What Katharine Graham did was involve other people in her life and in her family and in creating that institution. She was probably two great milestones in the history of journalism. She made the courageous decision to print the Pentagon Papers, which gave us this view on the Vietnam war, and then she rigorously pursued the Watergate story.

It is said that men in the highest of power just cringed at the name of Katharine Graham, the Washington Post, Ben Bradlee and the team that he assembled. The highest levels of Government tried to suppress these stories. They used threats, They used intimidations. Katharine Graham did not flinch nor did she falter. The Washington Post and Kay Graham stood firm.

Katharine Graham knew her role was to print the Post—no matter what the impact would be. She truly changed the course of history.

What Katharine Graham did was important. She had me in her home. I had a chance to be at those great parties she had to essentially get started in my career. But the story that I want to recall is one that is very special to me in which I participated with her. It was 1987. The late Pamela Harriman was asked to host a lunch at her home for Raisa Gorbachev to introduce her to first ladies of distinction. Dobrynin had called Mrs. Harriman to host this luncheon. Mrs. Harriman called me. And guess who else was on the list? My colleague, Senator Nancy Kassebaum—there were only two of us in the Senate then—Kay Graham of the Washington Post, Sandra Day O’Connor, at that time the only woman on the Supreme Court, and Dr. Hanna Grey, the president of the University of Chicago.

What an incredible lunch. First of all, we were the talk of Washington, and we were the talk of the world. Raisa was trying to woo America to show that Soviet women were smart and fashionable. And she chose as her venue the Pamela Harriman lunch.

I tried to engage her, in her dissertation on what was like on the collective farm, as two sociologists. We talked about life and times. But the hit of the lunch was Kay Graham and the way she engaged Raisa Gorbachev. Under Kay Graham’s incredible graciousness, courtesy, manners, and charm was one ace investigative reporter. While the rest of us were talking and engaging in intellectual conversation, Mrs. Graham began to engage Mrs. Gorbachev in these kinds of questions: What is it like to be the functional equivalent of the First Lady in the Soviet Union? What was your surprise when you came to power? What do you find it like as in the life of a woman?

I wish you could have heard the late Mrs. Gorbachev’s answers. We saw a side of Raisa Gorbachev we didn’t know: a woman who saw herself as a scholar, coming to power with a man who had been the head of the Department of Agriculture, that they were changing world history. She was shocked by the number of letters she received, the way the Soviet women had reached out to her, one on one.

I will be forever grateful to have gotten the Washington Post endorsement in both my primary and the general. Meg Greenfield—the wonderful and special friend, Meg Greenfield—felt that I had the qualities to become the first Democratic woman ever elected to the U.S. Senate in her own right.

I just want to say that Kay Graham, this wonderful blue-blooded lady, welcomed a blue-collar spitfire. And for that I was grateful. When I came to the U.S. Senate, I came with her endorsement and her welcome. It is something I treasured in those years as she introduced me to people.
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Mr. REID. Madam President, with respect to rule XXII, I ask unanimous consent that Members with amendments on the finite list of amendments to the energy and water appropriations bill have until 2 p.m. today to file first-degree amendments, except for the managers’ package, which has been agreed to by both managers and by both leaders.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to briefly speak as if in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Mr. Reid are printed in today’s RECORD under “Morning Business.”)

Mr. REID. Madam President, I suggest the previous question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON of Florida). Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1024

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I send the managers’ amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada (Mr. Reid), for himself and Mr. DOMENICI, proposes an amendment numbered 1024.

(The text of the amendment is printed in today’s RECORD under “Amendments Submitted.”)

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, the purpose of my amendment is to address the very serious problem of shoreline erosion and sedimentation which are adversely impacting the health of the Chesapeake Bay watershed. There are approximately 7,325 miles of tidal shoreline along the Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries. In an average year, it is estimated that 4.7 million cubic yards of shoreline material are deposited in the bay due to shoreline erosion. The results not only in serious property damage, but also contributes millions of cubic yards of sediment annually to the bay. This sediment adversely affects the bay’s water quality, destroys valuable wetlands and habitat, and clogs the bay’s navigational channels.

The Army Corps of Engineers operates thirteen reservoirs on the upper Susquehanna River and regulates the river’s low and high water flows. There are also four hydroelectric projects on the lower Susquehanna. Under normal conditions, these reservoirs and dams serve as traps for the harmful sediments which flow into the River. During major storms however, they suddenly discharge tremendous amounts of water, degrading the water quality of the Chesapeake Bay, destroying valuable habitat and killing fish and other living resources. Scientists estimate that Tropical Storm Agnes in 1972 aged the bay by months in a decade. Moreover, matter of days because of the slug of sediments discharged from the Susquehanna River reservoirs. There is a real danger that another major storm in the basin could scour the sediment that has been accumulating behind these dams and present a major setback to our efforts to clean up the bay.

