

I want to thank the gentleman from California (Chairman PACKARD) and also our ranking member, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISLOSKEY), for their continued support for the Houston-Galveston navigation project. I also want to thank all the Members of that committee, and particularly the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) for his leadership.

For two consecutive years, the Congress has appropriated sufficient funds to complete the widening and deepening of the Houston Ship Channel project in 4 years. This fiscal year, the \$60 million appropriation in this bill ensures we will maintain the optimum construction schedule.

Maintaining this schedule is important because it will add an additional \$281 million to the project's rate of investment, return on investment, and save taxpayers \$63.5 million in increased escalation and investment costs.

The expansion of the Houston Ship Channel is important on many levels. The port of Houston, connected to the Gulf of Mexico by the 50-mile ship channel, is ranked first in foreign tonnage and second in total tonnage among U.S. ports and eighth in total tonnage among world ports.

With more than 7,000 vessels navigating the channel annually and an anticipated increase over the next few years, the widening and deepening is a necessary step in safeguarding the safety and economic viability of the port and the city of Houston.

The port of Houston provides \$5.5 billion in annual business revenues, and creates 196,000 direct and indirect jobs. By generating \$300 million annually in customs fees and \$213 million annually in State and local taxes, the Houston-Galveston navigation project will more than pay for itself.

I appreciate the subcommittee's support, and ask my colleagues to support both this rule and the bill.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

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

Madam Speaker, there is legislation contained in this bill before us that is protected by the rule, legislating on an appropriations bill. This legislation that pertains to the Bonneville Power Administration is very, very problematic, and in fact, is contradicted by language in the manager's report. But, of course, we know the language in the manager's report does not hold sway over legislative provisions contained within the bill protected by the rule, riders on the bill.

There are two provisions that are aimed at Bonneville Power Administration and other Federal power mar-

keting agencies that are damaging and very ill-informed. One is incredibly broad, and it would repeal legislation Congress passed by a large majority in the 1992 Energy Policy Act.

□ 1615

It allowed the Bonneville Power Administration to directly fund operations and maintenance at hydroelectric facilities operated by the Army Corps and the Bureau of Reclamation in the Pacific Northwest.

For years, we had a horrendous backlog and horrendous inefficiency. But then this amendment passed. In fact, now unlike other Federal power marketing agencies and systems around the country, we are pretty much up to date, and it is working very efficiently and effectively, both for the Federal taxpayers and for the region.

Why would this bill repeal that? It is some sort of strange flat-earth view of competition that does not exist and cannot effectively deal with the problem and did not before we had a change in the statute.

Secondly, the bill would prevent Bonneville Power Administration and other PMAs from cooperating with the utility customers to properly maintain the regional transmission grades.

Here we are worried about system reliability across the country which carries both public and private power, and we are going to undermine that in this bill. That is not a good move for the West or even the Southeast in terms of the Tennessee Valley Authority and other PMAs. It is very damaging. In fact, it is so damaging that I will have to vote against the entire bill, and I would urge other western Members to do the same.

Finally, there is a provision that forces BPA to discontinue an important infrastructure development. BPA is installing a fiberoptic network on its transmission towers to improve its communication and its dispatch of power. It is good business. They need to do it.

At virtually no incremental cost, they could provide excess capacity to remote rural communities who will never see in this century or even in the next century for 20 or 30 years a private provider stringing fiber optics to their communities.

BPA owns 80 percent of the transmission. It does not, by policy, allow other people to access or hang things on its transmission. They are the only alternative out there. In some, again, misguided attempt to bring about competition that does not exist, and if it did exist, I would not be up here on that particular issue and prohibit them from using their excess capacity at no incremental cost to provide services to those communities.

These are ill-intentioned. They are not overcome by the manager's language. I urge colleagues to vote against the entire bill unless these are fixed.

