourselves about what is emergency funding and what is desirable funding. Whatever happened to not opening the Social Security lock box unless it is an absolute emergency?

''I propose that we develop and pass in the shortest possible time frame a freestanding emergency agriculture spending bill to provide critical guaranteed and direct operating loans that our farmers need to get into the field and the FSA staff to deliver these programs. These are truly emergency funding needs. We must move forward with a clean bill for agriculture now, and not hold hostage these funds for America's farmers in a raid on the Social Security Trust Fund to benefit nonemergency defense spending.''

That is the statement from our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. DAVID MINGE), and I know that he has great concern for America's farmers and for the future of American agriculture.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would just once again make the plea to the Speaker to let this legislation move forward

and treat America's farmers fairly. America's farmers are very resilient. They have great capacity for hard work to overcome obstacles and to achieve greatness. There has never been a producer of anything in this world that is as successful as the American farmer. They have done such an outstanding job that we take them for granted. They are the golden goose of America's economy and we should be very careful how we take care of it.

In conclusion, I would also want to thank Secretary Dan Glickman at the Department of Agriculture for the great job he has done in every possible way to deal with this emergency situation and, at the same time, make available as many funds as he can to serve this program. I think it is a shameful thing that we have allowed partisan politics to bring us to this point, and I urge the Speaker to allow this legislation to move forward.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

MILITARY AND DIPLOMATIC OPTIONS WITH REGARD TO YUGOSLAVIA

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I addressed the House earlier. I had about 15 minutes of things to say and lacked the conciseness and brevity to put it into a 5-minute speech. I guess the next thing to the capacity to brevity is to have a good friend who is willing to yield time.

If I may inquire as to the level of generosity of my friend, how much time is remaining, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOSELLA). The gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY) has approximately 20 minutes remaining.

Mr. SHERMAN. If I can inquire of the Chair, is it necessary that Mr. Berry remain standing through my speech or can that be waived through unanimous consent?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is necessary for the gentleman to remain on his feet.

Mr. SHERMAN. Well, then, perhaps brevity is called for, and I thank the gentleman. I did not realize the imposition involved.

Mr. Speaker, earlier today I stated that we have to reflect on the votes of yesterday, where by a 2-to-1 majority we voted against a unilateral withdrawal. But this was not a ringing endorsement of our current military or diplomatic strategy with regard to Yugoslavia nor is it a call for the introduction of NATO ground troops; rather, it is important that we come up with additional options. I have a few that I believe deserve to be considered, and I thank the gentleman from Arkansas for giving me the opportunity to present them to this House.

The first of these involves training, though not necessarily arming the Albanians, both those who are citizens of Albania and wish to fight for their brethren and the Kosovar refugees who have escaped from Kosovo.

Now, there are objections to this strategy. They point out that there is an arms embargo with regard to the nation of Yugoslavia. But this arms embargo would not be violated if we simply provided training while Americans retained custody of the weapons.

Second, the idea of just arming the Kosovars with the idea that we would just open up a box and distribute rifles does not create an army capable of defeating Milosevic. In fact, the KLA already has plenty of rifles from a variety of sources.

Now, I am not saying that the time has come to turn over custody of artillery and tanks to the Albanians. But if Milosevic knew that we were training an Albanian force to use heavy weapons, then he would know that he was up against not only the NATO air armada, not only a ragtag band of lightly armed KLA guerillas, but would also know that soon we would be able to unleash a force of heavily armed Albanians.

Second, I think it is important that we look at our diplomatic strategy and posturing. At this point we seem too tied to the intense vilification of Milosevic. And it is indeed tempting, for he is indeed evil. But let us keep in mind that we have to do business with evil men.

The Government of China sent its emissary to this Capitol just a few weeks ago. That government is responsible for more deaths than all the Albanians that have ever been alive anywhere since the days of the ancient Eridians. Saddam Hussein, a man with much blood on his hands, has not been deposed by the United States and we have had to reach an accommodation with him. Those who say that our objective should be to remove Milosevic should contemplate the casualties involved in sending American ground troops not only into Kosovo but into Serbia.

Mr. Speaker, our colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CURT WELDON), is leading a group to Vienna, and we should praise those efforts, because he is going to reach out to members of the Russian Duma in an effort to enlist Russian support for a negotiated peace. We should remember that negotiation involves give and take.

All too often we focus on the results of World War II. Glorious as they were, they are not typical. In fact, only one of our foreign wars ended with the unconditional surrender of our adversary. And for us to expect an unconditional surrender of Serbia, whether it is the unconditional surrender of its Kosovo province and all parts of it, or whether it is the surrender of that government and the occupation of all of Serbia, this should not be the expected result nor is it the necessary result.

I would suggest, and I have suggested this not only to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) but several others who are traveling with him, that we propose to the Russians that there be two zones in Kosovo and two separate peacekeeping forces. One zone would be along the border between Kosovo and Serbia and Kosovo and Montenegro and would be patrolled exclusively by Russian peacekeepers.

This area Serbia would know they would retain rights with regard to. And this area should include the ancient battlefield of Kosovo Polyea, the famous monastery to the south of Pristina, the City of Pec, which was the original site of the Serbian Orthodox Church, and other lands of critical significance to the Serb nation.

The remaining, I would suspect 70 to 80 percent of Kosovo, would be subject to NATO occupation, a NATO peacekeeping force, and in this area the Albanian Kosovars would live in security and could return from their refugee status.

If we propose this, Milosevic then has a reason to deal. Because instead of proposing that he lose all rights in Kosovo, we are proposing that he retains rights that he might otherwise lose if he continues to battle us and our Albanian allies in the year to come.

At the same time, we should work toward any acceptable peace. And an acceptable peace is one that is workable, and where the Kosovars are able to return to Kosovo, or any reasonable part thereof, to live in peace and security and, knowing the generosity of the American and European people, with the aid and trade concessions they need to live prosperous as well as secure lives.

☐ 1500

Mr. HILL of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BERRY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HILL of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arkansas for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, when I am home traveling in my district and talking to farmers in southern Indiana about this farm crisis that we are in, they always tell me that they do not want any handouts. What they do tell me is they want access to credit.

I think it is just common sense to provide farmers access to enough credit so they can plant their crops, market their products, and pay their bills. It does not make any sense to me that this has not been a higher priority for this Congress. Every day families across the country are losing their farms. I am especially concerned that this crisis is taking a hard toll on our next generation of farmers.

I think it is important that the American people understand how great the need is in rural America for this emergency money. The situation in my home State of Indiana is not encouraging. For one thing, many of our loan programs in Indiana are exhausted, or close to it anyway. Our direct operating loan money is, for the most part, exhausted. We are completely all out of guaranteed farm ownership loans. We are short nearly $800,000 for beginning and non-beginning direct farm ownership loans.

On March 23, the House of Representatives passed a supplemental appropriations bill that included much needed emergency credit for farmers across this country. I was one of the few Members of my own party to vote for the bill. Two days later, the Senate passed the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations bill and asked for a conference committee to come together to work out the differences of the House and Senate bills.

It was only on April 22, almost a month later, that the House leadership agreed to send the emergency bill to conference committee and appoint conferees. In the meantime, farmers in Indiana and all across this country have been waiting for this emergency money.

Many farmers have not been able to begin spring planting, while others have been forced to sell the family farm. While the farmers have been waiting, Secretary of Agriculture Glickman has been transferring money from different USDA accounts in an attempt to give the States more access to credit for farmers.

Without the supplemental appropriations to restore to these accounts we have been borrowing from, we are facing layoffs and furloughs at FSA offices. We have had even to borrow money from FSA salary accounts. As a last resort, more and more farmers are being forced to appeal to their local FSA offices for financial assistance, and demand for farm loans has increased by 62 percent over the last year.

So today I urge the leadership to act on the supplemental bill that this body passed over a month ago. I am truly concerned about Hoosier farmers. It is difficult for me to see this many farmers in need of access to credit. Indiana farmers need our help.

Every weekend I go back to Indiana to visit with my constituents, and many times my constituents are farmers. I have a lot of them in my district. And each time that I go back, I ask these farmers whether or not, in their view, they believe that a young man or woman in this country can on their own become a farmer, and each and every time all the farmers say no.

Now, there have been many speakers before me talking about the farm crisis, but this is a farm tragedy, to think that a young man or woman in this country could not fulfill their dream of becoming a farmer. I know of no other business, no other industry where this is true.

So today is the day we must start to begin to help the family farmer.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Indiana for his comments in support of America's farmers and his leadership in this area.

TRAVEL-TOURISM WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RYAN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my colleague today. I know how proud his mother must be as he ascends in the chair of the United States Congress in his first term. I am sure the people of Wisconsin are indeed fortunate and proud to have him representing them. And I salute him as he leads this Chamber today during our Special Orders.

Our Special Order today is designed to highlight Travel and Tourism Week, May 2 through May 8. Wednesday, May 5, is Tourist Appreciation Day; and in honor of this day there is a reception being held in the Longworth cafeteria from 5:30 to 8:30 p.m.

Why are we focusing on travel and tourism today? Well, my colleagues, it is vitally important to the economic mission, if you will, of all Floridians and all Americans. We have a lot to boast about when we think of the great resources around our country that people from all over the world come to each and every day. And some of us take those, frankly, for granted.

So I wanted to illuminate some of the things that are occurring in Florida's 16th District, talk about some of the revenues derived from tourism, and talk also as well about some of the significant sites in my district. Florida's 16th Congressional District has over $1 billion in travel expenditures annually. Over 16,000 people are employed in the travel business in the 16th District, earning a total of $236 million.