Chesapeake 2000, the new interstate Chesapeake Bay Agreement, has identified control of sediment loads as a top priority for improving the quality of the bay. The agreement specifically calls for load reductions from sediment in each major tributary by 2001 and for implementing strategies that prevent the loss of the sediment retention capability of the lower Susquehanna River dams by 2003.

Unfortunately, our understanding of the sediment processes and sources of sediments which feed the bay system is still very limited and, to date, few efforts have been undertaken to address the environmental impacts of shoreline erosion and sedimentation on the bay. In 1990, the Army Corps of Engineers completed a study on the feasibility of shoreline erosion/sedimentation protection measures which could protect both the land and water resources of the Chesapeake Bay from the adverse effects of continued erosion but, due to limited authorities, no Federal construction action was recommended at the time. However, the report recommended that the Corps pursue the development of additional older potential areas, which could lead to structural and non-structural environmental enhancement initiatives.

On May 23, 2001, the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, approved a resolution which I sponsored together with Senators Warner and Mikulski, directing the Secretary of the Army to review the recommendations of the Army Corps of Engineers’ 1990 Chesapeake Bay Shoreline Erosion Study and other related reports and to conduct a comprehensive study of shoreline erosion and related sediment management measures which could be undertaken to protect the water and land resources of the Chesapeake Bay watershed and achieve the water quality and related sediment conditions necessary to protect the bay’s living resources.

The resolution called for the study to be conducted in cooperation with other Federal agencies, the State of Maryland, the Commonwealth of Virginia, and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, their political subdivisions and the Chesapeake Bay Commission. It also directed the Corps to evaluate structural and non-structural environmental enhancement opportunities and other innovative protection measures in the interest of environmental restoration, ecosystem protection, and other allied purposes for the Chesapeake Bay.

The funding which my amendment would make available, would enable the Corps of Engineers to initiate this study and begin to assess alternative strategies for addressing the shoreline erosion/sedimentation problem in the bay. As the lead Federal agency in water resource management, the Army Corps of Engineers has an important role to play in the restoration of the Chesapeake Bay. The results of this study could benefit not only the overall environmental quality of the Chesapeake Bay, but improve the Corps’ dredging management program in the bay.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this amendment.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I rise in favor of an amendment on behalf of myself, Senator SARBANES and Senator ALLEN relating to the ongoing effort by the Corps of Engineers, the Commonwealth of Virginia and the State of Maryland to give new life to the Chesapeake Bay oyster.

Since 1996, the Corps of Engineers has joined with Maryland and Virginia to provide oyster habitat in the Chesapeake Bay. This partnership has stimulated significant financial support from Virginia and Maryland, dollars from the non-profit Chesapeake Bay Foundation, and many individuals. Today, once plentiful in the Bay, has been ravaged by disease, overharvesting and pollution. Oyster populations in the Bay are nearly non-existent at 99 percent of its traditional stock. In 1999, watermen landed about 220,000 bushels—approximately 2 percent of the historic levels.

Since the beginning of the joint federal-state Chesapeake Bay Restoration program in 1983, we have learned that restoring healthy oyster populations in the Bay is critical to improving water quality and supporting other finfish and shellfish populations. According to scientists, when oyster populations were at its height, they could filter all of the water in the Bay in three to four days. Today, with the depleted oyster stocks, it takes over one year.

Although it took a long time to develop, there is now consensus in the scientific community, and among watermen and the Bay partners that increasing oyster populations by tenfold over the next decade is a key factor in restoring the living resources of the Bay. Using historic oyster bed locations, owned by the Commonwealth,
this federal-state effort has built three-
dimensional reefs, stocked them with oyster spat and designated these areas as permanent sanctuaries. These pro-
tected areas, off limits to harvesting, have shown great promise in producing oysters that are “disease tolerant” which are reproducing and building up adjacent oyster beds.

The new Chesapeake Bay 2000 Agreement, between the federal government and the Bay states, calls for increasing oyster stocks tenfold by 2010, using the 1994 baseline. This goal calls for con-
structing 20 to 25 reefs per year at di-
mensions where the reefs rise about the Bay bottom so that young oysters sur-
vive and grow faster than silt can cover them.

Mr. President, with the funding pro-
vided last year to the Corps and the ad-
ditional state funds, there is now an
active oyster reef construction pro-
gram underway in both Virginia and
Maryland.