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

Mr. LINDER. Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this open rule. 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.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2587, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). The pending business is the question of agreeing to the resolution, House Resolution 260, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 227, nays 201, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 339]  
YEAS—227

Aderholt	Dunn	Kasich
Archer	Ehlers	Kelly
Armey	Ehrlich	King (NY)
Bachus	Emerson	Kingston
Baker	English	Knollenberg
Ballenger	Everett	Kolbe
Barr	Ewing	Kuykendall
Barrett (NE)	Fletcher	LaHood
Bartlett	Foley	Largent
Barton	Fossella	Latham
Bass	Fowler	LaTourette
Bateman	Franks (NJ)	Lazio
Bereuter	Frelinghuysen	Leach
Biggert	Galleghy	Lewis (CA)
Bilbray	Ganske	Lewis (KY)
Bilirakis	Gekas	Linder
Bliley	Gibbons	LoBiondo
Blunt	Gilchrist	Lucas (KY)
Boehler	Gillmor	Lucas (OK)
Boehner	Gilman	Manzullo
Bonilla	Goode	McCollum
Bono	Goodlatte	McCrery
Brady (TX)	Goodling	McHugh
Bryant	Goss	McInnis
Burr	Graham	McIntosh
Burton	Granger	McIntyre
Buyer	Green (TX)	McKeon
Callahan	Green (WI)	Metcalfe
Calvert	Greenwood	Mica
Camp	Gutknecht	Miller (FL)
Campbell	Hall (OH)	Miller, Gary
Canady	Hansen	Moran (KS)
Cannon	Hastings (WA)	Morella
Castle	Hayes	Myrick
Chabot	Hayworth	Nethercutt
Chambliss	Hefley	Ney
Coble	Herger	Northup
Coburn	Hill (MT)	Norwood
Collins	Hilleary	Nussle
Combest	Hobson	Ose
Cook	Hoekstra	Oxley
Cooksey	Hooley	Packard
Cox	Horn	Paul
Crane	Hostettler	Pease
Cubin	Houghton	Petri
Cunningham	Hulshof	Pickering
Davis (VA)	Hunter	Pitts
Deal	Hutchinson	Pombo
DeLay	Hyde	Porter
DeMint	Isakson	Portman
Diaz-Balart	Istook	Pryce (OH)
Dickey	Jenkins	Quinn
Doolittle	Johnson (CT)	Radanovich
Dreier	Johnson, Sam	Ramstad
Duncan	Jones (NC)	Regula

Reynolds	Shimkus	Thune
Riley	Shuster	Tiahrt
Rogan	Simpson	Toomey
Rogers	Skeen	Traficant
Rohrabacher	Smith (MI)	Upton
Ros-Lehtinen	Smith (NJ)	Vitter
Roukema	Smith (TX)	Walden
Royce	Souder	Walsh
Ryan (WI)	Spence	Wamp
Ryun (KS)	Stearns	Watkins
Salmon	Stump	Watts (OK)
Sanford	Sununu	Weldon (FL)
Saxton	Sweeney	Weldon (PA)
Scarborough	Talent	Weller
Schaffer	Tancredo	Whitfield
Sensenbrenner	Tauzin	Wicker
Sessions	Taylor (MS)	Wilson
Shadegg	Taylor (NC)	Wolf
Shaw	Terry	Young (AK)
Shays	Thomas	Young (FL)
Sherwood	Thornberry	