Restaurants, one of which I started, in 1980 I started the Lettuce Patch Restaurant, a small family restaurant, with my parents, and we began to develop a network of friends and customers. Well, 1999 has been designated the Year of the Restaurant by the Commerce Department.

Nationwide, international travelers spend more than $97 billion dining out in restaurants around America. Restaurants are the leading source of travel industry jobs in the United States. 47.8 million foreign travelers visited the United States in 1997, 47.8 million foreign visitors, a tremendous impact on both employment, economic opportunity, and job development. In fact, the restaurants have been leading the way in providing substantial jobs for those that are moving from welfare to work.

In fact, my first job in life was in a restaurant. I was a dishwasher in a small restaurant in Lake Worth, Florida. I obviously had to attend that job on a regular schedule basis. I learned the value of hard work, and I realized how hard it was to manage a small business. I learned what the impact of regulation was on taxes, on, if you will, customer preference.

So I got a huge experience at the age of 14 in my first job as a dishwasher, which then led me to start my own business, started the restaurant, as I said. And I said earlier it was 1980. It was actually 1975. But it taught me an entrepreneurial spirit. So the restaurant industry is, of course, alive and well and thriving throughout America's cities.

Projections for 1999. Travel and tourism contributes a total of $70 billion in Federal, State, and local tax revenue. $70 billion in Federal, State, and local tax revenue. Travel and tourism will represent 12 percent of the gross domestic product of the United States.

The United States' travel and tourism will have a trade surplus of $24.7 billion. Travel and tourism will support more than 7 million people in direct jobs and nearly $128 billion in payroll each year. Let me repeat that. Travel and tourism will support more than 7 million people in direct jobs and nearly 128 billion in payroll dollars each year. Travel and tourism was the United States' leading service export and third largest export overall.

Now, when we talk about travel and tourism, we do not just talk about restaurants, we talk about transportation. In 1997, airline passenger traffic increased 4.6 percent to top 605 million passenger miles. Amtrak passenger traffic grew to reach 5.2 billion passenger miles.

Now, one of the things I like to boast about and why I am proud of the 16th District is the vast array of assets that we have to entice people to come to Florida. One is significant because it is a national park. It is the Everglades National Park, managed by our National Park Service.

The Everglades National Park is the largest remaining subtropical wilderness in the continental United States, and has extensive fresh and salt water areas, open everglades prairies and mangrove forests. It has abundant wildlife, includes rare and colorful birds. And this is the only place in the world where alligators and crocodiles exist side-by-side.

The park is 1,506,539 acres or 606,688 hectares in size. It is a World Heritage site, an international biosphere reserve, and a wetland of international significance.

Now, obviously, people come from around the world to see Everglades National Park. But it also has a dual purpose. It not only is a national park, it is also the reservoir for water to supply South Floridians with the vital need of fresh, clean, clear drinking water. The park acts as an ecosystem. It is a natural refuge, as I mentioned, for birds and animals, but also for the sustenance of life in South Florida.

Now, program activities include ranger-led walks and talks, the boat tours, tram tours. But, most significantly, it is the educational programs that are arranged. The Everglades National Park sponsors on-site curriculum-based education programs for local fourth, fifth, and sixth graders. Participation in these programs is by advance reservation, and teachers are required to attend training workshops

before their classes are allowed to be admitted to the park. So it serves vital resources, tourist education and, obviously, clean and clear and abundant water.

The main park is 38 miles of road winding from the entrance to Flamingo. U.S. 41 leads to the Shark Valley entrance, and U.S. 29 leads to the Gulf Coast Visitor Center. Parking is available for buses at all visitor centers.

Now, this is a national park in which we are all vitally interested. In fact, this Congress has appropriated more money than any Congress in the past in order to provide and make certain that the Everglades National Park remains a vital, important national treasure.

I know every Member of Congress can talk about travel and tourism in their district, as well. I would like to show, in fact, a picture painted by my mother of the Jupiter Lighthouse. This is in my district. This, of course, is a rendering of one of the most historic sites in Palm Beach County.

And of course Jupiter, in the northern part of my district, is clearly proud of its lighthouse and, obviously, its history. But this is one I am proudly displaying in my office. In fact, many people comment as they come from our community how impressed they are with the painting. And I am thankful to my mother, clearly, for doing it for me. But most importantly, it represents something that most people when they come to our Nation's Capital can look at and admire and reflect on the fact that they just recently arrived from Florida, and they can see something that relates back to my district that they can enjoy and talk about.

The Jupiter Lighthouse was constructed in 1853 under the administration of President Franklin Pierce, and he appropriated at that time the sum of $25,000 for the building of the lighthouse at Jupiter Inlet. It was designed by Lieutenant George Gordon Meade, who later gained fame as the general in command of the victorious Union forces at the battle of Gettysburg.

The site was selected and the materials brought in in 1854. And of course it served as clearly an indication for navigational traffic, to make certain that they would arrive safely into the Jupiter Inlet at the time. And so this was one of our first vitally important public works projects by the Nation, but now is the oldest structure in Palm Beach County, and it is listed on the Natural Register of Historic Places. The lighthouse is maintained by the Florida History Center and Museum in cooperation with the United States Coast Guard.

So those are just a few of the places that exist in Florida that are, of course, vitally important, and we have many, many others.

Mr. Speaker, I see a friend approaching who would certainly like to speak, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN), the chairman; and I would be delighted to yield to the chairman to talk about travel and tourism in his State.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Florida yielding.

Let me just say, as chairman of the Committee on Public Lands and National Parks, I cannot believe how much people love parks. I tell my friend from Florida, there was a survey done recently on what the American people like the very most about America or the United States Government, and the thing that came out number one was the national parks. People love our parks. In fact, they love them to death.

And does my colleague know what they love the least? Maybe I should not even bring this up. It was the Internal Revenue Service.

Be that as it may, I am glad to join with my friend here and talk about the economic effects of many visitors who come to Utah for business and pleasure. And it is very substantial.

In Utah we have five national parks: Zion, Bryce, Capitol Reef, Canyonlands and Arches. We have seven national monuments: Cedar Breaks, Rainbow Bridge, Dinosaur, Natural Bridges, Hovenweep, Timpanogas Cave, and on September 16, 1998, the President of the United States gave us one that we really did not want very badly but we have it now, and it is called the Grand Staircase Escalante.

In addition to that, we have the Glen Canyon National Recreation Area, known as Lake Powell, and the Golden Spike National Historic Site, one of the most beautiful areas that we have in the West.

These scenic, cultural, and historic sites draw thousands of visitors to Utah each year to absorb and enjoy the wondrous lessons, stories, and inspiration to be gained from these special places.

□ 1515

The same can be said of the thousands of acres of public lands in Utah's national forests and those administered by the Bureau of Land Management. As these visitors seek out great destinations in Utah's public lands, there is a group of professional service providers in most of the units of the national park system to meet their necessary and appropriate needs.

My thanks go to these dedicated people who work at our several parks and the concession companies who work so diligently doing it. They provide the food, the laundry and the transportation, souvenirs and equipment rentals. Every day there are meetings, talking with and assisting the visitors to enjoy a more comfortable and safe experience. The park concessionaires are a vital cog in the network of those who make travel and tourism a major part of the Utah economy.

Many others in the broader area of the hospitality industry serve our national parks as well as other networks. It is fun, as the chairman of the Subcommittee Committee on National Parks, to go into the parks of America, like going into Yellowstone, and say, ''What do you like about Yellowstone?'' Some people like the bears, some people like the geysers. Some say, ''I just like the lodge, I like to go to the Old Faithful Lodge or the Lake Lodge or I like to go out on the lake.'' We all have something different we see in these areas. But we are so blessed in this country. Teddy Roosevelt was so right, if I may say so, when he established those. I guess I kind of zero in on those because so many, many people go to the parks of America.

Frankly, if I may say so, the parks are the best deal in America. In 1915 they could go to Yellowstone Park and drive their old Model A or Model T in there and it cost them $10. In 1996 the cost of taking a car into Yellowstone was $10. As you know, we have traded that up just a tad, and now they pay a few more dollars for it. It is funny how many people will write me and say, ''Mr. Chairman, we are getting such a good deal, I feel like I have ripped off the public'' and they send money, which I immediately give to the Treasury, I want the gentleman to know. It is interesting to see how many people realize what a good deal they have got. If you take the wife and family out to a show and dinner, you are going to pay a lot more than you would pay to go into our parks.

As we observe National Tourism Week, 1999, I am proud to join with my colleagues in saluting all of those involved with travel and tourism across America, in my home State of Utah and pledge my cooperation to work in continuing the great results that come from this extremely vital part of our economy.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentleman from Utah for his strong and dedicated work on funding our national parks, because that in fact is a real magnet, if you will, for people coming to America. As he clearly stated in his time allocated, that people desperately love to come to see the natural resources that we have to offer. Many of them in their own countries have not prioritized preservation of public lands in order to enhance not only this generation but future generations to come.

The gentleman from Utah has not only been a good steward of those resources but has appropriately given credit to President Teddy Roosevelt for establishing them. I think that is lost on a lot of people. But it took foresight, dedication and, I am sure, perseverance when there were other demands for dollars to be spent to preserve what are then great heritage sites for us that become something that is synonymous with America and represents, I think, the great fabric of our society. I want to commend the gentleman from Utah for that leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA)

who is also another strong advocate of tourism and probably can tell us a number of great sites that are located within the wonderful State of Maryland.

Mrs. MORELLA. I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY) for taking out this special order. I would certainly recognize the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) also for the stewardship he has shown and certainly the leadership that the gentleman from Florida has shown.