My amendment today recognizes the significant allocation of state sci-
entists and state programs that devote their time and resources to the oysters restoration partnership. Integral to the entire project is the state effort to map the large oyster ground areas to determine those sites most suitable for re-

s
toration, and to provide suitable shell stock.

For example, in Virginia the focus of the next oyster reef construction area is on the large grounds in Tangier and Pocomoke Sounds. State Conservation

and Replenishment Department staff

created maps that were gridded and

more than 3,000 acres were sampled and
evaluated. Eight sanctuary reef sites and more than 190 acres of restorable harvest areas were identified during the oyster ground stock assessment in this area earlier this year.

In preparation for reef construction this summer, Virginia contracted with local watermen to clean the harvest areas and reef sites. In June of this year, four areas were planted with 86,788 bushels of oyster shells at a cost of $339,000 in state funds.

The State of Maryland has been equally committed to providing re-

sources to the Corps for the construc-
tion of reef sites in the Maryland wa-
ters of the Bay.

Consistent with other Corps pro-
grams, my amendment permits the Corps to recognize the strong partner-
ship by the states to restore oyster populations and provide credit toward the non-federal cost share for in kind work performed by the states.

This federal-state sanctuary program is essential to restoring the Chesapeake Bay oyster. The oyster is a na-
tional asset because it has the capa-
bility to filter water by filtering algal, sediments and pollutants. San-
ctuary oyster reefs also provide critical habitat to other shellfish, finfish and migratory waterfowl.

It has been my privilege to see the construction of these sanctuary reefs last April and I am encouraged by the success of the initial reefs built in Virginia. I am confident that this program is the only way to replenish—and to save—the Chesapeake Bay oyster. I re-
spectfully urge its adoption.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I rise to thank Senator REID and DOMENICI for including the Snowe-Collins amend-
ment in the Fiscal Year 2002 Energy and Water Development Appropriations today to help the Town of Ft. Fairfield, ME. My amendment should resolve a serious design problem that has arisen in connection with the construction of a small flood control levy project in Ft. Fairfield, which is located above the 46th parallel in Northern Maine, where the river freezes every fall and stays frozen well into spring.

The proper functioning of the levy is vital to the town’s economic viability and for protection against future flood-
ing of the downtown area. My amend-
ment should allow the Army Corp of Engineers to assume financial responsi-
bility for a design deficiency in the project relating to the interference of ice with pump operation so that there will be no further and inappropriate cost to the Town.

My amendment calls for the Sec-

retary of the Army to investigate the flood control project and formally de-
termine whether the Secretary is re-
sponsible. Since the Corps has already assumed responsibility for the design deficiency, the Secretary will then order the design deficiency to be cor-
rected at 100 percent federal expense.

Once again, I thank the Chairs for

their continued support for the levy project in Ft. Fairfield over the years, and I am pleased that the town will now have assurance that their flooding problems are behind them and can go forward with their economic de-

velopment plans for their downtown area.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unan-
imous consent that the amendment submitted by Senators REID and

DOMENICI be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDENT OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 1024) was agreed
to.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT OFFICER. The
clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT OFFICER. Without objection, it is so or-
dered.

(The remarks of Mr. SPECTER are

printed in today’s RECORD under “Morning Business.”)

Mr. DOMENICI. I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT OFFICER (Mr. Nel-
sion of Nebraska). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll and the following Senators en-
rolled in the roll:

Mr. REID. Therefore, Mr. President, I move to instruct the Sergeant at Arms to request the presence of absent Sen-

ators. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDENT OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll and the following Senators an-

swered to the roll:

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Mr. ENSIGN) is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 76, nays 23, as follows:

YEAS—76

Akaka
Bahnsen
Baucus
Biden
Bingaman
Boxer

[ Rolcall Vote No. 239 Leg. ]
The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CORZINE). A quorum is present.

The majority leader.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, for the information of our colleagues, we are now preparing to third reading on the energy and water appropriations bill. Senator LOTT and I and Senator DOMENICI and others have been working on what we will do following the completion of our work on energy and water. Unless there is an objection, I think this would be an appropriate time to complete our work on that bill. Senator LOTT and I will have further announcements as soon as we complete our work on this particular bill.

At this time, it would be my suggestion we go to third reading and final passage.

MODIFICATION TO AMENDMENT NO. 104

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the managers' amendment be modified with the language I send to the desk.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. I would be happy to accommodate my colleagues from New Jersey.

Mr. TORRICELLI. I thank the Senator from Nevada. Mr. President, I am very pleased to see that the fiscal year 2002 Energy and Water Appropriations bill makes appropriations for many important water resources projects throughout the country. In particular, the Army Corps of Engineers budget includes $1.57 billion in construction funds for important drainage, flood control, and beach replenishment projects, many of which are in my State.

