

Smith (MI)	Thomas	Watkins
Smith (NJ)	Thompson (MS)	Watts (OK)
Smith (TX)	Thornberry	Weldon (FL)
Souder	Thune	Weldon (PA)
Spence	Tiahrt	Weller
Stearns	Toomey	Whitfield
Stump	Traficant	Wicker
Sununu	Upton	Wilson
Tauscher	Vitter	Wise
Tauzin	Walden	Wolf
Taylor (NC)	Walsh	Young (AK)
Terry	Wamp	Young (FL)

NAYS—186

Abercrombie	Hastings (FL)	Olver
Ackerman	Hill (IN)	Ortiz
Allen	Hilliard	Owens
Andrews	Hinchey	Pallone
Baca	Hinojosa	Pascarell
Baird	Hoefel	Payne
Baldacci	Holden	Pelosi
Baldwin	Holt	Peterson (MN)
Barcia	Hooley	Phelps
Barrett (WI)	Hoyer	Pickett
Becerra	Inslee	Pomeroy
Berman	Jackson (IL)	Price (NC)
Berry	Jackson-Lee	Quinn
Bishop	(TX)	Rangel
Blagojevich	Jefferson	Reyes
Bliley	John	Reynolds
Blumenauer	Johnson, E.B.	Rivers
Bonior	Kanjorski	Rodriguez
Borski	Kaptur	Roemer
Boswell	Kelly	Rothman
Boucher	Kennedy	Roybal-Allard
Boyd	Kildee	Rush
Brady (PA)	Kilpatrick	Sabo
Brown (OH)	Kind (WI)	Sanchez
Capps	Kleczka	Sanders
Capuano	Kucinich	Sawyer
Cardin	Lantos	Schakowsky
Clayton	Larson	Scott
Clement	Lee	Serrano
Coburn	Levin	Sherman
Condit	Lewis (GA)	Sisisky
Conyers	Lipinski	Skelton
Costello	Lofgren	Slaughter
Coyne	Lowe	Smith (WA)
Cramer	Lucas (KY)	Snyder
Crowley	Luther	Spratt
Cummings	Maloney (CT)	Stark
Danner	Maloney (NY)	Stenholm
Davis (LL)	Markey	Strickland
DeFazio	Mascara	Stupak
DeGette	Matsui	Sweeney
Delahunt	McCarthy (MO)	Tancredo
DeLauro	McCarthy (NY)	Tanner
Deutsch	McDermott	Taylor (MS)
Dingell	McGovern	Thompson (CA)
Dixon	McHugh	Thurman
Doggett	McKinney	Tierney
Doyle	McNulty	Towns
Edwards	Meehan	Turner
Etheridge	Meeke (NY)	Udall (CO)
Evans	Menendez	Udall (NM)
Farr	Millender-	Velazquez
Fattah	McDonald	Visclosky
Filner	Miller, George	Waters
Forbes	Minge	Watt (NC)
Ford	Mink	Waxman
Frank (MA)	Moakley	Weiner
Gejdenson	Moran (VA)	Wexler
Gephardt	Murtha	Weygand
Gonzalez	Nadler	Woolsey
Gordon	Neal	Wu
Gutierrez	Oberstar	Wynn
Hall (OH)	Obey	

NOT VOTING—16

Castle	Klink	Paul
Clay	LaFalce	Stabenow
Engel	Lazio	Talent
Eshoo	McCollum	Vento
Fossella	McIntosh	
Jones (OH)	Norwood	

□ 1116

Messrs. MCHUGH, HOLT, TAYLOR of Mississippi, QUINN, SWEENEY, REYNOLDS, and Mrs. KELLY changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. LAMPSON 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 and that I may include tabular and extraneous material on the conference report to accompany H.R. 4733.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 5130

Mr. CAMPBELL. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 5130.

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

There was no objection.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. PASTOR. Madam Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. PASTOR. Madam Speaker, this morning, as I was walking onto the floor, you reminded us that if we were going to speak on the floor that we could not wear any button that communicated a message.

I bring that to your attention because I ask what the rule is that, in the past, we have had Members speak on the floor while wearing such buttons.

In particular, yesterday I saw a number of Members that were wearing a button that communicated 90 percent. And this morning I was hoping to wear a button, but I was reminded by you that I could not.

The question is, what is the rule on wearing buttons on the floor while we speak, especially buttons that communicate a message?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Clause 1 of rule XVII, which requires Members to address their remarks to the Chair, has been interpreted to proscribe the wearing of badges by Members to communicate a message while under recognition to speak by the Chair.

The Chair would direct the gentleman to page 693 of the House Rules and Manual for a recitation of precedents under this rule, some of which involve the Chair taking the initiative when the Chair observed their display while the Member was speaking.

The Chair will endeavor to be consistent in this enforcement and will use due diligence to call the attention of the Member to this rule.

Mr. PASTOR. Madam Speaker, I want to thank Madam Speaker for her comments.

Hopefully, maybe in the morning before we start, the Chair might remind us what the rule is on buttons that communicate a message.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman for calling that to the attention of the Chair.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 4733, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

Mr. PACKARD. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 598, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 4733) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). Pursuant to House Resolution 598, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of September 27, 2000, at page H8312.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present to the House the conference report on H.R. 4733, the fiscal year 2001 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act.

At the outset, I would like to briefly state how pleased I am that the conference committee was able to work out the dramatic differences between the House and the Senate bills as amicably as we have and with a positive effect. Given the great divide over the House and Senate priorities, many concluded that we would never be able to resolve our differences. Not only did we resolve those differences, but we did so in such a way that the critical priorities of the House were carefully protected.

I am proud of the agreement struck between the House and that Senate on energy and water resources development programs. It was a difficult and arduous negotiation, but the product of our deliberations is a package that will help strengthen our defense, rebuild our critical infrastructure, and increase our scientific knowledge.

The total amount included in the conference agreement for energy and water program is \$23.3 billion. This is about \$1.6 billion over the amount included in the House-passed bill. The bill also includes \$214 million in emergency appropriations primarily to continue recovery operations at the Los

Alamos National Laboratory as a result of the Cerro Grande fire.

I am especially pleased with the level of funding we have recommended for the Civil Works program of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. At \$4.52 billion, the recommended funding is almost \$460 million higher than the administration's inadequate budget request. The majority of this increase, about \$350 million, is in the Corps' construction program. While that may sound like a large increase, the amount we have recommended is about the same as the amount the Corps will expend this year on construction. If we had funded the construction program at the level requested by the administration, the result would have been schedule delays, increased project costs, and the loss of project benefits.

In addition to providing more funding for ongoing projects, I am pleased that the conference agreement includes funding for a number of new construction starts.

For the Bureau of Reclamation we have provided \$816 million, which is \$10 million above the fiscal year 2000 level and \$24 million above the budget request.

Perhaps the most significant item is one that we did not fund, the Bay-Delta Ecosystem Restoration Program in my State of California. The administration had requested \$60 million to continue this program in fiscal year 2001. However, the authorization for the program expires at the end of this fiscal year; and as a result, neither the House nor the Senate included funding in their respective bills for this project.

The House authorizing committee reported the bill to reauthorize this program for fiscal year 2001; and as late as yesterday afternoon, we thought a compromise had been reached to permit the program to go forward. However, negotiations broke down when the Senate did not agree with the proposal. Accordingly, we have not funded it in this conference report.

For the non-defense programs of the Department of Energy, our top priority all year long was to provide adequate funding for the basic research programs of the Department. The basic research performed by the Department of Energy has led to many of the technological breakthroughs that have helped our economy grow. These programs will be even more important as we move into the 21st century.

I am pleased to report that additional allocations were received to enable us to fund these programs near the level requested by the administration. For renewable energy programs, I am pleased to report that we were able to provide about \$30 million over the House-passed level.

For the Atomic Energy Defense programs of the Department of Energy, the conference agreement includes

about \$13.5 billion. These funds will permit the Department to ensure that we have a reliable and safe nuclear weapons stockpile.

For the National Ignition Facility, we provided \$199 million. We are very concerned about the way this program has been managed in the past. However, we believe that the Department has assembled the management team and put in place the procedures that will enable the project to be successfully completed.