I wanted to make sure I came down to the floor of the House to be able to comment to this body about how important travel and tourism is, because every year more than 21 million visitors travel from every part of the country and the far corners of the world to Washington, D.C. The District is the Nation's capital. It is a cultural hub with many fine museums and theaters, and it is home to many fine colleges and universities. These visitors bring economic prosperity to the metropolitan Washington area, creating jobs, income and tax revenues for the local area.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the travel and tourism industry which has long been an important part of the American economy. The industry is the Nation's second largest employer, providing more than 16 million jobs. It is the third largest retail sales industry. In 1998, it generated more than $71 billion in tax revenues for Federal, State and local governments. The travel and tourism industry is diverse and it touches every sector of our society, from business to the arts to education. Dollars that tourists spend trickle down to local communities and benefit the whole U.S. economy.

The good news is that people are traveling at record rates and the industry is proving that it is an economic success story. The travel and tourism industry is often perceived as a collection of separate business industries: the hotel industry, airline industry, the cruise line industry, the car rental industry and the food and beverage industry. Considered as a whole, travel and tourism is an industrial powerhouse. It is critical to the economy of every State in our Nation.

In 1996, travel spending generated nearly 97,000 jobs in my State of Maryland, and nearly $1.9 billion in salaries and wages for Maryland residents. The 97,000 travel-generated jobs comprise 4.4 percent of the total State nonagricultural employment. Domestic and international travelers spent more than $6.4 billion in Maryland during 1996, of which more than $1.2 billion went to the Federal, State and local governments.

Over the past 10 years, world tourism has continued to grow. In 1997, there were 613 million international visitors to the United States. They spent approximately $444 billion. International arrivals to the United States reached 47.8 million in 1997 which was 7.8 percent of the world total.

Next week, and that is May 2nd through 8th, is National Tourism Week. The purpose of National Tourism Week is to celebrate the economic, social and cultural impact of travel and tourism on our Nation. Localities everywhere will celebrate tourism and make efforts to educate local residents on the importance and impact of tourism on their communities.

Mr. Speaker, this is a fitting time to pay tribute to the travel and tourism industry, because the industry is one of the largest in terms of employment. It is first as the Nation's largest export industry, and provides more than 684,000 executive-level positions. Spending by domestic and international travelers last year averaged $1.38 billion a day, which is $57.4 million in an hour, $955,800 a minute, and $15,900 a second. Without a doubt, travel and tourism is a major contributor to the economic well-being of our country.

I am really very pleased to add my voice to the chorus of praise to the travel and tourism industry, which brings a virtual treasure trove of economic opportunity right in our own backyards. I certainly thank the gentleman for his leadership in having us come to the floor of the House and submit statements on behalf of what is being done for our country through travel and tourism.

Mr. FOLEY. I thank the gentlewoman from Maryland.

It is my distinct pleasure to now introduce a gentleman who knows a great deal about travel and tourism, who in fact represents probably one of Florida's most dynamic cities, Orlando, which is the home to a number of large entities who have created, if you will, great opportunities for families to enjoy Florida's great opportunities, Disney, Universal and others, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM) who is from Orlando, chairman of the Subcommittee on Crime, and has been a leading proponent of tourism for Floridians and for all of our American citizens.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY) for having this time today. I want to join with him and the gentlewoman from Maryland who just gave the statistics that are so enlightening about the sheer dollar power of tourism to our Nation, but I can tell you as the representative who does represent, as you said, the number one tourist destination I think in the world, we have Disney World, we have Universal Studios of Florida in my district, we have Sea World, and we have lots of people who come, not just from other parts of the United States but from all over the world. Someone told me once that Brazil produced more than any other single country for tourism of Disney's products that are there and to visit the theme parks.

I think tourism is probably less understood as a business by most Americans than it should be. So this special order time and our Travel and Tourism Caucus that you work so much with and I work with is a very important thing to bring home that message.

And it is an opportunity to thank all of the people who are in the industry. We do not always think of what that industry is. I again hear the statistics rattled off about the dollars involved but there are people involved, people involved in operating those hotels, a tremendous number of hotel rooms, a tremendous number of employees who work very, very hard and contribute mightily to the business of travel and tourism. People who work in the airline industry. We would not get all those people coming here if it were not for the airlines, frankly. People who work with car rental companies. I do not know how many cars we have got but I know there are a lot of them. I remember being told that Orlando has more car rentals than anyplace else, I think, in the country, if I am not mistaken. I know it is very large.

And when we think about tourism, of course, we also immediately think about these theme parks. We have opened up so many new ones down there lately in terms of Disney has expanded, Universal has expanded and Sea World now in Orlando, and that area is about to expand with a new theme park, which will bring more business to central Florida and more business to the United States, probably add more hotel beds. We know they are building more hotel rooms every day. It is the number one industry in our State.

Agriculture, which the gentleman represents a great deal of that, is right there on its heels, has been a traditional source of very great industry to our State. But travel and tourism is indeed the thought that centers on central Florida and our State first and foremost in people's minds, again as a place to go to visit, as a place to go to have a good time.

But I think today we are more importantly saying thank you to the people who are employed in those industries, who develop and create them, who work them and who produce the economic engine that is so important to lots of other people whose jobs depend on that, who are not themselves maybe employed by the particular theme park or by the hotel or by the airline or by the car rental company or whomever else, but who would not be able to have these jobs that they have were it not for all the people who are brought into the area, is a tremendous economic engine. Again I am not here to belabor the point, but I could not resist being a part of your special order time, knowing that my home county, my hometown and my district is the number one tourist destination in the country.

Mr. FOLEY. Let me share a personal aside with the gentleman from Florida. When I was in China with Speaker Gingrich a couple of years ago when we were talking about a variety of issues relating to trade and what have you, I

kept trying to explain to them where West Palm Beach, Florida was. It became very difficult. I said West Palm Beach. They were not sure where it was. Finally I decided, I am an hour and a half, two hours south of Disney; they would immediately say, ''Disney World, I know that.'' So it really is well known worldwide.

I think the other thing, if you would comment briefly, was the high-tech side of the business. When you look at the motion picture industry and some of the other things that are going on in your district, I think that speaks to technology, it speaks to enhanced job opportunities for our youth, if the gentleman would take a moment on that.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Absolutely. I thank the gentleman for yielding. The spinoff from this is enormous. You think of jobs, I mentioned earlier, you think of the hotels and so on. But the gentleman is quite right. What is happening in our university, the large University of Central Florida and in our community college, we have programs now that have been developed in order to give opportunities for young people to get into motion picture production, to get into theater, to get into lots of things that are related to the studios and the businesses that are there that we would not otherwise have had, and as a result of that, that in addition has stimulated a lot of high-tech interest in coming to the area.

We have developed a great big technology center in central Florida now with high-tech industries that would not be there if it were not for the climate and the opportunity and the tourism and travel industry presence that was already there to begin with. We have a very large semiconductor manufacturing company there. I probably should not start naming names here of businesses.

We have the Navy, the Army and the Air Force's simulation training and research facilities in Orlando for the entire country. That in turn has spawned a lot of small-tech industries, over 150 small businesses in the last 5 years alone that have come to the region. I am confident this growth in that kind of quality business would not have occurred had it not been for Disney, Universal, Sea World and the tourism industry generally coming to Florida and to central Florida.

There is a synergy that operates around that whole area. We all know, for example, the field of animation, what is happening in that regard. Well, Disney has all these animations, but think about the games that people every day see themselves or have their kids playing on computers. One of the major computer manufacturing concerns, Electronic Arts—I named a company, I guess—came to central Florida, developed, working with a business that arose there, and they are employing people that basically use animation to make those football games and baseball games and sports games that people see played.

Most people have no idea a lot of that gamesmanship is developed in central Florida and a lot of the people they have employed are young people who came there associated with the other industry that is there, the tourism sector, the attractions sector who are involved in theater, animation and so on that go along with those theme parks.

□ 1530

So, Mr. Speaker, my colleague is quite right. It is an elaborate network of job creation and high tech development as a part of that, again a synergy with travel and tourism that most people do not recognize.

Mr. FOLEY. Well, Mr. Speaker, virtually every face you come in contact with in Florida has something to do with travel and tourism, whether you are arriving at Orlando International Airport where you will see the porter or the reservation clerk or the taxicab driver or the bus operator, or as you leave that facility, you encounter somebody at the fuel station, or you get to your hotel and check in.

I think that is the dynamic that is missed on a lot of people, is the sheer job generation, and it is not necessarily that they just work in travel and tourism, but the off shoots from that; as you mentioned, high tech, the things that are occurring.

Because of a transportation system that was originally designed for the tourist industry, the large expansion of the airport which has been very, very successful, it is highly regarded and probably one of the most efficient airports. But that now has spurred, if you will, the high tech side of it because now business executives can fly from around the country right to your hub airport.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield on just the airport, we have seen, for example, we have a travel tourism industry right in downtown Orlando called Church Street Station, and the fact that that night spot, and it is a family type night spot that was generated there a few years ago; the fact that it exists there transformed the entire downtown of Orlando and made it a community that was revived after years of decline, as many inner cities have, so that today we have a marvelous downtown city, and I would welcome people to come visit downtown Orlando, not just go to the theme parks that are out there, and see what we have got to offer. And you now see the businesses like that so that building and construction going on of high rises and office complexes there has just grown, too.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is amazing what things are related, and again most people never think about how travel and tourism, as an industry, produces all of this change, and it has certainly done so in my community.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for joining us today on our special order highlighting Travel and Tourism Week, which is May 2 through the 8.

Now I would like to present to my colleagues the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY), a new Member of Congress. Welcome.

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for giving me the opportunity to share some thoughts with him for Tourism Week.