NAYS—201

Abercrombie	Gordon	Obey
Ackerman	Gutierrez	Olver
Allen	Hall (TX)	Ortiz
Andrews	Hastings (FL)	Owens
Baird	Hill (IN)	Pallone
Baldacci	Hilliard	Pascrell
Baldwin	Hinchey	Pastor
Barcia	Hinojosa	Payne
Barrett (WI)	Hoeffel	Pelosi
Becerra	Holden	Peterson (MN)
Bentsen	Holt	Phelps
Berkley	Hoyer	Pickett
Berman	Inslee	Pomeroy
Berry	Jackson (IL)	Price (NC)
Bishop	Jackson-Lee	Rahall
Blagojevich	(TX)	Rangel
Blumenauer	Jefferson	Reyes
Bonior	John	Rivers
Borski	Johnson, E.B.	Rodriguez
Boswell	Jones (OH)	Roemer
Boucher	Kanjorski	Rothman
Boyd	Kaptur	Roybal-Allard
Brady (PA)	Kennedy	Rush
Brown (FL)	Kildee	Sabo
Brown (OH)	Kilpatrick	Sanchez
Capps	Kind (WI)	Sanders
Capuano	Kleczka	Sandlin
Cardin	Klink	Sawyer
Carson	Kucinich	Schakowsky
Clay	LaFalce	Scott
Clayton	Lampson	Serrano
Clement	Lantos	Sherman
Clyburn	Larson	Shows
Condit	Lee	Sisisky
Conyers	Levin	Skelton
Costello	Lewis (GA)	Slaughter
Coyne	Lipinski	Smith (WA)
Cramer	Lofgren	Snyder
Crowley	Lowey	Spratt
Danner	Luther	Stabenow
Davis (FL)	Maloney (CT)	Stark
Davis (IL)	Maloney (NY)	Stenholm
DeFazio	Markey	Strickland
DeGette	Martinez	Stupak
Delahunt	Mascara	Tanner
DeLauro	Matsui	Tauscher
Deutsch	McCarthy (MO)	Thompson (CA)
Dicks	McCarthy (NY)	Thompson (MS)
Dingell	McGovern	Thurman
Dixon	McKinney	Tierney
Doggett	McNulty	Towns
Dooley	Meehan	Turner
Doyle	Meek (FL)	Udall (CO)
Edwards	Meeks (NY)	Udall (NM)
Engel	Menendez	Udall (NM)
Eshoo	Millender-	Velazquez
Etheridge	McDonald	Vento
Evans	Miller, George	Visclosky
Farr	Minge	Waters
Fattah	Mink	Watt (NC)
Filner	Moakley	Waxman
Forbes	Mollohan	Weiner
Ford	Moore	Wexler
Frank (MA)	Moran (VA)	Weygand
Frost	Murtha	Wise
Gejdenson	Nadler	Woolsey
Gephardt	Napolitano	Wu
Gonzalez	Neal	Wynn

NOT VOTING—5

Chenoweth	McDermott	Peterson (PA)
Cummings	Oberstar	

□ 1640

Mr. CRAMER changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. GOODLATTE changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PACKARD. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill (H.R. 2605) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). Pursuant to House Resolution 261 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. 2605.

□ 1642

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. 2605) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, with Mr. Hansen 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 California (Mr. PACKARD) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKEY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD).

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

Mr. Chairman, it is my privilege to present to the Committee of the Whole for its consideration the bill H.R. 2605, making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000.

Mr. Chairman, this bill provides annual funding for a wide array of Federal Government programs involving such diverse matters as national secu-

urity, environmental cleanup, flood control, advanced scientific research, navigation, alternative energy sources, and the nuclear power regulation.

□ 1645

Programs funded by this bill affect multiple aspects of American life, having significant implications for domestic security, commercial competitiveness, and the advance of science.

I am proud of the bill reported by the Committee on Appropriations without amendment, and I believe it merits the support of the entire membership of this body.

Perhaps the most remarkable aspect of this bill is its constrained size. The measure represents an unqualified victory for fiscal austerity, conservatism, and responsibility.

Total funding for the energy and water bill in H.R. 2605 is \$20.19 billion. This is more than \$900 million below the fiscal year 1999 baseline for energy and water development programs. Further, it is \$1.4 billion below the budget request and more than \$1 billion less than the energy and water bill passed by the Senate earlier this year.

Mr. Chairman, the substantial cuts contained in H.R. 2605 are real. They are not produced by smoke and mirrors gimmicks or creative accounting. They, rather, are the result of a fiscal discipline demanding reduction in the size, scope, and cost of the Federal Government.

Despite the bill's deep programmatic reductions, it provides adequate funding for the continuation of high priority programs, promising the greatest return on the investment of taxpayer dollars.

The cost-effective civil works program of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, for example, is funded at a level significantly higher than the budget request and slightly higher than the fiscal year 1999 level. This funding is more than offset by considerable reductions in the Department of Energy.

The bill requires, for example, a reduction of \$125 million in DOE contractor travel expenses. This is one-half the level of this current year. And, as my colleagues all know, we have received documented evidence of abusive travel in that Department.

Mr. Chairman, I owe a great debt of gratitude to the hard-working members of the Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development. They have labored hard under difficult fiscal constraints to provide a bill that is balanced and fair.

I especially want to express my gratitude to the ranking minority member, the honorable gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKEY). He has been extremely helpful. Together we have developed a good bill. I know there are one or two items of disagreement, but overall I think both of us support a very good bill.