I need to point out to the Members of the House that when we were at conference this week, we received a letter signed by the President's chief of staff indicating that the President would veto the bill if a provision regarding the management of the Missouri River included in the Senate bill was not dropped in the conference. It was not dropped, incidentally, in the conference. I believe that this is the only item in the bill that the Senate actually voted on. Therefore, the provision was retained in conference.

I would point out that the President has signed this very same provision into law four times previously. I would hope that on the fifth time the President would not see fit to veto the entire bill over this one issue that he has agreed to in the past and would not allow a single issue to destroy months of hard work by the House and the Senate.

The conference agreement includes funding for many of the administrative initiatives, particularly in the Department of Energy's science programs, but also in a number of smaller programs that are important to the President.

I want to thank my Senate counterpart, Chairman PETE DOMENICI, and his ranking minority member, Senator HARRY REID, for their cooperation and hard work in conferencing the bill. Moreover, I would like to express my sincere appreciation to my colleagues on the House Subcommittee on Energy and Water, whose devoted efforts have made this conference report possible.

I am especially grateful to my very good friend and the ranking minority member of the House subcommittee, the honorable gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), for his tremendous effort on behalf of this conference report.

□ 1130

Some last minute issues arose yesterday that had the potential to reopen our conference and not allow us to be here today and finish the work. His willingness to cooperate permitted us to complete our work, and I am deeply grateful for his cooperation.

I also want to thank our chairman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking member of the full committee, for their cooperation in enabling us to bring this conference report to the floor today.

I would be remiss if I did not express my sincere gratitude to all of the staff people who have worked on this conference report. They have given untireless effort to getting the conference report ready for this morning, and I sincerely want to thank them: Mr. Bob Schmidt, the clerk of the committee; Jeanne Wilson; Tracey LaTurner; Witt Anderson; Terry Tyborowski; Sally Chadbourne; and Rich Kaelin; and perhaps several others even on the Senate side that have helped us so much.

I believe the conference agreement is balanced and fair. I would urge the unanimous support of the House for its adoption. I would hope we could quickly conclude action on this conference report so we can get the bill to the White House before the new fiscal year begins.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would want to note for all of the Members in the Chamber that as we begin the debate on this conference report, this will also be the last time that the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD) will manage legislation on the House floor.

As I mentioned in my earlier remarks during House consideration of this legislation, we ought to all just take a moment to appreciate the fact that for over 4 decades, every day of every year of more than 40 years, the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD) has dedicated his life not only to his family, but to his country. We are richer for that. And given the experience I have had during the last 2 years of working closely with the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD) as my chairman, I certainly would emphasize to all of the Members of the House that the golf game of the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD) will certainly improve, not that it needs much improvement, in his retirement, his family will see him more often, but we will be the poorer of it.

Again, I would say to the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD), he has done a terrific job, and we ought to give him a hand.

Mr. Speaker, I want to also not only thank the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD) and the members of the subcommittee and full committee, but to thank those who are truly responsible for ensuring that this legislation is on the floor, and that is the staff connected with the committee, as well as the personal offices. I want to thank Nora Bomar, who is in the office of the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD); Terry Tyborowski; Carol Angier; Tracey LaTurner; Witt Anderson; Sally Chadbourne; Jeanne Wilson; Bob Schmidt; Rich Kaelin; and, as a former

associate staff person myself, all of the associate staff who worked so hard with the professional staff throughout the year to make this conference report a reality.

Before getting into the merits of the bill, I would also want to express my regret and apology to Members who feel that, for whatever reason, their requests were not met in this bill. While we did receive a larger allocation after conference, there clearly was more demand placed on us than ability to perform.

I do want to emphasize to Members that, regardless of which side of the aisle they were on, particularly on water projects, we tried to give everyone every serious consideration, every fair consideration, but clearly we could not do everything. I do regret that. I am sure that the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD) does as well. It was unavoidable.

During House consideration and consideration in the committee, I expressed concern that as far as this country's investment in infrastructure, we have fallen short; and while we have moved strongly in the right direction during conference on this bill, I would reiterate that, for myself, I do believe that we continue to under invest in economic infrastructure, and I would continue to use the Army Corps as an example of that failure.

There are \$30 billion on the active construction list that are authorized, that are economically justified, and that are supported by non-Federal entity. Most of those will, unfortunately, not be funded in this bill, because, again, of the squeeze of our allocation. There is \$450 million in backlog of critical deferred maintenance for next year alone, and the Corps estimates they need \$700 million per year to permit projects to move forward on their most efficient schedule.

The administration asked for a new initiative on recreational facility modernization, and the money was not available to do that. The administration asked for the Challenge 21 Riverine Exploration Program to begin, and there was not enough money for that.

Generically, in constant dollars, we have seen expenditure on these kinds of projects to decline from 1996 of \$5 billion to approximately \$1.7 billion during the 1990s in constant dollars. So while we have improved this bill and increased funding for economic infrastructure, I think, generically, this institution and the administration has not paid enough attention to this critical need.

I would also want to advise Members that while I am going to vote for this bill, they should all, as a matter of information, understand that the President has threatened to veto this bill because of a paragraph included in the Senate relative to a master water con-

trol manual for the Missouri River that is being developed by the Army Corps of Engineers.

Relative to the House mark, the Army Corps of Engineers will have an additional \$395 million, and I think that is a vast improvement. I am also happy that the compromise struck in the conference raised the dollars to the House level relative to the regulatory programs that the Corps has to undergo. That figure is \$125 million.

I would note, however, for the record that because of additional regulatory requirements that the Corps has now undertaken, as well as additional reporting requirements that we will be imposing on the Corps in this bill, it is my belief today that the Corps remains \$6 million short.

I warn Members that I hope we do not see a self-fulfilling prophesy; and that is during the debate on these new regulations and requirements the suggestion was this was going to slow down permitting process nationally, well, if you do not give an agency the required monies, that is not a possibility. It would not in this case be the Army Corps' fault.

We had a debate during House consideration as far as monies set aside for civilian science. That number is higher today than it was in the House, and in fact is \$356 million higher.

Finally, we had an amendment in debate on renewable energy. The figure in this conference is \$422 million. That is \$59 million greater than when the bill left the House, but I would also note for the information of Members that it remains \$30 million below the President's request. Again, I have these iterations essentially for the information of Members.

It has been a pleasure to work with the gentleman from California (Chairman PACKARD). This is a good bill, I support it, but I do want Members to be fully informed before their vote.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, the two gentleman bringing this bill to the floor have done a fine job. The gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD) is a fine Member of this institution, and I am going to hate to see him leave his post. The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VIS-CLOSKY) is also an extremely fine Member. But I am not going to vote for this bill, and I want to explain why.

This bill is the product of the total and utter collapse of the budget process. That collapse came about as a result of the adoption of a budget resolution last spring which pretended that domestic spending priorities could be squeezed to the bone, far below the level that everyone understood would actually be producible by this Congress, and under that resolution the House then proceeded to debate and pass all 13 appropriation bills. We spent

the entire summer working on those bills. Many of those bills passed by the narrowest of margins because of concerns expressed on both sides of the aisle over the lack of adequate resources being provided and most of them to fund government activities.

Now, suddenly, in the last inning, in the middle of September, only a few weeks before the beginning of the fiscal year, that budget resolution has been thrown out. Discipline has been thrown out. Now we are told that we should ignore all decisions that were made in early morning and late night sessions throughout the spring and summer to produce radically different bills.

The new guidelines that we have been given by the Republican leadership are to spend up to 10 percent of the unified budget surplus of nearly \$280 billion. That was first interpreted to mean about \$28 billion. Later Republican leaders revealed that, relative to the budget passed last spring, they would permit \$41 billion of the surplus to be spent. But you need to understand that really means close to \$80 billion. Here is why.

The surplus is only spent when the funds actually leave the Treasury. Most appropriations for discretionary programs do not result in all of the money leaving the Treasury in the fiscal year for which they are provided. They are spent later. So, on average, only half of the appropriated funds leave the Treasury in any give year, and, for some programs, less than one-tenth of the appropriated funds result in funds leaving the Treasury during that same fiscal year. As a result, that \$40 billion in spending can be leveraged into an expenditure of up to \$80 billion, and, if you really twist the numbers, you could squeeze even more than \$80 billion in additional spending into the budget.