I represent the most unique district in the United States. I represent the City of Las Vegas. It is the fastest growing community in the United States. I have got the fastest growing school age population, the fastest growing senior population, the fastest growing veterans population. I have got the fastest growing Hispanic population, the fastest growing Asian population, and the fastest growing Jewish population in the United States. The reason that thousands of people, that is, 5,000 new residents a month are pouring into Las Vegas is because of the incredible strength of our economy, and our economy is based on one industry, the tourism industry.

In my home State of Nevada tourism is the very life blood of our economy. We owe our incredible quality of life and our thriving economy to one industry, and that is the tourism industry. More than one-third of our jobs in Nevada, over 315,000, are created by tourism.

In addition to gaming, world class hotels, spectacular entertainment, fine dining, and the wonders of the Valley of Fire, Hoover Dam and the Red Rock Canyon, visitors to Las Vegas have the opportunity to experience the majesty of the Grand Canyon by taking air tours that depart from my district. Without air tours, many of these travelers who come to Las Vegas solely to see the Grand Canyon would never have the opportunity to experience the grandeur of the Grand Canyon due to a disability or some other constraint which would prevent them from viewing the Grand Canyon and enjoying its splendor. Yet the air tour industry could be put out of business if an ill-advised provision of H.R. 1000 is passed. It would force the industry to meet impossible sound standards for no good environmental or esthetic reasons.

I urge the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY) to join me in opposition to this provision so that travelers may continue to enjoy the Grand Canyon from the air, in addition to all the other wonders that my great district has to offer. And I want to thank the gentleman from Florida, and I will be glad to share with him any other thoughts that he would like me to on this issue.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, one thing I think is important to note, the family value of the gentlewoman from Nevada's destination. I understand a lot of families now have great activities in Las Vegas and in Nevada that they can enjoy.

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, as my colleague knows, that is very true, and I grew up in Las Vegas. My family moved there 38 years ago, and I have

two wonderful children that are also growing up in Las Vegas.

When I first moved to town, Las Vegas was a destination where many families did not think of coming. But today I can tell my colleague it is an entirely different environment. We have some of the most magnificent hotels in the world that cater to children, cater to families and have made our community family-friendly, and I can tell my colleague that when it comes to my children, my parents who also live in Las Vegas, when they take the grandchildren for an afternoon, most times they take them to the Las Vegas strip so they can enjoy the many attractions that are designed specifically for children and for families who come to my wonderful community.

Mr. FOLEY. I think that is why it is important today for Members to come out and describe their districts and describe some of the value that the tourism and travel industry plays in their hometown communities because, as the gentlewoman is suggesting, years ago it was known as a destination primarily for gaming, but now it is the site of international conventions dealing with some of the most important issues. It has become very family-friendly and is a great resource for all residents of Nevada who enjoy employment, enjoy economic growth and opportunity and activity.

So it is very appropriate that we signal and salute the variety of sectors of the Nation, if my colleague will, and the 435 districts that make up the great United States of America.

Ms. BERKLEY. Well, as my colleague knows, a very interesting statistic:

In 1900 the census showed that there were 30 residents in the Las Vegas Valley. Now we boast of 1.2 million. It has been a remarkable, remarkable growth area, and that is primarily because our area is for tourism, it is a destination resort area, and the tourism industry has played an incredible and indispensable role in making Las Vegas what it is today. And when we have 30 million visitors a year coming to Las Vegas to enjoy what we have to offer, we invite the rest of the country to come to Las Vegas and enjoy the wonderful scenery that we have, the magnificent hotels that we have. And as my colleague knows, if he comes to the Las Vegas strip he can see pyramids, he can see the City of Paris, he can see the City of Venice, he can see medieval castles and New York, New York, a replica of the City of New York, the City of New Orleans. It is just the most spectacular place.

And I will boast this: Our pyramids, our medieval castles, our City of Paris, our City of Venice, and New York, New York are better than the originals. So I invite my colleague to come out and see it for himself.

Mr. FOLEY. Well, I am indeed tempted to, and I will also tell my colleague she gained national prominence with the opening of the Beloagio, which has probably one of the great art collections that I understand being displayed for the benefit of art lovers as well.

Ms. BERKLEY. Well, if I can share something with my colleague for one half a minute more, Las Vegas has not been known as a cultural Mecca; however, with the addition of the Beloagio Art Museum I can tell him that it has added significantly to our culture. And my own children, who have studied art in school, we took them to the Beloagio Art Museum, and as soon as my children walked into the facility they were able to pick out Monets, Picassos, Renoirs, and they never would have had an opportunity to see these magnificent works of art up close and personal if not for the Beloagio bringing them to our fair city.

So I invite my colleague from Florida to come out and not only see all those other wonderful things, but see a wonderful art collection as well.

Mr. FOLEY. I thank the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY) for joining us today in this special order, and I do want to in conclusion thank a variety of groups that have helped supply some of the critical data that we have shared today.

I want to go over it real quickly again so people understand the, if my colleague will, great economic import of the industries we talk about today:

The travel industry supports 7 million jobs contributing 127.8 billion in payroll expenditures.

The restaurant industry is the leading source of travel industry jobs in the United States.

Employment growth in the travel industry continues to outpace job growth in the overall economy.

During 1997 the industry produced more than 200,000 new tourism jobs.

The travel industry generates more than $70 billion in Federal, State and local tax revenue.

47.8 million foreign travelers visited the United States in 1997, spending $94.2 billion.

Last year visits from international travelers fell 1 percent. This drop represented 627,000 less travelers, 950 million in lost spending and 121 million in lost tax to Federal, State and local governments.

The reason I bring that up is the fact that the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), a Member of Congress who represents the areas of Pebble Beach, and I decided that as former, if my colleague will, employees of the travel and tourism sector, we felt it vitally important to make certain that we remain competitive, that we try and see how we can continue to grow the industry, if my colleague will, again for the sake of providing jobs and opportunity for Americans and for Floridians, as I represent Florida.

The National Restaurant Association and the Travel Industry Association of America and the Travel Business Round Table and other groups have contributed mightily to the presentation, if my colleague will, today, of the statistical data. In fact, it was the Travel Industry Association of America that worked in conjunction with the White House, the 1995 national strategy at the White House Conference on Travel and Tourism, in order to determine exactly what the statistics are, because we want to be able to document for the record the significance of which travel and tourism relates to people's home districts.

And again we have enjoyed being able to present these facts for people as we once again celebrate Travel and Tourism Week, May 2 through the 8, and again I would remind the staff of Members of Congress that on Wednesday, May 5, it is Tourist Appreciation Day, and we will again have a reception in the Longworth cafeteria from 5:30 to 8:30 p.m.

And again I want to thank specifically the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), who has been a leading proponent and advocate of travel and tourism in his district. We are a bipartisan committee. We are an advocate for the travel and tourism industry. We are equally represented by Democrats and Republicans because we recognize that the growth of opportunity and the growth of jobs and the growth of a strong community depends on the many components and parts that make up this unique and great industry.

GETTING TO THE BOTTOM OF ILLEGAL CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, my committee, the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, of which I am chairman over the past 2½ years, has been investigating illegal campaign contributions that came in from a variety of countries around the world. Came in from South America, from Taiwan, from communist China, from Macao, from Indonesia, from Egypt, and on and on, and these illegal campaign contributions came in to the Clinton/Gore Reelection Committee and to the Democrat National Committee.

During the past 2½ years we have been trying, day and night, to get to the bottom of this. We have tried to get people to come forward and testify, we tried to get cooperation from the Justice Department, the White House, but we have been very, very unsuccessful because there seems to have been a stone wall erected by the White House and the Justice Department and other agencies to keep us from getting to the bottom of this.

We have had 121 people, 121 people take the Fifth Amendment or flee the country. That is unparalleled in American history, and I have been here on the floor a number of times talking about this because I think it is unbelievable that foreign governments

should be able to influence our elections and even elect a President. Millions of dollars have come in illegally into the Clinton/Gore campaign and to the Democrat National Committee, and much of that money has been returned because of our investigation.

Now today I rise on a different subject, but it may be related, and that is why it is so troubling to me. The Chinese communists, through people in their government, the head of their military intelligence and the head of their Chinese aerospace industry gave a man named Johnny Chung $300,000 to give, at least in large part, to the Clinton Reelection Committee, and they were not doing it in my opinion for Mr. Clinton's good looks. They obviously had some kind of an agenda. The head of the Chinese military intelligence and the head of the Chinese aerospace industry giving campaign contributions to a candidate for President in this country would lead almost anyone to say there is something amiss here, there is something wrong, and it should be thoroughly investigated.

Mr. Speaker, we just recently found out that at Los Alamos, one of our nuclear research facilities, that they had a man there named Wen Ho Lee who had been there for a long time who is believed to have been involved in espionage.

□ 1545

I am very concerned about some of the statements that have come out of the administration with respect to China's thefts of these U.S. nuclear secrets. Again and again we have seen administration officials all the way up to the President make misleading statements about what they knew and when they knew it. Let me provide you with some examples.

One good example is on March 19, 1999, President Clinton was asked by a reporter, ''Can you assure the American people that under your watch, no valuable secrets were lost?''

The President responded, ''Can I tell you there has been no espionage at the lab since I have been President? I can tell you that no one,''—listen to this—''I can tell you that no one has reported to me that they suspect such a thing has occurred.'' So the President was saying he was totally uninformed. He did not know anything about it.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the President's response about his knowledge of Chinese spying is not only troubling and disingenuous, it is just hard to believe. The Clinton administration, his administration, knew about the full extent of Chinese spying at Los Alamos and Livermore and other laboratories as far back as 1996, over 3 years ago.

Then the National Security Adviser, Sandy Berger, head of the NSC, was briefed about the Chinese spying by the Energy Department's chief of intelligence, a Mr. Notra Trulock. Berger was told that China had stolen W–88 nuclear warhead designs and neutron bomb technology. He was told that a spy might still be passing secrets to China at Los Alamos, our nuclear research facility. He was even told that the theft of neutron bomb data occurred in 1995 under the President's administration.