We are extremely grateful that the subcommittee has provided New Jersey with sorely needed funds. And while we understand that the committee has appropriated projects with limited funds, we ask that should funds be made available during conference, that they would consider funding beach replenishment new construction starts. There are several new start projects in my State which are in desperate need of funding, and I would like to draw your attention to several of these projects, and ask that the chairman and ranking member of the subcommittee consider funding for these projects. I cannot stress how vital these projects are to the economies of my State, the region, and our Nation.

Mr. CORZINE. Mr. President, New Jersey's 127 miles of beaches are wide and inviting, dotted with sand dunes and inviting, dotted with sand dunes and boardwalks offset by a rollicking blue surf and white, warm sand. From Sandy Hook to Cape May Point, one hundred and sixty million people visit New Jersey beaches per year. These visitors generate the bulk of the tourism industry in New Jersey, which is the backbone of my State's economy.

Spending by tourists totaled $26.1 billion in New Jersey in 1998, a 2 percent increase from $25.6 billion in 1997. Clearly, our beaches are our lifeblood, and their health is paramount.

This year, there are five new start beach replenishment projects that are in critical need for Federal funding. These projects: the Lower Cape May Meadows, the Brigantine Inlet to Great Delaware Bay coastline—Oakwood Beach, the Delaware Bay coastline—Villas and Vicinity, are vital to fighting beach erosion and protecting the tourist economy for South Jersey. My fear is that if Federal funds are not immediately directed to protect these beaches, they will literally disappear in the future.

Mr. TORRICELLI. While we recognize the difficulties involved in providing funding for new starts, we cannot stress how important the construction cases for these provisions as soon as possible. I would like to note that all of these projects have been authorized by the Water Resources Development Act.

The economy of the region depends directly upon the health of its beaches. Unless construction begins in fiscal year 2002, I am concerned that the economies of the beach-towns within the scope of these projects will be seriously damaged.

Mr. REID. I thank the Senators from New Jersey and assure them that the committee recognizes the importance of protecting our beaches throughout the country.

JENNINGS RANDOLPH LAKE PROJECT

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I have an amendment. I would like to clarify that it is the committee's intent that the additional $100,000 provided in the Army Corps of Engineers' operations and maintenance account for the Jennings Randolph Lake project will be used to develop access to the Big Bend Recreation Area on the Maryland side of the Jennings Randolph Lake immediately downstream from the dam.

Mr. REID. The Senator is correct. The committee has provided an additional $100,000 for planning and design work for access to the Big Bend Recreation Area located immediately downstream of the Jennings Randolph dam. Mr. SARBANES. I thank the chairman for these assurances. There is great demand for additional camping, fishing, and white water rafting opportunities particularly in the area just below the dam, known as Big Bend, and these funds will be very helpful in developing access to this area.

GREAT LAKES DRILLING STUDY

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, as the Senator from Nevada knows, the Senate adopted the Stabenow-Fitzgerald-Levin-Durban amendment which
The House of Representatives has already fully funded the project for fiscal year 2002.

Mr. CORZINE. Mr. President, I support my colleague from New Jersey’s request and on our behalf, we would like to raise an additional issue with the project. We also urge that the Committee Report language that affects the Secretary of the Army to implement the locally requested plan in the western portion of Middlesex County with regards to the Green Brook Sub-Basin projects to be included in the Energy and Water conference report. Many of the local residents that are affected by the Green Brook Sub-Basin project have expressed their interest in changing the project to include buyouts for this area. The report language will implement the change as well as provide lands for badly needed recreation and as well as fish and wildlife habitat enhancement. We are support this language and the House has included similar language in their conference report.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. President, I understand the difficulty the managers will have in providing additional funds for the Green Brook Sub-Basin project. However, the full funding of this project will provide stability and economic revitalization to this very important region in the state of New Jersey.

Mr. REID. I thank the Senators from New Jersey and assure them that the committee will closely review his request.

SEWER INFRASTRUCTURE FUNDING FOR MICHIGAN

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, as the Senate considers the fiscal year 2002 appropriations Act for Energy and Water Development I wonder if the distinguished Senator from Nevada would answer a question regarding funding for environmental infrastructure. I would like to know if the Senator would be willing to consider in conference sewer infrastructure funding for Michigan projects. The need to invest in sewer infrastructure is an urgent one facing the people of Michigan and the Army Corps of Engineers is in a position to address that need. The Army Corps has had many success stories throughout the country in assisting communities in upgrading their sewer infrastructure. I would greatly appreciate the Committee’s assistance in protecting water quality in Michigan by addressing this problem.