That is why this bill now can come to the floor almost \$2 billion above the level of the same bill passed by the House in the summer, and \$800 million above the level requested by the President.

Now, the leadership is arguing that the reason this has to be done is to reach compromise with the President because they do not want him to veto the bill. Well, if you take a look the statement of administration policy for this bill when this bill was reported in mid-June, almost \$2 billion lower in spending than the bill now before us, you do not find in that eight-page statement the word "veto." The President would have signed that bill as it stood in June.

The problem that we have here is that the \$2 billion that has been added to this bill was not for him, it was for Members of this body, and this is not the only bill where that is happening. The problem is that I might be willing to vote for this money if I knew what was going to happen in some of the

other bills, but we are being told, for instance, that in the Labor, Health and Education conference, that we cannot add to the amount that has been agreed to by the majority in that conference. So there is no room in the budget for additional funding above the level that the Republican Party has laid out for the Labor, Health and Education programs, and yet they have room to put \$2 billion of additional money in for this program.

I am not willing to vote for that added money in this bill, if it means that it is going to be squeezed out of education or out of health or out of worker protection programs. Those are not my priorities.

If we have to choose, and we should have to choose, there should be some limits, there should be some context, there should be some discipline; but the problem is that there is none, because under the new rules under which we are now proceeding in this rush to get out of town, the only people who know what the spending limits are are a few staffers in the leadership offices of the majority party. The problem is that they change the rules every 2 or 3 days.

So at this point, by voting for the additional \$2 billion in this bill, I do not know what consequences there are for other programs in the budget that, to me, are of higher priority. That is why I am not going to vote for this bill.

I mean no criticism of either of the gentleman, and I certainly mean no criticism of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the full committee chairman.

□ 1145

But this process by which decisions are made arbitrarily by a few staffers on instruction from a few other staffers in the House leadership office disenfranchises rank and file members of the Committee on Appropriations. And if we doubt that, take a look at what is happening in all the other conferences. Those rank and file members are not in those conferences.

It also disenfranchises the vast majority of members of both parties in this House. That is not the fault of the Committee on Appropriations. In the end, the committee, the way this place works, will take the heat for it, but it is not the fault of the Committee on Appropriations. They are simply following the orders of their leadership.

So the result is we have institutional chaos, no discipline, no real understanding of what the rules are, and no context in which to judge whether the amount of money being put in these bills is responsible or not.

That is why, and I mean no criticism of these two gentlemen, but that is why I intend to vote against this bill. Because this is a lousy way to run a railroad, and it is a lousy way to run a legislative body that is supposed to be

the greatest legislative body in the world.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the very distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD), chairman of the subcommittee, for yielding me this time. I wanted to say to the gentleman, and I know it is not appropriate to direct a comment directly from one Member to another without going through the Chair, so, Mr. Speaker, let me say to the gentleman from California through the Speaker that he has been an outstanding member of the Committee on Appropriations, an outstanding Member of the House of Representatives, and he has been a dynamic chairman on the subcommittees on which he has chaired over the last 6 years.

I would say that one way that a chairman of a committee can be successful in getting the job done is to have outstanding subcommittee chairmen. The gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD) certainly fits that bill. He is, and has been, an outstanding subcommittee chairman.

Also, he has been a very good friend to this chairman, and I think to most everybody in this House Chamber. So, Mr. Speaker, I want the gentleman to know how much we are going to miss him, and I regret his decision to retire voluntarily from the United States Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman from California (Chairman PACKARD) and also the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKEY), the ranking minority member, for having brought this bill to the floor. It has not been an easy task. There have been many, many differences on this bill. There are many Members who have requests for projects in the bill that did not make it. They did not make it, not because they were not important projects, not because they were not necessary, but because we were trying to be as fiscally conservative as we could possibly be. I know that there are several Members who are looking for another opportunity to have their projects considered.

But the idea that the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) spoke to just a moment ago, that he would not support this bill because he was not sure what would be done in some other bill, well, that is not the way the process works. Mr. Speaker, we have 13 separate bills. I would say to and remind my colleagues that the House of Representatives has passed all 13 of our bills. And I cannot say that often enough. And we passed them at lower spending levels than the White House or many Members of the minority side wanted.

If my colleagues recall, we spent hour after hour, day after day on some

of these bills dealing with amendments to add more billions of dollars, and we fought off successfully most of those amendments, realizing that there was only a certain amount of money that we ought to spend.

Just because there is a \$230 billion surplus out there, we do not have to spend it all. In our homes, in our personal lives, in our businesses, and in our government, at a time of great prosperity, we pay down some of our bills that have been haunting us for months or years before. That is one of the things that we are committed to doing in this Congress, pay down some of those debts.

Mr. Speaker, we have paid in the last 2 years nearly half a trillion dollars on the public debt that this Nation owed. That is good news, and it is good news for this reason, Mr. Speaker: it is good news because we have had to pay a substantial interest payment on the national debt. \$250 billion is a good round figure to estimate what the interest payment on the national debt was last year and would be this year.

Can my colleagues imagine how many schools we could build? School construction is a big issue. How many schools could we build with \$250 billion that we are now paying out as interest on the national debt? How many highways could we build or bridges could we build? How much more advantage could we give to our veteran population in medical care? In some areas veterans have to wait in line to get their medical care because the demand is greater than the supply available.

So, it is important that we have fought off some of these big spending amendments. I found it really ironic yesterday when I read a statement by the President of the United States scolding Congress for being a "big spending Congress." Well, up until just the last couple of weeks, he was scolding us for not providing all of the money that he wanted for all of his programs. He cannot have it both ways. There he goes again. On the one hand he is scolding us for not spending enough; on the other hand he scolds us for spending too much.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman brought up the subject I wanted to discuss and that was the news accounts last night where I saw the President criticizing the majority for wanting to spend too much money. I have been in on some of the negotiations. The gentleman from Florida has been in all of them. In every instance that I have been involved in we have been trying to hold down the growth in spending; and the President's representatives ought to go see the President and see what he was talking about, because the representatives he

has negotiating these appropriation bills with us are insisting that we spend more money, that we increase the size of government. Yet the President very clearly last night on the news account indicated that we were trying to hold him hostage so we could spend more money.

I am glad the gentleman from Florida clarified that, because I was confused. I thought maybe I had fallen asleep in some of those meetings.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman from Alabama for those comments.

I think it is important that our colleagues know this. We have been very diligent in communicating with the White House and the President's staff, and the Office of Management and Budget, to do the best we could to accommodate the wishes that they had within our strong desire to keep the budget balanced and to pay down a substantial amount on our national debt.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, we are at this point. This bill should be decided on its own merits. We should not vote for this bill or against this bill because of what may or may not be in some other appropriations bill. This is a good bill, and all of the minority members signed the conference report except for the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), so I think that is an indication that this is a pretty decent bipartisan appropriations bill.

Again, I congratulate the gentleman from California (Chairman PACKARD) and the ranking member, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKEY), for bringing a good bill to this floor; and I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. PASTOR), a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to congratulate the gentleman from California (Chairman PACKARD) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKEY), the ranking member, for bringing to the floor a good bill. I know that we have worked on it. We worked on it very hard, and we are able to have a good conference. I will support the bill and ask other Members to support it.

I would like to thank the staff. I would like to thank the gentleman from Indiana for working with all of us, as well as the gentleman from Florida.

People of Arizona in Maricopa County and in Pima County want to thank the committee for the fine work they have allowed to be funded in terms of habitat restoration and the studies that will rehabilitate the environment.

I would like to take a moment to thank the gentleman from Florida (Chairman PACKARD). He has been very fair and willing to work things out

with all of us. I want to thank him for the way he treated this Member. I wish him the best. Sorry to see him go, but I wish him the best in his retirement.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM), a valued member of the subcommittee.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I want to join in congratulating the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PACKARD), our subcommittee chairman, on a great job this year. It is only indicative of the job he has done for so many years in this Congress, and I think we all know that he will be sorely missed next year.