Let me just tell you that the W–88 warhead is a miniaturized nuclear warhead that can be put on one missile. You can put 10 of these nuclear warheads on one missile so that with one missile you can hit 10 American cities and kill 50 to 60 million American citizens. We have no defense for that right now.

The neutron bomb technology would allow a neutron bomb to be launched on a missile to the United States, and, if it exploded over a major city, it would kill everybody in the city, but the infrastructure would not be damaged, so it would be something an enemy would like to do, protect the infrastructure, the roads, the buildings, and so forth, but kill all the people in it.

At the end of the briefing that Mr. Berger, the head of the National Security Council, received, Trulock referred to a recent intelligence report. In the report a Chinese source, a Chinese spy that spies for us, a Chinese source said that officials inside, inside, China's intelligence service, were boasting about how they had just stolen U.S. nuclear secrets, and how those secrets allowed them to improve their neutron bomb technology.

Now, Mr. Speaker, again in July of 1997, a year before his meeting with President Jiang of Communist China and 21 months before his meeting with Prime Minister Shu of China, Sandy Berger received a second detailed briefing about China's spying, and soon after told the President about the weaknesses at the laboratories at Los Alamos and Livermore, and about the Chinese spying. This was in 1997.

Now, remember, the President just a few weeks ago said that no one had informed him. Yet Sandy Berger, the head of the NSC, did tell him for sure 2 years ago in 1997. Why would the President misspeak? Why would he mislead the American people? I do not know.

Mr. Speaker, in August of 1997, Gary Samore, the senior National Security Council official assigned to the China spy case, received a briefing from Mr. Notra Trulock, who is the head of intelligence security over at the Department of Energy, and immediately after the briefing about this spying, he went to the CIA director and asked the CIA director to seek an alternative analysis about how the Chinese had developed these small nuclear warheads.

So after he had been told they stole this nuclear technology and that spying was going on, he went to the CIA and said, ''Can't you give us a different way they got this technology?''

Why would he do that? Why, when presented with such overwhelming evidence of Chinese espionage, did Gary Samore seek to downplay the significance of the information, asking the CIA to come up with another explanation, other than espionage, about China's advances? We had already gotten some of this information from our intelligence sources over in China.

Mr. Speaker, in May of 1998, Notra Trulock, the Energy Department's director of intelligence, was demoted; he was demoted after he brought this information out, to acting deputy director of Intelligence, after he made a third report to the Energy Department's Inspector General about a steady pattern, a steady pattern of suppression of counterintelligence issues. They did not like what he was saying, so they demoted the guy.

I want to go back just a minute to this briefing that took place about the neutron bomb. The Chinese intelligence source that we have also said that Chinese agents solved a 1988 design problem by coming back to the United States after they had already been involved in espionage in 1995 to steal more secrets. Trulock's April 1996 briefing to Sandy Berger could not have been more detailed and it could not have been more alarming. So the head of the NSC, the man who reports to the President about security issues, was completely informed about this in 1996, in April.

When Paul Redmund, the CIA's chief spy hunter was given a similar briefing from Trulock a few months earlier, he said that China spying, now, get this, China spying was far more damaging to the U.S. national security than Aldrich Ames, who is now serving a prison term for spying, and it would turn out to be as bad as the Rosenbergs, who were put to death because they gave Communist Russia, the Soviet Union, secrets back after World War II.

Mr. Speaker, is it really, really likely that Sandy Berger, the head of the NSC, after hearing such a detailed and alarming picture of Chinese espionage, would not tell the President about it? Yet the President just a few weeks ago said no one brought it to his attention, and this was 3 years ago. If you were the President or if I was the President and our head of National Security did not tell us this, you would fire him. You would have him hung out to dry, because this a national tragedy, a national security issue. Yet the President said he did not know about it just a few weeks ago.

According to the White House, Berger first briefed the President about Chinese spying in July of 1997. So why did the President say he had not been informed about it? He did so after he received a second briefing from Notra Trulock, which, according to Berger, was much more specific than the first.

In addition, according to NSC spokesman David Levy, Berger ''did not detail each and every allegation.''

Why would he not detail each and every allegation? We are talking about spying at one of our foremost nuclear research laboratories and about technology that could endanger every man,

woman and child in the country. Mr. Levy gave this explanation, after being asked if Berger had told the President about the neutron bomb data that was stolen in 1995.

Apparently the White House wants us to believe that Berger only told the President about the W–88 design theft which happened before 1992, which was done under his watch, and left out the theft of the neutron bomb data and China's recent spying at Los Alamos.

Are we to believe that 3 years after the President's national security adviser received his first briefing about this wave of espionage that happened under the President's watch, that he would not have told the President about it? And, after that, how can you believe anything the administration says?

Why does the President, despite all the evidence to the contrary, continue to accept every Chinese denial, not only of spying, but also of illegally funneling money to the Clinton-Gore reelection committee?

We know that the President was briefed about China's spying in July of 1997. Why then, while in China in 1998, with President Jiang, did he quickly accept President Jiang's denial that China had illegally funneled money to the Clinton-Gore reelection committee? He already knew about the spying. He already had Chinese nationals coming in and out of the White House on a regular basis. Johnny Chung was bringing them in, Charlie Trie was bringing them in, John Huang, Mark Middleton, and on and on and on. They were running in and out like they were on a railroad train. Yet he said he believed President Jiang when President Jiang said they were not illegally funneling money into the Clinton-Gore reelection committee. We know for a fact that that was going on.

How could the President say, I do believe him, that he did not order, authorize or approve such a thing, the illegal contributions, and that he could find no evidence that anybody in governmental authority had done that?

The head of the Chinese military intelligence was running money through Johnny Chung. The head of the Chinese aerospace industry, who benefitted from the technology transfer I am talking about, was involved. They were very high up. In fact, the head of the Chinese National Aeronautics Agency over there, the aerospace industry, her father was the head of the Chinese Liberation Army, the People's Liberation Army. He was right in the Politburo, right next to the President of the country.

For them to say the head of the country was not involved is just ludicrous, because if you do not keep the head of the government involved in a Communist society, you are either put away for good or you are killed.

Mr. Speaker, again in April of this year, how could the President listen to Chinese Prime Minister Zhu Rongji deny that Chinese had any involvement in spying and respond by saying, and this is what the President said, ''China is a big country with a big government, and I can only say that America is a big country with a big government, and occasionally things happen in this government that I do not know about.''

He was implying the Chinese did not know, the head of the Chinese Government, did not know they were stealing through espionage nuclear technology from Los Alamos and Livermore. That is just insane. I do not think anybody could believe that.

Mr. Speaker, our leadership cannot continually be blind and accept each and every denial that comes out of China. Newsweek recently reported that a team of U.S. nuclear weapons experts in America practically fainted when the CIA showed them the data that China had obtained. These are the guys that know what these weapons can do. They practically fainted when they found out that technology had been taken by espionage to the Communist Chinese.

What did this data show? It showed that Chinese scientist also routinely used phrases, descriptions and concepts that came straight out of Los Alamos and Livermore labs. The Chinese penetration, they said, is total, one official close to the investigation said. They are deep, deep into the labs' black programs. Those are the top, top secret programs involving our country and our security.

Now, today, because of these things that happened, the head of the Senate Intelligence Committee, Mr. SHELBY, started investigating it. Mr. SHELBY said that he had known there was an ongoing investigation and that it confirmed his worst fears. He said we have got to get to the bottom of this. He is working on it right now.

One of the people, a senior analyst and nuclear weapons expert at the Natural Resources Defense Council, said, ''It is staggering. I am still in shock here.''

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin). The gentleman should please refrain from quoting Members of the other body.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I will do that. I will mention the other body generically, Mr. Speaker.

''It is staggering,'' he said. ''I am still in shock here,'' a senior analyst and nuclear weapons expert at the Natural Resources Defense Council said. He said, ''If someone had access to Lee's,'' that is the fellow who was involved in the espionage, allegedly involved, ''unclassified computer, this could be all over the world.''

What he was talking about, this was this Mr. Wen Ho Lee, took this top secret information and he transferred it from a top secret computer into a non-top secret computer, where all you had to do was put in a password and you could get every one of our nuclear secrets that he had available to him.

This has been going on for some time. Norris's colleague, physicist Matthew G. McKenzie said that ''unauthorized access to those programs, so-called legacy codes, used to simulate warhead detonation, would represent an unprecedented act of espionage in his scope. Get this. The espionage in the Manhattan Project, that was right after we discovered the nuclear bomb that ended World War II, the espionage in the Manhattan Project would pale, would pale, in comparison.''

This is so much more damaging. We are focusing everything right now in the media almost on Kosovo, and our heart goes out to the people who are suffering over there. But this espionage endangers every man, woman and child in this country if we ever go to war with Communist China. And they have made threats in the Taiwan Straits. They have made overt threats about we would not go into Taiwan to protect them because we value Los Angeles more than we do Taiwan, which was an implied threat. So you do not know what might happen. They are a Communist dictatorship. Yet they got all this, and we keep working with them and dealing with them as if nothing happened.

Asked whether Clinton stands by his statement that he made last month that there was no evidence indicating Chinese espionage on his watch, David Levy, a National Security Council spokesman, said, ''Administration officials are investigating a number of recent allegations and are under no illusion that China and other nations continue to acquire secrets. This does not come as news to this administration,'' he said.

Does not come as news? The President said just a few weeks ago that he had not been informed about it, even though the national security adviser, the head of National Security in this country, found out about it in 1996.