Mr. REID. We recognize the need to upgrade our aging infrastructure that protects water quality throughout the Nation. I can assure my friend that we will carefully consider his request in conference if indeed the Conference committee is able to fund construction new starts and environmental infrastructure projects at conference, as we have done in the past.

Mr. LEVIN. I thank my friend from Nevada and the committee for their
Mr. REID. I express to Senator JOHNSON my desire to consider opportunities in conference committee negotiations on the FY02 Energy and Water Appropriations bill to increase funding for the Mid-Dakota Rural Water Project and to fund the James River Water Development District in South Dakota.

Mr. JOHNSON. I thank the Senator. ESTUARY RESTORATION ACT

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I would like to engage the managers of the fiscal year 2002 Energy and Water Development Appropriations bill on the issue of funding for the Estuary Restoration Act. Along with Senators WARNER, LIEBERMAN, and SMITH of New Hampshire, I have offered an amendment that would provide $2 million in funding for the implementation of the Estuary Act. Enacted last year, this bi-partisan law establishes the Estuary Habitat Restoration Program with the goal of restoring one million acres of estuary habitat. We understand the budgetary constraints that the Appropriations Committee is operating under, but I am hopeful that the managers can identify funding for the implementation of the Estuary Restoration Act during the conference with the House.

Mr. DOMENICI. I commend Senators CHAFEE, WARNER, LIEBERMAN, and SMITH of New Hampshire for their dedication to the issue. I will work with my colleagues during the conference with the House to identify potential sources of funding for the Estuary Restoration Act.

Mr. REID. I concur with Senator DOMENICI. There is no objection on this side of the aisle to the Senator from New Hampshire’s request.

Mr. CHAFEE. I thank the Senators and look forward to working with the committee to provide funding for the restoration of our Nation’s important estuary environments.

SMALL WIND PROJECTS

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Nevada, Senator REID, for recognizing the important role small wind projects play in our energy future. As my colleague knows, the State of Vermont has been looking at the use of small wind projects. I appreciate the efforts of my colleague to provide $500,000 for a small wind project in Vermont.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, small wind projects are an important source of energy for rural areas that often are not connected to the electricity grid. Both Vermont and Nevada have a number of these areas that benefit from this reliable, sustainable, clean source of energy.

Mr. JEFFORDS. To ensure that these small wind projects achieve these objectives.

Mr. REID. I agree that we need to conduct such field tests. I know that the Senator from North Dakota would like a field test in North Dakota, which would be extremely valuable, with the State’s cold and wind conditions, to help determine the effectiveness of this technology. I will work with the Senator in conference to address his request to test this technology in the field.

RENEWABLE ENERGY RESEARCH

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Nevada, and I commend him for his efforts to promote the advancement and progress of renewable energy sources that will help to address our energy challenges. He has been a leader of these efforts, and I appreciate his leadership.

This bill actually increases renewable energy research, development and deployment programs for fiscal year 2002 by $60 million over last year.
These increases will help speed the deployment of these cutting-edge technologies. But because the House had not fully funded certain solar R&D programs, the committee put its emphasis for solar programs on those programs that had not fared as well in the other Chamber. These programs, the Concentrating Solar Power program, and the Solar Buildings program with its innovative Zero Energy Buildings initiative, are now on solid footing. But the photovoltaics program, the program that has led to dramatic advances in those solar electric panels that we see popping up on the roofs of homes and businesses across the country—this program was not fully funded by the Committee. Much of this funding goes to the National Renewable Energy Lab in Golden, Colorado. Yes, it is our intention to seek the House funding level for photovoltaics in conference, and push for our funding level for CSP and solar buildings. All three solar programs deserve increases from the current fiscal year, and we intend to see this through in conference. I thank the Senator for his work on this issue and for being a friend of clean, renewable energy programs.

**METROPOLITAN NORTH GEORGIA WATER PLANNING DISTRICT**

Mr. CLELAND. I thank the distinguished Senator from Nevada for his leadership on the Appropriations Energy and Water Subcommittee. I would like to ask the Senator from Nevada whether I am correct in my understanding that the reason the Metropolitan North Georgia Water Planning District, a project that was one of my highest priorities because of its importance to the people of my State and its priority with the Governor of Georgia, was not included in the Energy and Water Appropriations Subcommittee report was because of the subcommittee's policy made pursuant to budgetary constraints that new start construction and/or environmental infrastructure water projects will not be addressed until the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act is considered in conference committee?

Mr. REID. The Senator from Georgia is correct.

Mr. CLELAND. Am I also correct in my understanding that when the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act is considered by the conference committee that the Metropolitan North Georgia Water Planning District project will be considered for inclusion in the conference report?