I would like to just address one issue that is in this bill that is of extreme importance to Iowa and the States along the Missouri River. Apparently, the President and the Vice President have threatened a veto over this issue.

Mr. Speaker, this has to do with the Missouri River flow. Mr. Speaker, apparently our memories are very, very short. No one is going back to 1993 with the tremendous flooding that we had in the Midwest. At that time, if the policies that President Clinton and Vice President GORE wanted to put in place had been in place, we would have dramatically increased the amount of flooding along the Missouri River, all the way down to the lower Mississippi River basin.

This is a direct threat to the lives and property of people who live along the Missouri River. It is extraordinary that when the Vice President comes out of Iowa and asks for our support, or Nebraska, or Missouri, or any of the States below the junction of the Missouri and Mississippi Rivers, that he would want to compound a tremendous flooding potential.

It is not only a matter of lives and property; it is a matter of economic necessity that we maintain navigation on the Missouri River. It is going to dramatically increase the cost to agriculture as far as our inputs are concerned, and it is going to dramatically reduce the price even further of our grains as we try to export them down the river. What it is going to do is make the railroads absolutely king, with no competition in the upper Midwest.

One other issue that is not talked about is the reduced generating power of the dams upstream during the low flow that they are proposing in the middle of the summer.

Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of life, property, economic viability for anyone along the Missouri River or the lower Mississippi. It is something that is wrong in their position, and we have to maintain the position that is in the bill. And I would really ask anyone, when the Vice President comes out and asks for support, how he can put the lives of our citizens in jeopardy by supporting this outrageous proposal that they are threatening a veto over.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). The Chair advises the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKEY) has 14½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD) has 12½ minutes remaining.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY), a member of the full committee.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKEY), the ranking member of the subcommittee, for his kind consideration. I also want to express my respect and appreciation to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PACKARD), chairman of the subcommittee, and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), chairman of the full committee as well. I am a great admirer of their work and certainly of their personal qualities.

This bill, however, is a different matter all together. The bill suffers from serious and dramatic deficiencies. First of all, with regard to the need to bring our country more closely into a condition of energy independence, the bill fails. It is \$32 million less than what the President requested for alternative energy and energy conservation.

Now, I wish that the President had requested more than that, but the very least that this bill could do is to meet the request laid out by the President of the United States and recognize the need to move our country closer to a situation of energy independence.

We are now importing 53 percent of the oil that we use every single day for transportation and for heating of our homes, businesses, and industries. This is a deplorable situation. This is a matter of strategic interest and strategic concern.

□ 1200

I can only conclude that this is a conscious decision. Why? Because it is not a matter of money. The bill adds \$2 billion to that which was in the bill when it left this House. So it is not a question of funding.

It is a question of establishing priorities. We could use a substantial portion of that \$2 billion to move us away from our dependence upon people who wish us ill in the Middle East. In fact, this bill plays into the hands of several leaders who wish this country ill, Middle Eastern leaders who control the oil spigot, because it increases our dependence on foreign oil. That is one of the deficiencies.

Another deficiency is that the bill fails to reauthorize the Strategic Petroleum Reserve and fails to authorize a strategic home heating oil reserve for the northeastern part of this country.

We have heard that those provisions may be in another bill, another bill coming out of another subcommittee. But at this moment, we have no reason

to have any confidence in those pronouncements. Why? Because that subcommittee, the Interior Subcommittee, the conferees of that subcommittee are allegedly meeting somewhere in this Capitol, somewhere, allegedly. Now I say allegedly because I am one of the conferees.

I am one of the conferees, and I do not know where that conference is meeting, nor do almost all of the other conferees, whether they are Democrats or Republicans. These meetings, if they are being held, are being held clandestinely.

This is a bill that suffers seriously in its deficiencies, and for those reasons, it ought to be defeated.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to respond to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY).

Mr. Speaker, this bill is \$60 million on alternative fuels more than last year's, so we have not neglected that area. We have raised it even from where it was as it passed out of the House.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate what the gentleman just said, and I think that that is a very good procedure and the right direction, but is it not true that the bill appropriates an additional \$2 billion for a variety of unknown works, and that it is \$32 million below the requests for energy conservation and alternative energy as requested by the President; is not that true?

Mr. PACKARD. Reclaiming my time, the \$2 billion figure has been thrown around several times today. It is an inaccurate figure. We have increased the funding for this bill to the tune of \$1.6 billion, not \$2 billion. But the fact is we have readdressed the alternative fuel issue, and we have increased it substantially this year over last year. That is moving in the right direction and in the direction the gentleman has addressed.

Mr. HINCHEY. But it is \$32 million less than the President requested.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG), a valued member of the Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Chairman PACKARD) very much for his great work. I, too, want to join my colleagues in extending to the gentleman the very best. Three words come to mind when I think of the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD) as to the style in which he operates, one is temperament and another patience and the third is attentiveness. The gentleman ranks high on all three of those.

Again, my thanks also to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKEY), the ranking Member and the staff that contributed so much to this bill.

Let me just say that this is a good bill. It is a good conference report. It exercises a proper balance between spending for the Nation's important water, energy and national security projects while still maintaining adequate fiscal restraint. Furthermore, the bill sets aside a sizable amount of money, sizable amount of the budget surplus to go towards paying down the Federal debt.

As we all know, the Nation is facing a period of exceptionally high energy prices. Unfortunately, the Clinton-Gore administration has decided to tamper with our national security by releasing oil from our Strategic Petroleum Reserve instead of correcting what can only be called their antienergy policy of the last 8 years.

Mr. Speaker, this measure takes some of the necessary steps toward bringing a proper balance to our national energy mix. It provides for a variety of important research and development projects that I hope will deliver some of the break-through technologies to fuel America's future energy needs.

It is clear that electricity is the source that drives our burgeoning information economy, and we need to recognize that nuclear power now provides over one-fifth of our total electric demand. Along these lines, this bill provides vitally required funding for nuclear energy research under the NERI, the NEPO and the NEER programs; and it enhances the ability of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to perform its mission. And nuclear technology provides more than just power. Nuclear technology right now is being used to take excess weapons material and making it available for life-saving cancer treatment.

It likewise keeps the Department of Energy on its path towards completing nuclear cleanup as some of the Nation's old cold war weapon sites by the year 2006, and it funds the development of the Yucca Mountain spent fuel repository.

The measure also invests in fusion as a future energy source, and it addresses the need to bring ever-greater computing capabilities through the advanced scientific computing research initiative to our national laboratories and universities. Finally, in addition, the vital water infrastructure projects that the Corps of Engineers performs are, I believe, sufficiently addressed.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California, the chairman of the subcommittee for yielding me the time.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK), a member of the full committee.

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, let me first thank the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development for his leadership and for working with us as we try to work together to serve the people of America. I thank the gentleman very much and I wish him well in his retirement.

And I would like to thank our ranking member, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKEY), for his work in yielding time to me this morning.

Mr. Speaker, I voted for this bill, as some 400 others did as it went through the House in June, June 28, I do believe. At that time we thought it was a good bill, needed improvement, but we were willing to work with the chairman and our ranking member to see that we can address America's problems.

The Interior bill should have included, and did not, a provision that the Strategic Petroleum Reserve would be used in the case of an emergency. The Interior bill did not have that in the House. It did not have that in the Senate. This House passed a bill that would give the President authority to release those reserves in an emergency. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, that bill has not been acted on in the Senate.

The Committee on Appropriations took action to put an amendment on this bill that would give our President the authority, should he need it, to release those reserves. This House adopted that amendment, as well as one that said that the Northeast Corridor could also secure the oil reserves they need.

We are now 2 days from a new fiscal year, and much more than that or, just as important, we are on our way in the Midwest and the Northeast part of our country in a severe weather winter season.

Mr. Speaker, this bill has stricken the language for the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, and I think that is unfortunate. It has also stricken the language that would help the people in the Northeast meet their heating bills. At a time when our economy is booming, we find many people on fixed incomes, seniors, who will not have the dollars it will take to heat their homes; families who will not have the dollars they will need to send their children to school from a heated healthy home.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is unfortunate 2 days before the new fiscal year ends that we have not approved permission to our President to release the oil reserves.