Why? Why was this money coming into America from Chinese Communist sources into the campaign? Why did this technology transfer take place, this espionage? Why did that take place? And why did the President say he did not know about it?

The transfers took place from 1983 to 1995 when Los Alamos began installing a new mechanism that would have made such transfers more difficult. It looks like he was moving quickly, Mr. Lee, in the last few months, to get it transferred before the new system came in. They were coming up with a new system.

When the FBI finally searched Lee's computer last month, following his dismissal on March 8, the official said they found he had made an effort to erase what he had been doing as far as classified information was concerned.

□ 1600

Mr. Speaker, what is interesting is that the FBI a couple of years ago wanted to put electronic surveillance on Mr. Lee and the Justice Department said no. The Justice Department told the FBI two years ago that they did

not want electronic surveillance on Mr. Lee because the information was not current enough. We were talking about espionage of our most top secret nuclear weapons systems, and the Justice Department denied the FBI the right to put electronic surveillance on this guy.

In addition to that, they wanted a warrant to go in and look at his computer and search facilities of his, and that also was denied by the Justice Department. Why? What in the world is wrong with this administration, from the White House all the way to the Justice Department? I do not understand it.

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to come down here to the House floor to compliment the gentleman for what he is trying to do, to educate the American people and also educate some of our colleagues, in fact, many of our colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, I served in the Air Force, and I was in a classified program dealing with top secret material, and the access we had to have to get into the room where we worked was coded, and the code would change, and we would have to punch it in. Then, when we had classified material on our desks, we had to account for this at the end of the day, and we had to account for it the next morning. There were very detailed procedures on how we handled it.

What I read today in the paper, and in The New York Times yesterday, is very alarming, and I think the gentleman is talking about this scientist, Wen Ho Lee. It was reported in The New York Times on March 24 that he was already under investigation. Now, the gentleman may have said this and I might have missed it.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, they started investigating him in 1996–1997.

Mr. STEARNS. It was reported on March 24 of this year, he was under investigation as a suspected spy for China to run a sensitive weapons program, and it is just outrageous that they would continue to take a person like this and put him in that responsibility. Then he was asked, as the gentleman knows, to hire his own special assistant. So he hired a special assistant.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. This was after he was under surveillance.

Mr. STEARNS. After he was under surveillance, after he was working there. So he hired a researcher who was a citizen of China. Intelligence and law enforcement officials have confirmed this. The FBI has said that they wanted to put a wiretap on Mr. Lee. And so it is sort of flabbergasts the American people, I think, if they look at it, how this individual could get a top secret clearance and get access to so much information.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. And why the Justice Department denied electronic surveillance on the man.

Let me just interrupt my colleague and tell him something else that we recently found out, and I will be having other Special Orders going into other aspects of this, but the gentleman is welcome to stay so that we can discuss this.

We found out under Hazel O'Leary, the previous head of the Department of Energy, that she relaxed, cut the budget for security, cut the security force to such a degree that the head of intelligence for the Energy Department was really alarmed. Not only that, they changed the cards, the cards that they used to have, one card for top secret people, another card for somebody else, color codes so people could not get into the top secret areas, she did away with those and came up with one card for everybody so you could not track who was going in and out of the top secret areas.

This was an invitation to espionage. I cannot figure out why in the world they relaxed, they cut the budget for security, especially in view of the fact that this man was a suspect back as far as 1996. It does not make any sense to me.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, just to confirm what the gentleman is saying, throughout all our military they do not have that type of operations in their classified programs, they do not have that one-pass-fits-all, and I do not think any classified program of that delicate a nature should have be relaxed; in fact, they should have increased security.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, that is absolutely correct. However, this administration, for whatever reason, from top to bottom, is guilty of either just mishandling all of this or worse. I do not know what it is. But we need to get to the bottom of it because this endangers, as I said before, every man, woman and child in this country.

Let me just go on with this article, because I have some things I would like to comment about it. When the FBI finally searched Lee's computer last month following his dismissal, they found that he was trying to erase top secret information that he had put in the computer. The official said that a password was needed to access the information even after Lee transferred it from the classified computer system, but all he had to do was give the password to one of his Communist friends and they could access every nuclear secret before him at that laboratory, everything that was in that computer, and this was top secret information that had been transferred to a non-top secret computer.

The unclassified system allows investigators to determine when and whether the data was accessed, the official said, and initial indications are that the materials was accessed. So they think somebody did get into the computer and get this technology, at least a little bit.

Who was looking at it remains unclear, the official said, since Lee could have given the password to anyone else in any government.

Another high-ranking official reported no indication that the information was compromised. He denied a published report of evidence showing a password had been misused to gain access. He also denied that the FBI had been derelict in not searching Lee's computer at the beginning of the espionage investigation in 1996. At the time the FBI agents from the Bureau's Albuquerque field office wanted to search the computer but were told they needed a search warrant from the Federal court under the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act. The warrant was denied, the official said, because a lack of evidence showed that Mr. Lee was engaged in acts of espionage.

If there was any doubt, why would the Justice Department not grant a search warrant? That would have been the prudent thing to do. They could have done that.

I can tell the gentleman, the FBI would never go to the Justice Department without probable cause. If they think there is probable cause that espionage took place and they went to the Justice Department and that was denied, that is darn near criminal.

Lee became a suspect in 1996 after the Energy Department and intelligence agencies determined that a Chinese military document that the CIA had obtained from some of our sources a year earlier contained classified data about the size and shape of the newest miniaturized nuclear weapon, which I was talking about, the W–88. The FBI was unable to gather hard evidence against him, and he has not been charged with a crime yet, but Lee was fired in March for security violations after the investigation was disclosed. The official said transferring data to an unclassified computer system would be or could be a crime, depending on the intent of the person who did it.

As soon as FBI agents discovered Lee had transferred massive amounts of secret data to his unclassified computer, Richardson ordered to shut down, Mr. Richardson is now the head of the Energy Department, Richardson ordered a shutdown of the classified computers at Los Alamos, Lawrence Livermore and Sandia National Laboratories.

The problem is this: The cat is out of the bag. The secrets have been taken by the Chinese communists. The things that our taxpayers spent millions and millions and millions of dollars and hundreds and thousands of man-hours researching to protect the citizens of this country have been given away through espionage to the Chinese communists, endangering every man, woman and child in this country.

My committee will continue to investigate the illegal campaign contributions. The Cox report which looked into this espionage should be made

public. The White House has blocked, according to the information I have, the White House has continued to block the Cox report from being made public. Much of it has been leaked to the American people through the media, but not all, and that information needs to be made known to every man, woman and child.

Because if this administration has been derelict in its responsibilities and endangered every man, woman and child, it is more important than Kosovo. It is more important than anything. And we need to get to the bottom of it and those who let this happen, for whatever reason, campaign contributions or because they like the Chinese or whatever reason. They need to be held accountable and brought to justice.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I would just echo what the gentleman says. If nothing else, at some point we in the House should have an up-or-down vote to make the Cox report public if the White House continues to procrastinate on this, and at that point the House can redact or take out the things that they think would compromise some of our agents, but somehow we have to get this report public.

So I think the gentleman's effort here this afternoon in trying to say to the American people, this is important to us, this is important to Congress, we have to get to the bottom of this, is right on target. As the gentleman pointed out earlier, the Department of Energy as well as the administration knew all about this a long time ago. They relaxed the security provisions, and that in itself is terrible. The fact that the White House did not move quickly to put in place more secure operations is a sad commentary.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, one other thing. Just a few weeks ago the President denied he had knowledge of any of this, and yet we know that he was briefed by Sandy Berger as far back as 1997. I can not understand why he is saying that.

This chart, which I did not get to today, but I will get to in a future Special Order, and I hope the gentleman from Florida will once again join me as I get additional information for people regarding this espionage.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ENGEL (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of family illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FILNER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. FILNER, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. UNDERWOOD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LUTHER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BLUMENAUER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MINGE, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STENHOLM, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DOOLEY of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SMITH of Washington, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HOLT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SHERIDAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CUMMINGS, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FLETCHER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. NETHERCUTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. METCALF, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WHITFIELD, for 5 minutes, on May 3.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly, (at 4 o'clock and 13 minutes p.m.), under its previous order the House adjourned until Monday, May 3, 1999, at 2 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1780. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting the annual report of the Maritime Administration (MARAD) for Fiscal Year 1998, pursuant to 46 U.S.C. app. 1118; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1781. A letter from the Administrator, Panama Canal Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize expenditures for fiscal year 2000 for the operation and maintenance of the Panama Canal; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1782. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services Secretary of Labor, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to reauthorize the Older Americans Act of 1965 and thereby set the stage for strategic activities the Administration will pursue to more effectively and efficiently serve older Americans and their caregivers in the 21st Century; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1783. A letter from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Department of Energy, transmitting Life Cycle Asset Management; to the Committee on Commerce.

1784. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report which describes current conditions in Hong Kong of interest to the United States, the report covers the period since the last report in March 1998; to the Committee on International Relations.

1785. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the transfer of administrative jurisdiction of land within the boundary of the Home of Franklin Delano Roosevelt National Historic Site to the Archivist of the United States for the construction of a visitor center; to the Committee on Resources.

1786. A letter from the Chief Justice, the Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting amendments to the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure as adopted by the Court, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 2075; (H. Doc. No. 106–53); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

1787. A letter from the Chief Justice, the Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting amendments to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure adopted by the Court; (H. Doc. No. 106–54); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

1788. A letter from the Chief Justice, the Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting amendments to the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure adopted by the Court; (H. Doc. No. 106–55); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

1789. A letter from the President, U.S. Institute of Peace, transmitting a report of the audit of the Institute's accounts for fiscal year 1998, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 4607(h); jointly to the Committees on International Relations and Education and the Workforce.