Mr. REID. The Senator is correct that the Metropolitan North Georgia Water Planning District project will be considered for inclusion in the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act conference report. I will make every effort to accommodate my colleague.

**CONSORTIUM FOR PLANT BIOTECHNOLOGY RESEARCH**

Mr. CLELAND. Mr. President, is the Senator from Nevada aware of an entity called the Consortium for Plant Biotechnology Research, a national consortium of industries, universities and federal laboratories that together support research and technology transfers?

Mr. REID. Yes, I am aware of the consortium and am familiar with the good work and significant achievements that the consortium has produced for the Department of Energy in the past.

Mr. CLELAND. I understand that the committee was unable to include it in the Solar Renewable Account during its consideration of the energy and water development appropriations bill. Mr. REID. Yes, I believe that is correct.

Mr. CLELAND. As the energy and water development bill moves into conference, I hope the Senate can identify additional funds in the Solar and Renewable Account or another appropriate research account for the consortium so that it can continue its important work.

Mr. REID. The Senate will do all it can to find these funds for the consortium as we work with the House conference on the bill.

Mr. ALLARD. I commend my colleague from Georgia, Senator CLELAND, for his work on behalf of the consortium and my support for the allocation of funding for the consortium in the energy and water development appropriations bill. The consortium, of which the university of Colorado is a member, has an astounding record of obtaining private sector matching support for its research activities and has done an amazing job of commercializing its research product. For every dollar invested in the consortium, $2.20 worth of research has been conducted with private sector matching funds—an impressive 120 percent private sector match. Additionally, the consortium has managed to commercialize its research within an average of three years, compared to an industry average of about 10 years. Again, I would like to state my support for funding for this unique and efficient national research institution.

Mr. REID. The committee is aware of the good work the consortium has produced with department of Energy funding over the past decade. The Senate will do its best to try and identify funding for the consortium while in conference with the House.

**GAS COOLED REACTOR SYSTEMS**

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, as some Members may be aware, I have supported the development of gas cooled reactor systems, both small and large, for the provision of electric power and useful heat for our cities. As currently envisioned, gas cooled reactors will be meltdown proof, create substantially less radioactive waste and will be more efficient than our current generation of reactors.

Currently, the Department of Energy is funding a joint U.S.-Russian effort to develop the Gas Turbine Modular Helium Reactor for the purpose of burning up surplus Russian weapons plutonium. This tremendously successful swords to plowshares project is making great technical progress and employs more than 500 Russian weapons scientists and nuclear engineers.

Although the GT-MHR unit built in Russia will be primarily for burning plutonium, the Senator from Nevada knows that if the reactor type can be easily converted into a uranium burning commercial reactor for use around the globe. Indeed, the Appropriations Committee's report notes that "the United States must take full advantage of the development of this attractive technology for a possible next generation nuclear power reactor for United States and foreign markets".

However, the committee's bill does not explicitly provide any dollars for the commercialization of the GT-MHR design.

The senior Senator from New Mexico is a leader in nuclear energy and research. I want to ask my good friend, the Ranking Member of the Energy and Water Subcommittee, the following question regarding the commercialization of the GT-MHR: "the Nuclear Energy Technologies" account in the bill provides $7 million for Generation IV reactor development and sponsorship research on small, modular nuclear reactors. Given that the federal government is already making a substantial investment on the GT-MHR for non-proliferation purposes, and given the near-term promise of this reactor, doesn't it make sense that at least one-half of the $7 million provided be used by the Department of Energy for GT-MHR commercialization efforts?

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank my friend from Alaska for his observations and for his question. As the Senator from New Mexico knows, I too am a great fan of the development of the GT-MHR in Russia and indeed, I was the Senator that initiated the first Federal funding for this program. The question is a fair one and I will have to say that his observations and the conclusion he draws from them are correct. I agree that a substantial portion of the $7 million in funding should indeed be put to good use in commercializing the GT-MHR which is being designed with great cost-effectiveness and success in Russia.

Mr. STEVENS. I thank my good friend from New Mexico for his response. Small modular reactors which
are of great potential importance to rural areas and hence of great interest to me. Last year, at my request, Congress provided $1 million for the Department of Energy to study the feasibility of small modular nuclear reactors for deployment in remote locations. That report is now done and in brief, the Department of Energy has concluded that such reactors are not only feasible, but may eventually be a very desirable alternative for many remote communities without access to clean, affordable power sources.

Importantly, one of the most desirable remote reactor types the Department examined was a reduced sized version of the GT-MHR called the Remote Site Modular Helium Reactor. Given the outstanding characteristics of this remote reactor as identified in the Department’s report and given that the Department is already developing the basic technology via the Russian program, I believe the Department of Energy should focus on further developing the RS-MHR in the upcoming year.