It is important with 2 days left that we act for the people of the Midwest, for the people of the Northeast Corridor who are about to embark on the winter season, when they do not have the resources. Oil prices are high. It is unfortunate that since we announced and since the President acted on releasing some of the 30 million barrels

of oil that oil prices have begun to come down now because this Congress is not acting, because we have stricken the language in this bill.

Oil prices are on the way up. Now why is that? The demand is high. Can we not as Members of Congress do what we need to do to make sure, A, the President has the authority, B, that oil prices begin to come down, and that people on fixed incomes, middle-income people with families have the right to heat their homes and drive their cars to get back and forth to their employment with oil reserves that this country can make available to them.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the work of the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD) and the work of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY). It did not get in the Interior bill. We passed it in this full House. We ought to do it today. I urge my colleagues to adopt it.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP), a member of the full committee.

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from California (Chairman PACKARD), who is just simply a class act. He will be sorely missed here. He is a real gentleman and a credit to this institution. I want to commend the staffs on both sides of the aisle. They are professionals, specifically Bob Schmidt, the staff director, an excellent job. I do not think there is a staffer on the Hill who is more thorough, efficient, fair or tougher than Jeanne Wilson, I thank her. I thank Eric Mondero and Nora Bomar for their cooperation.

Thousands of Tennesseans work in national security, science, and environmental management every day on behalf of our country. The Department of Energy needs oversight. We need to be tough with them. We need to hold them accountable. This committee does both. They fund them, but they hold them accountable.

This bill is the product of both of those things. We thank our colleagues for the priorities that they set to carry out the critical missions of national security, major science investments for future generations, and environmental cleanup. The work this bill will do in those areas is the best product in the last 6 years that this Congress has passed out, but it comes with tough love and oversight of the Department of Energy, which is very needed. A job well done, everyone should support this conference report.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN) and would point out that his work on the Brays Bayou flight control project and the Houston Ship Canal has been critical.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), the

ranking member. I also want to congratulate the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD), chairman of the Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development for his work and for putting together an extremely good bill.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this bill, and I want to point out three items that are in it. First, the bill fully funds for the second consecutive year the Brays Bayou project which runs through my congressional district, that affects tens of thousands of homeowners, the Texas Medical Center, the largest medical center in the world and Rice University, all in my district. This is part of a new authorization that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) and I worked on and had passed, that gives more local control. And we think this is going to be a very good project for the taxpayers and for providing public safety.

It also fully funds the Simms Project, which runs in part through my district. And it fully funds the Port of Houston project, which is an ongoing project which will continue economic growth in our area. Most particularly, it includes legislative authorization for barge lanes along the Houston Ship Channel project that I and others have been working on trying to get for the last year and a half.

This will enhance the barge business in our districts but also provide great safety. So I appreciate it.

In closing, let me say I strongly support this bill. I think it is a well-done bill. It would be very good for Texas and for the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4733, the FY 2001 Energy and Water Appropriations Conference Report. Chairman RON PACKARD, Ranking Member PETER VISCLOSKY, and all other conferees deserve recognition for their hard work on this important legislation. I would also like to thank my good friend from Texas, Mr. EDWARDS, for all the help he and his office have provided me.

I strongly support the decision of the conferees to provide the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers with vital funding to continue their work in the areas of flood control and navigational improvement. This funding is necessary for the critical economic and public safety initiatives contained within the legislation. Because many flood and navigation projects located in and around my district are on accelerated construction schedules, full funding by the conferees leads to expedited completion at great savings to the taxpayers and reduced threat to public safety.

I am very pleased with the support this legislation provides for addressing the chronic flooding problems of Harris County, Texas. H.R. 4733 provides vital federal assistance to flood control projects in the Houston area on Brays, Sims, Buffalo, Hunting and White Oak bayous. I am confident these projects will safeguard tens of thousands in my district from flood waters and safeguard taxpayers from potential disaster relief expense.

Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege of representing Harris County, one of the original

sites for a demonstration project for a new federal reimbursement program which was authorized by legislation introduced by Representative TOM DELAY and myself as part of the Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) of 1996. Much of the flood control project design, contracting, and maintenance in my district is undertaken by an extremely competent local agency, the Harris County Flood Control District, which is at the forefront of integrated and effective watershed management. This unique program strengthens and enhances Corps/Local Sponsor relationship by giving the local sponsor a lead role and providing for reimbursement by the federal government to the local sponsor for the traditionally federal portion of work.

I am most gratified that the conferees, for the second consecutive year, decided to fully fund the Brays Bayou project at \$6 million for FY '01. This project will improve flood protection for an extensively developed urban area along Brays Bayou in southwest Harris County including tens of thousands of homeowners in the floodplain and the Texas Medical Center and Rice University by providing three miles of channel improvements, three flood detention basins, and seven miles of stream diversion resulting in a 25-year level of flood protection. Originally authorized in the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 and reauthorized in 1996 as part of a \$400 million federal/local flood control project, over \$16.3 million has already been appropriated for the Brays Bayou Project. It is important that the Congress fully fund its match now that the local sponsor has approved the final design.

I am also gratified that the conferees decided to fully fund the Sims Bayou project at a level of \$11.8 million. This project is necessary to improve flood protection for an extensively developed urban area along Sims Bayou in southern Harris County. Authorized as part of the 1988 WRDA bill, the Sims Bayou project consists of 19.3 miles of channel enlargement, rectification, and erosion control and will provide a 25-year level of flood protection. The Sims Bayou project is scheduled to be completed two years ahead of schedule in 2004.

Flood control projects are necessary for the protection of life and property in Harris County, but improving navigation in our Port an integral step for the rapid growth of our economy in the global marketplace. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that this legislation provides the full \$53.5 million for continuing construction on the Houston Ship Channel expansion project. I also commend the Committee for including legislative language directing the Corps of Engineers to design and construct new barge levees in the Houston Ship Channel as part of the deepening and widening project. I and others have worked very hard over the last year and a half to obtain this authorization to ensure that the increasingly important barge traffic can be conducted safely and without disruption. Upon completion, this entire project will likely generate tremendous economic and environmental benefits to the nation and will enhance one of our region's most important trade and economic centers.

The Houston Ship Channel, one of the world's most heavily-trafficked ports, desperately needs expansion to meet the challenges of expanding global trade and to maintain its competitive edge as a major international port. Currently, the Port of Houston is the second largest port in the United States in total tonnage, and is a catalyst for the southeast Texas economy, contributing more than \$5 billion annually and providing 200,000 jobs.

The Houston Ship Channel expansion project calls for deepening the channel from 40 to 45 feet and widening it from 400 to 530 feet. The ship channel modernization, considered the largest dredging project since the construction of the Panama Canal, will preserve the Port of Houston's status as one of the premier deep-channel Gulf ports and one of the top transit points for cargo in the world. Besides the economic and safety benefits, the dredged material from the deepening and widening will be used to create 4,250 acres of wetland and bird habitat. I congratulate the conferees on continuing a project supported by local voters, governments, chambers of commerce, and environmental groups.

I sincerely thank the conferees, Chairman, and Ranking Member for their support and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY), the chairman of the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD) for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the conference report before the House. We are supposed to be considering an appropriations conference report today. Instead, what we have before us is a legislative outrage.

Mr. Speaker, who knew that instead of funding energy and water programs this year, we would be bailing out the nuclear industry to the tune of hundreds of millions of dollars. Well, that is exactly what this bill does, by dramatically changing the fee structure that the industry pays to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

That is not all. Who knew that not only would we be funding the Department of Energy this year, but we would be legislating major changes to the agency that safeguards our nuclear secrets? That is right. This conference report contains substantial amendments to the National Nuclear Security. The NNSA has not been doing such a great job in the last year, does anyone really think that legislative on the fly like this is going to improve our nuclear safety?

It is conference reports like this, Mr. Speaker, that have gotten the American people sick and tired with Washington politics. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against the conference report.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN), who also has been indispensable in working on the Houston Ship Channel Project.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I hope we quickly pass this conference report and send it on to our colleagues in the Senate and hopefully the President will sign this vital piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from California (Chairman PACKARD) not only for this particular bill, but the service to our Nation for many years, and thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), our ranking member, along with the conferees for the work on this report.