1790. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for the Department of State to carry out its authorities and responsibilities in the conduct of foreign affairs during the fiscal years 2000 and 2001; jointly to the Committees on International Relations, Government Reform, and Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SENSENBRENNER: Committee on Science. H.R. 1183. A bill to amend the Fastener Quality Act to strengthen the protection against the sale of mismarked, misrepresented, and counterfeit fasteners and eliminate unnecessary requirements, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 106–121, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GILMAN: Committee on International Relations. H.R. 1211. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and related agencies for fiscal years 2000 and 2001, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 106–122). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GEKAS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 833. A bill to amend title 11 of the United States Code, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 106–123 Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule X the Committee on Banking and Financial Services discharged from further consideration. H.R. 833 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule X the Committee on Commerce discharged from further consideration. H.R. 1183 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule X the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 833. Referral to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services extended for a period ending not later than April 29, 1999.

H.R. 1183. Referral to the Committee on Commerce extended for a period ending not later than April 29, 1999.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. GEJDENSON (for himself and Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts):

H.R. 1619. A bill to amend the Quinebaug and Shetucket Rivers Valley National Heritage Corridor Act of 1994 to expand the boundaries of the Corridor; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. ISTOOK (for himself, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. COMBEST, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. DELAY, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. DICKEY, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. GRAHAM, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mrs. NORTHUP, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PORTER, Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. STUMP, Mr. TALENT, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. WAMP, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida):

H.R. 1620. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to provide for inflation adjustments to the mandatory jurisdiction thresholds of the National Labor Relations Board; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. FORBES, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Ms. DANNER, Mr. BACHUS, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. WEINER, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. GOODE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. STARK, Mrs. THURMAN, and Mr. PALLONE):

H.R. 1621. A bill to prohibit the use of the ''Made in USA'' label on products of the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands and to deny such products duty-free and quota-free treatment; to the Committee on Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KLECZKA:

H.R. 1622. A bill to prohibit the importation of products made with dog or cat fur, to prohibit the sale, manufacture, offer for sale, transportation, and distribution of products made with dog or cat fur in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CLAY (for himself, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. MARTINEZ):

H.R. 1623. A bill to reduce class size, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. LAFALCE (for himself, Mr. VENTO, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Ms. LEE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. FILNER, Mr. BROWN of California, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. OLVER, Mr. MEEHAN, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 1624. A bill to improve the quality of housing for elderly individuals and families, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. LANTOS (for himself, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. PORTER, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. COYNE, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. LUTHER, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNULTY, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. MINGE, Mr. MOAKLEY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. OLVER, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. SABO, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. STARK, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WEINER, and Mr. WEXLER):

H.R. 1625. A bill to provide a process for declassifying on an expedited basis certain documents relating to human rights abuses in Guatemala, Honduras, and other regions; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. BAKER:

H.R. 1626. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to repeal the highway sanctions; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. BALDACCI (for himself and Mr. ALLEN):

H.R. 1627. A bill to require the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to distribute funds available for grants under title IV of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act to help ensure that each State receives not less than 0.5 percent of such funds for certain programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Ms. BROWN of Florida:

H.R. 1628. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a national cemetery for veterans in the Miami, Florida, metropolitan area; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. CLAYTON (for herself, Mr. CLAY, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. OWENS, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. FORD, Mr. FROST, Mr. WU, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. JOHN, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. TURNER, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. HOLDEN, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN):

H.R. 1629. A bill to provide grants to rural eligible local educational agencies to enable the agencies to recruit and retain qualified teachers; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. COYNE (for himself and Mr. RANGEL):

H.R. 1630. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend permanently environmental remediation costs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FORD:

H.R. 1631. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make higher education more affordable by providing a full tax deduction for higher education expenses and interest on student loans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin (for himself and Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin):

H.R. 1632. A bill to provide that certain attribution rules be applied with respect to the counting of certain prisoners in a decennial census of population; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. HOUGHTON (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. CRANE, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. HERGER, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. HULSHOF, Mr. LEVIN, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. DUNN, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. FOLEY, and Mr. CAMP):

H.R. 1633. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the limitation on the use of foreign tax credits under the alternative minimum tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JONES of North Carolina:

H.R. 1634. A bill to amend the Consumer Credit Protection Act to assure meaningful disclosures of the terms of rental-purchase agreements, including disclosures of all costs to consumers under such agreements, to provide certain substantive rights to consumers under such agreements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

H.R. 1635. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that a member of the uniformed services shall be treated as using a principal residence while away from home on qualified official extended duty in determining the exclusion of gain from the sale of such residence; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. LOWEY (for herself, Mr. CASTLE, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. KOLBE, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. SHAYS, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. PORTER, Mrs. THURMAN, Mrs. ROUKEMA, and Mr. MORAN of Virginia):

H.R. 1636. A bill to provide for a reduction in the rate of adolescent pregnancy through the evaluation of public and private prevention programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. MARTINEZ:

H.R. 1637. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to extend authorizations of appropriations for programs under the Act through fiscal year 2004, to establish a National Family Caregiver Support Program, to modernize aging programs and services, to address the need to engage in life course planning, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MCINNIS:

H.R. 1638. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand S corporation eligibility for banks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. QUINN:

H.R. 1639. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require 6-months' advance notice to enrollees of Medicare managed care plans of termination of hospital participation under such plans; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 1640. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to restore and make permanent the exclusion from gross income for amounts received under qualified group legal services plans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REGULA:

H.R. 1641. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to eliminate PAC contributions to individual House of Representatives candidates, to provide a tax credit and tax deduction for contributions to such candidates, to provide for voluntary expenditure limitations in House of Representatives elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROGAN:

H.R. 1642. A bill to require local educational agencies to develop and implement a random drug testing and counseling program for students in grades 9 through 12; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SAXTON (for himself and Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA):

H.R. 1643. A bill to establish a moratorium on large fishing vessels in Atlantic herring and mackerel fisheries; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. SERRANO (for himself, Mr. LEACH, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. JOHN, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. LAMPSON, Ms. LEE, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. MINGE, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. NADLER, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. NEY, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. OLVER, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. RIVERS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. STARK, Ms. WATERS, and Ms. WOOLSEY):

H.R. 1644. A bill to provide the people of Cuba with access to food and medicines from the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. STARK (for himself, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. THURMAN, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. FILNER, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. FROST, and Mr. HILLIARD):

H.R. 1645. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for full payment rates under Medicare to hospitals for costs of direct graduate medical education of residents for residency training programs in specialties or subspecialties which the Secretary of Health and Human Services designates as critical need specialty or subspecialty training programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. STARK:

H.R. 1646. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to provide for an extra payment amount under the Medicare Program to rural providers of services who furnish case manager services to Medicare beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SWEENEY:

H.R. 1647. A bill to amend the Crime Control Act of 1990 to prohibit law enforcement agencies from imposing a waiting period before accepting reports of missing children less than 21 years of age; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. TAUSCHER (for herself, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BROWN of California, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FROST, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SHOWS, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. STARK, Mr. TIERNEY, and Mr. WEINER):

H.R. 1648. A bill to establish State infrastructure banks for education; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. TIAHRT (for himself, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. SANFORD, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. PITTS, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. SUNUNU, Mr. POMBO, Mr. COBURN, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. GOSS, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. KASICH, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. PAUL, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. DELAY, Mr. EHRLICH, Mr. BLUNT, and Mr. MCINTOSH):

H.R. 1649. A bill to abolish the Department of Energy; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, Science, Resources, Rules, and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. UPTON (for himself, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MCHUGH, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. METCALF, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. CAMP, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. QUINN, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SUNUNU, Mr. BALDACCI, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. WALSH, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. REYES, Mr. FROST, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. SABO, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. WYNN, Ms. LEE, and Mr. BONIOR):

H.R. 1650. A bill to amend the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 to modify the requirements for implementation of an entry-exit control system; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska (for himself, Mr. SAXTON, and Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA):

H.R. 1651. A bill to amend the Fishermen's Protective Act of 1967 to extend the period during which reimbursement may be provided to owners of United States fishing vessels for costs incurred when such a vessel is seized and detained by a foreign country; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska (for himself and Mr. SAXTON):

H.R. 1652. A bill to establish the Yukon River Salmon Advisory Panel; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska (for himself, Mr. SAXTON, and Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) (all by request):

H.R. 1653. A bill to approve a governing international fishery agreement between the United States and the Russian Federation; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. KASICH:

H.J. Res. 49. A joint resolution to designate the Village of Sunbury, Ohio, as ''Flagville, U.S.A.''; to the Committee on Government Reform.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

27. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Idaho, relative to Senate Joint Memorial No. 104 memorializing that they support the passage of the Imported Meat Labeling Act of 1999 by the First Session of the 106th Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

28. Also, a memorial of the House of Delegates of the Commonwealth of Virginia, relative to House Joint Resolution No. 650 memorializing the Congress of the United States be urged to reconsider federal restrictions on discipline of certain students with disabilities; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

29. Also, a memorial of the House of Delegates of the Commonwealth of Virginia, relative to House Joint Resolution No. 552 memorializing the Congress of the United States be urged to either enact meaningful patient protections at the federal level with respect to employer self-funded plans or, in the absence of such federal action, amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act (ERISA) of 1974 to grant authority to all individual states to monitor and regulate self-funded, employer-based health plans; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

30. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan, relative to House Resolution No. 14 memorializing the Congress to enact legislation to prohibit the federal government from claiming any tobacco settlement money from the states or directing how the states expend these funds; to the Committee on Commerce.