I thank the Senator from New Mexico.

NEW YORK-NEW JERSEY HARBOR NAVIGATION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, there are currently three major federally authorized and sponsored navigation projects under construction in the Port of New York and New Jersey and a fourth in the preconstruction, engineering, and design phase. These projects, which would deepen the Arthur Kill Channel to 41 feet, the Kill van Kull Channel to 45 feet, the Port Jersey and New York Harbor channels to 41 feet, are being built. An overarching project called the New York-New Jersey Harbor Navigation project which would take these channels to 50-foot depths is in PED.

These projects are staggered in this fashion only because of the order in which they were authorized. I am happy to ask my colleague from New Jersey if there is any other reason for this segmentation.

Mr. TORRICELLI. There certainly is no policy reason. In fact, each constituent project has passed a cost-benefit analysis, each has been shown to be in the federal interest, and each is subject to the appropriate cost-share consistent with Water Resource Development Act policy. The Port Authority of New York and New Jersey will fund the non-Federal share of each of these projects.

Since the Harbor Navigation Project was authorized last year, the Army Corps and the Port Authority have been working to formulate a plan that would allow these projects to be managed as one in order to provide time and cost savings. They have recently concluded that doing this could result in as much as $400 million in savings to the Federal Treasury.

But in order to achieve that savings, it is important that we begin looking into as much as $400 million in savings to the Federal Treasury.
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DOE industrial and research sites will ultimately cost more than the construction of the MOX facility and the Plutonium Immobilization Plant.

Mr. THURMOND. The Senator is correct, the status quo simply does not make fiscal sense. It is my understanding that the cost of the two plants together is less than the cost of current storage requirements, over a comparable time period. In fact, according to a November 1996 DOE report entitled "Technical Summary for Long Term Storage of Weapons-Useable Fissile Materials," building and operating the MOX plant over a 50-year period, is over $1 billion less than the costs of maintaining the current infrastructure.

Mr. ALLARD. I thank my good friend, Senator HOLLINGS, for allowing me to speak on behalf of the committee of the Armed Services Committee, the Strategic Subcommittee on Energy Programs. I appreciate the Senator's efforts and his willingness to work with senators from both sides of the aisle to ensure that DOE can continue to meet all its needs and requirements.

Representing Colorado and Rocky Flats, I was concerned that this amendment could have delayed the shipment of plutonium to the Savannah River Site until a final agreement was concluded for primary and secondary disposition activities.

All members with a DOE site located in their State understand how sensitive these issues are to our constituents. But we also understand the importance of the nationwide integration of sites to ensure that DOE can continue to meet all its needs and requirements.

Mr. REED. I thank my colleagues from South Carolina for raising this very important issue. I also want to commend my colleague from Colorado for working with senators from South Carolina on this matter. As the chairman of the Strategic Subcommittee on the Armed Services Committee, I am very interested in ensuring that DOE sites are closed in a timely manner and that the waste is treated and disposed of properly. I want to assure my colleagues that the Strategic Subcommittee will carefully examine this issue as the Senate Armed Services Committee considers the Fiscal Year 2002 Defense Authorization bill.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, the Energy and Water Development Appropriations bill is important to the Nation's energy resources, improving water infrastructure, and ensuring our national security interests. Let me first commend the managers of this bill, the distinguished Chairman Senator Reid and Ranking Member Senator Domenici, for their hard work in completing the Senate bill in order to move the appropriations process forward.

The bill provides funding for critical cleanup activities at various sites across the country and continues ongoing water infrastructure projects managed by the Army Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. The bill also increases resources for renewable energy research and nuclear energy programs that are critical to ensuring a diverse energy supply for this Nation.

These are all laudable and important activities, particularly given the energy problems facing our Nation. While I have great respect for the work of my colleagues to complete the committee recommendations for the agencies funded in this bill, I am also disappointed that the appropriators have once again failed to abide by a fair and responsible budget process by inflating this bill with pork barrel spending. Unfortunately, my colleagues have determined that the debate over increase energy spending is just another opportunity to increase pork barrel spending. This bill is 5.8 percent higher than the level enacted in fiscal year 2001, which is greater than the 4 percent increase in discretionary spending that the President wanted to adhere to.

A good amount of this increase is in the form of parochial spending for unrequested projects. In this bill, I have identified 442 separate earmarks totaling $732 million, which is greater than the 328 earmarks, or $300 million, in the Senate bill passed last year.