Mr. Speaker, I especially want to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS), my colleague and friend, for his dedication and hard work and especially appreciate his advice during this process.

□ 1215

Because of the vision of the conference committee and the Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, the Houston-Galveston Navigation project will receive \$53.5 million needed to continue the construction schedule for the deepening and widening of the Houston Ship Channel including the safety effort in barge lanes.

The continued expansion of the Port of Houston is important on many levels. More than 7,000 vessels navigate the ship channel each year. The port provides \$5.5 billion in business revenue and creates indirectly and directly 196,000 jobs.

It is anticipated that the number and size of vessels will only increase. So this important project is definitely needed for, not only for the port, but for the city of Houston and Harris County.

In addition to the Houston Ship Channel, there are several other flood control projects that the Army Corps of Engineers, in partnership with the Harris County Flood Control, have undertaken.

The Hunting Bayou project and the Greens Bayou project will protect many square miles of watershed and provide protection for hundreds of homes.

Mr. Speaker, again, citizens of Houston and Harris County appreciate the work of the conference committee and our Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON).

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD) for yielding me this time. Mr. Speaker, I, too, compliment him on his work. I particularly rise to thank him for including the ongoing funding for the Brevard County Beach project.

The historical record supports that, prior to the creation of Port Canaveral by the Army Corps of Engineers, the beaches in Brevard County were grow-

ing. The creation of that port was in order to stimulate commerce but as well to support the Navy's ballistic missile program, clearly a program that benefited us in our ability to win the Cold War that accrued to the benefit of every American.

The disruption of the natural flow of sand from north to south by the creation of that port has contributed to a heavy degree of erosion. The Federal Government is recognizing that. I compliment the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD) and all the conferees for their support of ongoing funding for this project and the need to badly redress the critical problem of beach erosion there.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) has 5½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD) has 5½ minutes remaining.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise because of my great concern that within this bill is the reauthorization for the Energy Policy and Conservation Act. But missing from it is the language which would authorize the President to deploy the Strategic Petroleum Reserve or to create a regional home heating oil reserve on a permanent basis. When this bill left the House, it was in. As it comes back from the Senate, it is gone.

Now, I know that there are some people, George Bush, who is saying it is 45 days before the election. I understand his perspective. But for those of us in the Northeast and the Midwest, we have a different perspective. We think it is 45 days before winter.

We think the President should have the authority to create a regional home heating oil reserve on a permanent basis, to have a trigger in it that is a definition that he can use to deploy it, that is flexible so that we can deal with the fact that two-thirds of all the home heating oil in the world is really consumed in the northeastern part of the United States, and that ultimately there can be this depressing impact upon the price of crude oil.

Since last Wednesday when this discussion began in the Clinton-Gore administration, the price of oil has dropped \$6 a barrel, from \$38 down to \$32, which is good for the consumers.

Now, yesterday the chairman of the energy subcommittee, the Republican chairman, said that he was going to introduce a bill that prohibited the President from using the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. He said he did not think it was an emergency.

Of course, down in Texas, they have another phrase for this kind of a situation. They call it a profit-taking opportunity, and it is for the oil companies.

They are tipping people upside down and shaking money out of their pockets.

This bill should contain the authorization for the Strategic Petroleum Reserve and for the regional home heating oil reserve which is so critical for the Northeast and Midwestern part of the country.

Now, people say that we should not use it. Nero fiddled while Rome burned. They could have sent over some firehoses to kind of do something about it, but he just decided to fiddle away, and Rome was lost. Noah could have listened to the fish, not built an ark. The fish say, no problem. The higher the water gets, the better it is for us.

Kind of like the oil companies. You do not need this ark of a Strategic Petroleum Reserve for everybody else, for the human beings. They can just pay higher prices.

So this bill is severely deficient, lacking the authority to protect American consumers from these skyrocketing outrageous energy prices. As a result, this bill should be rejected.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, the Energy and Water Appropriations Conference Report provides critical funding for many important water projects in my state of North Dakota. Under the bill we will be able to provide a clean, reliable water supply to communities across North Dakota and on the reservations. We will be able to continue work on the construction of a permanent flood control project to protect the city of Grand Forks. Finally, we will be able to continue preconstruction, engineering and design of an emergency outlet to relieve flooding in Devils Lake.

However, while I will be supporting the conference report, I strongly object to language included in the conference report that would prevent the Corps of Engineers from moving forward to revise the Missouri River Master Manual. Today, the Army Corps of Engineers is managing the Missouri River on the basis of a manual that was adopted in the 1960s. Under the manual, the Corps manages the river by trying to maintain steady water levels through the spring and summer to ensure there is always enough water to support barge traffic downstream. Unfortunately, under this management system, navigation has been emphasized on the Missouri River to the detriment of upstream interests, including recreation, which is much more important now than it was in 1960. The projections on barge traffic used to justify the manual have never materialized and have actually declined since its peak in the late 1970s.

After more than 40 years, the time has come for the management of the Missouri River to reflect the current economic realities of a \$90 million annual recreation impact upstream, versus a \$7 million annual navigation impact downstream. The Corps has proposed to revise the master manual to increase spring flows, known as a spring rise, once every 3 years in an effort to bring back the river's natural flow and reduce summer flows every year.

The President has indicated that he intends to veto the conference report because of this

provision. If the conference report comes back to the House with this provision in it, I will vote to sustain the President's veto. I firmly believe the Corps should not be stopped in their efforts to revise and update the manual.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to thank the Chairman of the Energy and Water Appropriations Subcommittee Representative RON PACKARD and the Ranking Member, Representative PETER VISCLOSKEY, and the conferees for their support of Sacramento flood control projects included in the FY 2001 Energy and Water Appropriations Conference Report. Flooding remains the single greatest threat to the public safety of the Sacramento community, posing a constant risk to the lives of my constituents and to the regional economy. Thanks to your efforts and the efforts of this Committee, Sacramento can continue to work toward improved flood protection.

With a mere 85-year level of protection, Sacramento remains the metropolitan area in this nation most at risk to flooding. More than 400,000 people and \$37 billion in property reside within the Sacramento flood plain, posing catastrophic consequences in the event of a flood. While Congress will continue to consider the best long-term solution to this threat, funding in this bill will provide much needed improvements to the existing flood control facilities throughout the region.

I am grateful that the Committee was able to find the necessary resources to provide funding for the Folsom Dam Modifications under the Army Corps of Engineers New Starts construction account. This project is crucial to the public safety of the residents in the Sacramento flood plain. The funding allotted will be used to make modifications to the outlet works on Folsom Dam, improving its flood control efficiency, and allowing more water to be released earlier during storms that cause flooding. These improvements represent the first significant enhancements to Sacramento's flood control works in roughly 50 years, and will boost its level of flood protection to approximately 140-years.

Also, this legislation provides funding that allows for the continuation of levee improvements and bank stabilization projects along the lower American and Sacramento Rivers, increasing levee reliability and stemming bank erosion. Additionally, I greatly appreciate the Committee's willingness to provide funding for projects—including the Strong Ranch and Chicken Ranch Sloughs, and Magpie Creek—aimed at preventing flooding from a series of smaller rivers and streams that present substantial threats separate from those posed by the major rivers in the region. Importantly, the Committee's willingness to include funding for the American River Comprehensive Plan will allow for ongoing Corps of Engineers general investigation work on all area flood control needs, including a permanent long-term solution.

Again, I am thankful this Committee has recognized the grave danger confronting Sacramento and by this funding has signaled a willingness by the federal government to maintain a strong commitment to the community. On behalf of my constituents, I am grateful for your support in helping to address this perilous situation.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4733, the FY 2001 Energy and

Water Appropriations Conference Report. Chairman RON PACKARD, Ranking Member PETER VISCLOSKEY, and all other conferees deserve recognition for their hard work on this important legislation. I would also like to thank my good friend from Texas, Mr. EDWARDS, for all the help he and his office have provided me.