31. Also, a memorial of the House of Delegates of the Commonwealth of Virginia, relative to House Joint Resolution No. 640 memorializing the Congress of the United

States be urged to direct the Federal Communications Commission to study the feasibility of including all of Buchanan County, Virginia, and all of Dickenson County, Virginia, into the Southwest Virginia Network; to the Committee on Commerce.

32. Also, a memorial of the House of Delegates of the Commonwealth of Virginia, relative to House Joint Resolution No. 598 memorializing the Congress of the United States be urged to enact legislation giving states and localities the power to control waste imports into their jurisdictions; to the Committee on Commerce.

33. Also, a memorial of the House of Delegates of the Commonwealth of Virginia, relative to House Joint Resolution No. 581 memorializing the Congress of the United States be urged to enact legislation to prevent the seizure of state tobacco settlement funds by the federal government, and that the federal government be urged not to interfere in the tobacco settlement which has been reached between the fifty states and the largest tobacco manufacturers; to the Committee on Commerce.

34. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Maine, relative to Senate Paper #750 memorializing the President of the United States and the United States Congress to support a World War II Memorial; to the Committee on Resources.

35. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Virginia, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 440 memorializing Congress to enact the ''Conservation and Reinvestment Act''; to the Committee on Resources.

36. Also, a memorial of the House of Delegates of the Commonwealth of Virginia, relative to House Joint Resolution No. 754 memorializing the Congress of the United States be urged to grant historic congressional federal recognition to the Chickahominy; the Chickahominy, Eastern Division; the Mattaponi; the Monacan; the Nansemond; the Pamunkey; the Rappahannock; and the Upper Mattaponi as Indian tribes under federal law; to the Committee on Resources.

37. Also, a memorial of the House of Delegates of the Commonwealth of Virginia, relative to House Joint Resolution No. 568 memorializing the retention of the 1,250-mile perimeter rule and slot rule at Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport be supported and that any relaxation of, exemption from, or amendment to Section 6012 of the Metropolitan Washington Airports Act of 1986 or the regulations promulgated pursuant thereto be opposed; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

38. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of North Dakota, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 3039 memorializing the United States Congress to enact legislation to return adequate funds to states to fund the employment security system and give a fair return to employers for the taxes employers pay under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

39. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Idaho, relative to Senate Joint Memorial No. 103 memorializing the Congress and the President to provide that the provisions of the North American Free Trade Agreement be enforced or that the Agreement be nullified and the United States withdrawn from the provisions of and participating in the Agreement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

40. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Idaho, relative to Senate Joint Memorial No. 101 memorializing that they strongly support aggressive, immediate and continued management activities on all acres of Douglas fir bark beetle infested lands on all Idaho national forests, and specifically on the Idaho Panhandle National Forests; jointly to the Committees on Resources and Agriculture.

41. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Idaho, relative to Senate Joint Memorial No. 102 memorializing the Congress to implement procedures similiar to the procedure employed by the state of Idaho which requires all rules proposed by executive agencies to be submitted to the Legislature of the State of Idaho for final approval before such administrative law may become effective; jointly to the Committees on the Judiciary and Government Reform.

42. Also, a memorial of the House of Delegates of the Commonwealth of Virginia, relative to House Joint Resolution No. 649 memorializing that availability and unfettered usage of strong encryption technology for any legitimate purpose will enable and facilitate the growth of the information economy and therefore should be encouraged and supported by government at all levels; jointly to the Committees on International Relations, Commerce, and the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 5: Ms. STABENOW, Mrs. NORTHUP, and Mr. GOODLING.

H.R. 8: Mr. ROGAN, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. BASS, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SUNUNU, and Mr. WHITFIELD.

H.R. 49: Mr. BOSWELL and Mr. ENGLISH.

H.R. 137: Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 142: Mr. BATEMAN, Mrs. BIGGERT, and Mr. COBURN.

H.R. 175: Mr. PACKARD, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. DREIER, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. KING, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. PHELPS, and Mr. STARK.

H.R. 230: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 261: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 262: Mr. MCDERMOTT and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 315: Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. BERMAN.

H.R. 323: Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.R. 324: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 351: Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. HOUGHTON, and Mrs. BIGGERT.

H.R. 353: Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. PASTOR, and Mr. MCNULTY.

H.R. 383: Mr. LAZIO, and Mr. COOKSEY.

H.R. 425: Mr. ENGLISH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CAMPBELL, and Mr. OBERSTAR.

H.R. 488: Mr. LATOURETTE.

H.R. 516: Mr. COBURN, Mr. WALSH, and Mr. WALDEN of Oregon.

H.R. 518: Mr. COBURN, Mr. WALSH, and Mr. UPTON.

H.R. 544: Mrs. EMERSON.

H.R. 568: Ms. STABENOW.

H.R. 580: Ms. DUNN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MCCRERY, and Mr. STARK.

H.R. 629: Mr. SANDLIN.

H.R. 632: Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. WALSH, Mr. HOLT, Mr. GARY MILLER of California, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. COOK, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. HAYES, Mr. LAHOOD, and Mr. DEAL of Georgia.

H.R. 639: Mr. DEMINT.

H.R. 648: Ms. PRYCE of Ohio and Mr. LAMPSON.

H.R. 655: Ms. DEGETTE, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, and Mr. BALDACCI.

H.R. 673: Mr. YOUNG of Florida.

H.R. 674: Mr. MCINNIS and Mr. HOUGHTON.

H.R. 716: Mr. RODRIGUEZ.

H.R. 721: Mr. MOAKLEY.

H.R. 742: Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. WATKINS, AND Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 750: Mr. GANSKE and Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 756: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H.R. 764: Mr. BOEHLERT, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, and Mr. LAHOOD.

H.R. 773: Mr. MICA, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Mr. LARSON, and Mr. FOSSELLA.

H.R. 775: Mr. SIMPSON.

H.R. 796: Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. PACKARD, and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 815: Mr. GANSKE, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. BACHUS, and Mr. DEMINT.

H.R. 828: Mr. BASS.

H.R. 835: Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 845: Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin.

H.R. 864: Mr. WALSH, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. GARY MILLER of California, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. DREIER, Mr. HERGER, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. KING, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, and Mr. PHELPS.

H.R. 872: Mr. UNDERWOOD.

H.R. 895: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. WATERS, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. ALLEN, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. UNDERWOOD, and Mr. BROWN of California.

H.R. 904: Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. SHOWS, and Ms. RIVERS.

H.R. 941: Mr. FOLEY, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. MATSUI, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, and Mr. ENGLISH.

H.R. 948: Mr. WICKER.

H.R. 989: Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.R. 1008: Mr. PALLONE and Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 1039: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. KIND.

H.R. 1044: Mrs. EMERSON.

H.R. 1070: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania and Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 1074: Mr. BEREUTER, Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mr. NETHERCUTT, and Mr. WHITFIELD.

H.R. 1083: Mr. SNYDER and Mr. CHAMBLISS.

H.R. 1084: Mrs. MYRICK.

H.R. 1088: Mr. HOYER, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. FROST, Mrs. EMERSON, and Mr. KOLBE.

H.R. 1095: Mr. BENTSEN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. LUTHER.

H.R. 1102: Mr. TANCREDO.

H.R. 1111: Mr. DICKS and Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 1122: Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. FARR of California, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, and Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon.

H.R. 1130: Mr. PASCRELL and Mr. STARK.

H.R. 1138: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 1178: Mr. WICKER, Mr. TURNER, and Mr. LAHOOD.

H.R. 1180: Mr. FARR of California and Mr. BONIOR.

H.R. 1183: Mr. HOBSON.

H.R. 1187: Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Mr. HOUGHTON.

H.R. 1193: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. GANSKI, Mr. WELDON of Florida, and Mr. BONIOR.

H.R. 1194: Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska and Mrs. MORELLA.

H.R. 1196: Mr. WAXMAN.

H.R. 1224: Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 1229: Mr. WHITFIELD and Mr. BARCIA.

H.R. 1239: Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. MEEKS of New York, and Mr. SPRATT.

H.R. 1250: Mr. SABO and Mr. WYNN.

H.R. 1260: Mr. SAXTON, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. DICKS, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. INSLEE, and Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 1261: Mr. SHAYS, Mr. FROST, and Mr. NETHERCUTT.

H.R. 1278: Mr. INSLEE.

H.R. 1288: Mr. BONIOR and Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 1304: Mr. GOODE, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. BARR of Georgia, and Mr. DICKEY.

H.R. 1317: Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky.

H.R. 1319: Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 1320: Mr. ACKERMAN, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. GORDON.

H.R. 1333: Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. FATTAH, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 1337: Mr. DELAY and Mr. KOLBE.

H.R. 1342: Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. BROWN of California.

H.R. 1344: Mr. BISHOP.

H.R. 1349: Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska and Mr. BILBRAY.

H.R. 1387: Ms. CARSON and Mr. MCINTOSH.

H.R. 1388: Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. NADLER, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, and Mr. KOLBE.

H.R. 1399: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. WYNN.

H.R. 1414: Mr. GARY MILLER of California, Mr. RAHALL, and Mr. LAFALCE.

H.R. 1447: Mr. HOLDEN.

H.R. 1472: Mr. WYNN, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, and Mr. LATOURETTE.

H.R. 1477: Mr. GARY MILLER of California, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 1491: Mr. JEFFERSON and Mr. HILL of Indiana.

H.R. 1530: Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, and Mrs. THURMAN.

H.R. 1551: Mr. BARCIA.

H.R. 1560: Mr. SHAW.

H.R. 1579: Mr. PHELPS and Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.J. Res. 25: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, and Mr. ACKERMAN.

H. Con. Res. 30: Mrs. CHENOWETH and Mr. TOOMEY.

H. Con. Res. 78: Mr. UNDERWOOD.

H. Res. 35: Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon.

H. Res. 106: Mr. WHITFIELD.