I strongly support the decision of the conferees to provide the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers with vital funding to continue their work in the areas of flood control and navigational improvement. This funding is necessary for the critical economic and public safety initiatives contained within the legislation. Because many flood and navigation projects located in and around my district are on accelerated construction schedules, full funding by the conferees leads to expedited completion at great savings to the taxpayers and reduced threat to public safety.

I am very pleased with the support this legislation provides for addressing the chronic flooding problems of Harris County, Texas. H.R. 4733 provides vital federal assistance to flood control projects in the Houston area on Brays, Sims, Buffalo, Hunting and White Oak bayous. I am confident these projects will safeguard tens of thousands in my district from flood waters and safeguard taxpayers from potential disaster relief expense.

Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege of representing Harris County, one of the original sites for a demonstration project for a new federal reimbursement program, which was authorized by legislation introduced by Representative TOM DELAY and myself as part of the Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) of 1996. Much of the flood control project design, contracting and maintenance in my district is undertaken by an extremely competent local agency, the Harris County Flood Control District, which is at the forefront of integrated and effective watershed management. This unique program strengthens and enhances Corps/Local Sponsor relationship by giving the local sponsor a lead role and providing for reimbursement by the federal government to the local sponsor for the traditionally federal portion of work.

I am most gratified that the conferees, for the second consecutive year, decided to fully fund the Brays Bayou project at \$6 million for FY 2001. This project will improve flood protection for an extensively developed urban area along Brays Bayou in southwest Harris County including tens of thousands of residents in the flood plain, the Texas Medical Center, and Rice University. The project will provide three miles of channel improvements, three flood detention basins, and seven miles of stream diversion resulting in a 25-year level of flood protection. Originally authorized in the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 and reauthorized in 1996 as part of a \$400 million federal/local flood control project, over \$16.3 million has already been appropriated for the Brays Bayou Project. It is important that Congress fully fund its match now that the local sponsor has approved the final design.

I am also gratified that the conferees decided to fully fund the Sims Bayou project at a level of \$11.8 million. This project is necessary to improve flood protection for an extensively developed urban area along Sims

Bayou in southern Harris County. Authorized as part of the 1998 WRDA bill, the Sims Bayou project consists of 19.3 miles of channel enlargement, rectification, and erosion control and will provide a 25-year level of flood protection. The Sims Bayou project is scheduled to be completed two years ahead of schedule in 2004.

Flood control projects are necessary for the protection of life and property in Harris County, but improving navigation in our Port is an integral step for the rapid growth of our economy in the global marketplace. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that this legislation provides the full \$53.3 million for continuing construction on the Houston Ship Channel expansion project. Upon completion, this project will likely generate tremendous economic and environmental benefits to the nation and will enhance one of our region's most important trade and economic centers.

The Houston Ship Channel, one of the world's most heavily-trafficked ports, desperately needs expansion to meet the challenges of expanding global trade and to maintain its competitive edge as a major international port. Currently, the Port of Houston is the second largest port in the United States in total tonnage, and is a catalyst for the southeast Texas economy, contributing more than \$5 billion annually and providing 200,000 jobs.

The Houston Ship Channel expansion project calls for deepening the channel from 40 to 45 feet and widening it from 400 to 530 feet. The ship channel modernization, considered the largest dredging project since the construction of the Panama Canal, will preserve the Port of Houston's status as one of the premier deep-channel Gulf ports and one of the top transit points for cargo in the world. Besides the economic and safety benefits, the dredged material from the deepening and widening will be used to create 4,250 acres of wetland and bird habitat. I congratulate the conferees on continuing a project supported by local voters, governments, chambers of commerce, and environmental groups.

I also commend the committee for including legislative language directing the Corps of Engineers to design and construct new barge lanes in the Houston Ship Channel as part of the deepening and widening project. I and others have worked very hard over the last year and one-half to obtain this authorization to ensure that the increasingly important barge traffic can be conducted safely, without spills, and without disruption.

I sincerely thank the conferees, Chairman, and Ranking Member for their support and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the conferees for their excellent work in bringing this Energy and Water Appropriations Conference Report to the floor today.

It is my understanding that the conference report under consideration provides \$125 million for the regulatory program account of the Corps of Engineers for fiscal year 2001—an increase of \$8 million above the FY00 appropriation for this program. This funding is necessary for the Corps to carry out its permit-related responsibilities pertaining to navigable waters and wetlands under the Clean Water Act, the Marine Protection Research and

Sanctuaries Act, and the 1899 Rivers and Harbors Act.

I am pleased that the conferees have added these important funds in an effort to help address the growing backlog of permit applications in need of Corps review and decision. In my district and State, there is increasing concern about the number of permits that are awaiting final agency action, a number more than double what has been achievable in recent years. This growing permit backlog is unnecessarily delaying projects that are vitally important to local and regional economies. I believe the Corps must redouble its efforts to reduce this permit backlog to more reasonable levels as expeditiously and professionally as possible. I am confident that this is the intention of the conferees when they added \$8 million to the regulatory program account.

I also expect the Corps to review its current program procedures and to revise those procedures through streamlining, partnering with other public entities, or other appropriate measures that will expedite permit review and decision without jeopardizing the quality of that review and decision or the interests of the public.

Again, I thank the conferees for taking real steps to address this crucial need and I look forward to working with my colleagues to ensure that the Corps effectively reduce the current permitting backlog.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report to H.R. 4733, the Energy and Water Development Appropriations bill for fiscal year 2001.

I want to thank Chairman PACKARD for his hard work on producing this important bill.

This conference report will appropriate funding to the Army Corps of Engineers providing for the design and construction of necessary flood control projects throughout our Nation. These projects offer our constituents and communities the protection against the devastation that flooding has on human life and property.

In fact, my constituents in Elmsford and Suffern, New York, have and continue to suffer from the flooding of the Saw Mill and Ramapo Rivers.

In 1999, when Hurricane Floyd dropped more than 11 inches of rain on my congressional district, my constituents were faced with flood waters that destroyed homes and businesses and created severe financial stress.

After observing the destruction in my district first-hand, I contacted the U.S. Army Corps and Chairman PACKARD for assistance.

Accordingly, Chairman PACKARD has provided the Army Corps with \$750,000 for each of these flood projects, the Saw Mill River and the Ramapo-Mahwah Flood Control projects, to begin the phases necessary to prevent such destruction in the future.

I look forward to continuing my work with the chairman as the flood control process in both Elmsford and Suffern proceeds.

Once again, I thank Chairman PACKARD for his diligence and work on this important measure, and I urge our colleagues to support this conference report.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to thank Chairman PACKARD for his commitment to fully fund the Office of River Protection and include increases in many vital Hanford cleanup projects in my district.

The Office of River Protection is a congressionally created office in the Department of Energy that is responsible for "managing all aspects" of the River Protection Project, the world's largest and most challenging environmental cleanup project. The \$377 million in total available funds the conference report provides for the River Protection Project Vitrification facility and \$383 million for the tank feed delivery and tank farm operation portion is critical to ensure that the project remains on schedule.

The conference report will also allow for the continued timely placement of eight retired plutonium reactors along the Columbia River at the Hanford site, into an interim safe storage (ISS) mode. The continuation of the accelerated schedule funding will allow these reactors to be cocooned by the end of FY 2003, 6 years ahead of schedule saving the American taxpayer more than \$14 million. \$950,000 of this increase will go directly to ensuring the preservation of the world's first nuclear reactor, The B reactor, which I hope to see opened one day as a museum.

I also support the additional \$12 million for the successful cleanup of the Spent Fuel Project in the K-basins and the additional \$7 million provided for the stabilization of plutonium at the Plutonium Finishing Plant included in the conference report. The Spent Nuclear Fuel Project is a first of its project the will safely move 2,100 metric tons of irradiated nuclear fuel away from the Columbia River beginning this November. The additional \$7 million for the PFP will allow current operations allowing for the continued disposition of over 1800 metric tons of Uranium as well as the deactivation of highly radioactive hot cell facilities.

Further, I appreciate the Committee's support of \$720,000 for the Pasco Shoreline Rivershore project. These dollars are necessary to initiate and complete plans and begin construction on this vital project.

I also appreciate the committee's support of language to ensure that no cleanup funds will be diverted from the Hanford site for the implementation of the Hanford Reach National Monument. While many in my community are split on the issue of a National Monument all of us agree that cleanup at Hanford must not be affected by this decision.

Finally, I want to thank Chairman PACKARD for his excellent work throughout his tenure in Congress and especially his time as chairman of this important subcommittee. America is truly a better place because of his work and his leadership will be truly missed by all of us.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 301, nays 118, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 501]

YEAS—301

Abercrombie	Fattah	Manzullo
Aderholt	Filner	Martinez
Armye	Fletcher	Mascara
Baca	Foley	Matsui
Bachus	Forbes	McCarthy (NY)
Baird	Ford	McCrery
Baker	Fossella	McHugh
Ballenger	Fowler	McInnis
Barcia	Franks (NJ)	McIntyre
Barr	Frelinghuysen	McKeon
Barrett (NE)	Frost	Meek (FL)
Bartlett	Gallegly	Menendez
Barton	Ganske	Metcalfe
Bass	Gekas	Mica
Becerra	Gephardt	Millender
Bentsen	Gillmor	McDonald
Bereuter	Gilman	Miller (FL)
Berkley	Gonzalez	Miller, Gary
Berry	Goode	Miller, George
Biggert	Goodlatte	Mink
Bilbray	Gordon	Mollohan
Bilirakis	Goss	Moore
Bishop	Graham	Murtha
Blagojevich	Granger	Napolitano
Blunt	Green (TX)	Nethercutt
Boehrlert	Gutknecht	Ney
Bonilla	Hall (OH)	Northup
Bonior	Hall (TX)	Norwood
Bono	Hansen	Nussle
Borski	Hastings (WA)	Ortiz
Boucher	Hayes	Ose
Boyd	Hayworth	Packard
Brady (PA)	Heger	Pastor
Brown (FL)	Hill (IN)	Pease
Bryant	Hill (MT)	Pelosi
Burr	Hilleary	Peterson (MN)
Burton	Hilliard	Peterson (PA)
Buyer	Hinojosa	Phelps
Callahan	Hobson	Pickett
Calvert	Hoeffel	Pitts
Camp	Hoekstra	Pombo
Canady	Hooley	Pomeroy
Cannon	Horn	Porter
Capps	Houghton	Price (NC)
Carson	Hoyer	Pryce (OH)
Chambliss	Hulshof	Quinn
Clayton	Hunter	Radanovich
Clement	Hutchinson	Rahall
Clyburn	Hyde	Regula
Coble	Isakson	Reyes
Collins	Jackson (IL)	Reynolds
Combest	Jackson-Lee	Riley
Condit	(TX)	Rivers
Cooksey	Jefferson	Rodriguez
Costello	Jenkins	Roemer
Cox	John	Rogers
Cramer	Johnson (CT)	Rohrabacher
Crane	Johnson, E. B.	Ros-Lehtinen
Crowley	Jones (NC)	Roukema
Cummings	Kaptur	Roybal-Allard
Cunningham	Kasich	Sanchez
Danner	Kelly	Sandlin
Davis (FL)	Kildee	Sawyer
Davis (IL)	Kilpatrick	Saxton
Davis (VA)	King (NY)	Scarborough
Deal	Kingston	Schakowsky
DeGette	Knollenberg	Scott
DeLay	Kolbe	Serrano
Diaz-Balart	Kuykendall	Sessions
Dickey	LaFalce	Shaw
Dicks	LaHood	Sherwood
Dixon	Lampson	Shimkus
Dooley	Lantos	Shows
Doolittle	Latham	Shuster
Doyle	LaTourette	Simpson
Dreier	Leach	Sisisky
Duncan	Lee	Skeen
Dunn	Levin	Skelton
Edwards	Lewis (CA)	Slaughter
Ehlers	Lewis (GA)	Smith (NJ)
Ehrlich	Lewis (KY)	Smith (TX)
Emerson	Linder	Smith (WA)
English	Lipinski	Snyder
Etheridge	LoBiondo	Souder
Evans	Lofgren	Spence
Everett	Lucas (KY)	Spratt
Ewing	Lucas (OK)	Stabenow
Farr	Maloney (NY)	Stark

Strickland	Thornberry	Watts (OK)
Stump	Thune	Weiner
Stupak	Tiahrt	Weldon (FL)
Sweeney	Trafficant	Weldon (PA)
Tanner	Turner	Weller
Tauscher	Udall (CO)	Whitfield
Tauzin	Udall (NM)	Wicker
Taylor (MS)	Visclosky	Wilson
Taylor (NC)	Vitter	Wise
Terry	Walden	Wolf
Thomas	Walsh	Woolsey
Thompson (CA)	Wamp	Wu
Thompson (MS)	Watkins	Young (FL)

NAYS—118

Ackerman	Hefley	Payne
Allen	Hinchee	Petri
Andrews	Holden	Pickering
Archer	Holt	Portman
Baldacci	Hostettler	Ramstad
Baldwin	Inslee	Rangel
Barrett (WI)	Istook	Rogan
Berman	Johnson, Sam	Rothman
Biley	Kanjorski	Royce
Blumenauer	Kennedy	Rush
Boehner	Kind (WI)	Ryan (WI)
Boswell	Kleczka	Ryan (KS)
Brady (TX)	Kucinich	Sabo
Brown (OH)	Largent	Salmon
Campbell	Larson	Sanders
Capuano	Lowe	Sanford
Cardin	Luther	Schaffer
Castle	Maloney (CT)	Sensenbrenner
Chabot	Markey	Shadegg
Chenoweth-Hage	McCarthy (MO)	Shays
Coburn	McDermott	Sherman
Conyers	McGovern	Smith (MI)
Cook	McKinney	Stearns
Coyne	McNulty	Stenholm
Cubin	Meehan	Sununu
DeFazio	Meeks (NY)	Tancredo
Delahunt	Minge	Thurman
DeLauro	Moakley	Tierney
DeMint	Moran (KS)	Toomey
Deutsch	Moran (VA)	Towns
Doggett	Myrick	Upton
Engel	Nadler	Velázquez
Frank (MA)	Neal	Waters
Gejdenson	Oberstar	Watt (NC)
Gibbons	Obey	Waxman
Goodling	Olver	Wexler
Green (WI)	Owens	Weygand
Greenwood	Oxley	Wynn
Gutierrez	Pallone	
Hastings (FL)	Pascrell	

NOT VOTING—14

Clay	Klink	Paul
Dingell	Lazio	Talent
Eshoo	McCollum	Vento
Gilchrest	McIntosh	Young (AK)
Jones (OH)	Morella	

□ 1242

Messrs. RANGEL, HASTINGS of Florida, BRADY of Texas, WEYGAND, TOWNS, COOK, GREEN of Wisconsin, HOLT, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Ms. KAPTUR changed her vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 4461, AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 4461) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural

Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MS. KAPTUR

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees.

The Clerk read as follows:

Miss KAPTUR moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 4461 be instructed to hold a full and adequate public meeting at which managers have the opportunity to debate and vote on all matters in disagreement between the two Houses, and be instructed to fully resolve all differences between H.R. 4461 and the Senate amendment as part of this conference.

□ 1245

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. QUINN). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very important motion to instruct for members of the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration and Related Agencies, of which I am ranking member. But it goes beyond just the need of our particular subcommittee.

We have 13 appropriations bills that we must pass in this Congress in order that the Government of the United States be allowed to operate. The Republican leadership of this institution, 3 days before the end of this fiscal year, has not completed work on but two of them, which means that we have 11 bills hanging out there that are not complete. Our bill is one of them.

What we understand might be happening to us is that, in spite of the fact that we in the House operated under regular order and passed our bill over 60 days ago, now, 2 days before the end of the fiscal year, we are told that conferees are going to be appointed.

Now, may I remind the membership that a year ago conferees were also appointed but then we never met. What I am very concerned about and the purpose of this motion to instruct is that we ask that full and open conference committee hearings be held at which managers have the opportunity to debate and vote on all matters in disagreement between the two Houses and