I have no doubt that many of my colleagues will assert the need to expend Federal dollars for their hometown projects, but the funding of projects in lieu of support for development of biomass or ethanol projects in their respective States. If these projects had been approved through a competitive, merit-based prioritization process or if the American public had a greater voice in determining if these projects are indeed the wisest and best use of their tax dollars, then I would not object.

The reality is that very few people know how billions of dollars are spent in the routine cycle of the appropriations process. No doubt, the general public would be appalled that many of the funded projects are, at best, questionable—or worse, unauthorized, or singled out for special treatment because of politics.

This is truly a disservice to the American people who rely on the Congress to utilize prudent judgment in the budget approval process.

Let me share a few examples of what the appropriators have done in this year: additional $10 million for the Denali Commission, a regional commission serving only the needs of Alaska; $200,000 to study individual ditch systems in the state of Hawaii; earmark of $300,000 for Aunt Lydia's Cove in Massachusetts; $300,000 to remove aquatic weeds in the Lavaca and Navidad Rivers in Texas; $3 million for a South Dakota integrated ethanol complex; $2 million for the Sealaska ethanol project; two separate earmarks totaling $5 million for development of Iowa Switch Grass; additional $2.7 million to pay for electrical power systems, bus upgrades and communications in Nevada; $500,000 to research brine waste disposal alternatives in Arizona and Nevada; and, $9.5 million to pay for demonstrations of erosion control in Mississippi.

These are just a few examples from the 24-page list of objectionable provisions I found in this bill and its accompanying report. As I learned during the consideration of the Interior appropriations bill when my efforts failed to cut wasteful spending for a particular special interest...
project, an overwhelming majority of my colleagues accept and embrace the practice of pork barrel spending. Unfortunately, to the detriment of American taxpayers, the practice of porkbarrel spending has advanced at light-speed in the last decade and shows no sign of abating. Just look at the numbers.

We have witnessed an explosion of unrequested projects passed by Congress in the last decade. According to the Office of Management and Budget, there were 1,724 unrequested projects in 1995; 3,476 in 2000; and 6,454 unrequested projects this fiscal year.

We all know the direction this spending train is going. Come October, spending bills will be piled-up, frantic negotiations will ensue, a grand deal will be struck, and guess what? Those spending caps we were supposed to abide by will just fade away.

I hope I am wrong.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I rise to voice my strong support for the Material Protection, Control, and Accounting, or MPCA, program managed by the Department of Energy to better secure and protect nuclear weapons and materials in the former Soviet Union. I want to strongly urge the House-Senate conference committee for this bill to increase the funding for this important initiative. I call upon the Senate conferees to join with our House colleagues in supporting a $190 million funding level for fiscal year 2002.

The MPCA program is often referred to as the first line of defense in safeguarding Russian nuclear materials against potential diversion or theft. From the mundane, such as installing barbed wire fences around sites, to more sophisticated measures like implementing computerized material accounting systems to keep track of nuclear materials, the MPCA program helps ensure that rogue regimes and terrorist groups do not have access to the most dangerous byproducts of the cold war.

Let me make clear that this program has been considered an enormous success. Vensl and reports have confirmed the cost effectiveness of this program. Simply put, it benefits both Russia and the United States, as well as all the other former members of the Soviet Union.

But our current efforts may not be enough. A high-level bipartisan level headed by former Majority Leader Howard Baker and Lloyd Cutler declared earlier this year:

While the security of hundreds of tons of Russian nuclear material has been improved under the MPCA Program, comprehensive security upgrades have covered only a modest fraction of the weapons-usable material. There is no program yet in place to provide incentives, resources, and organization for Russia to sustain high levels of security.

The Baker-Cutler panel goes on to recommend $5 billion in improvements and upgrades to the MPCA program over the next 8 to 10 years to accomplish these objectives.

That may be too ambitious an objective given our current budget environment. At the very least, the Baker-Cutler panel points to the need to build upon, not cut back, existing funding for the MPCA program. In testimony before the Foreign Relations Committee in March, Senator, and now Ambassador, Baker offered a personal concern:

I am a little short of terrified at some of the storage facilities for nuclear material and nuclear weapons; and relatively small investments can yield enormous improvements in security, from my standpoint, that is my first priority.

I share his well-grounded fear, and I hope my colleagues in both houses will recognize the vital benefits that the MPCA Program contributes to our national security.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I am pleased to rise in support of Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2002. I believe the Senate has addressed these very complex matters appropriately.

As we all know, this bill funds many significant projects. Of particular significance to me is the critical funding this bill provides for the clean-up activities at our Nation’s Department of Energy nuclear complexes. Specifically the Savannah River Site (SRS) in my hometown of Aiken, SC. I was disappointed by the administration’s proposal to include only $357 million in the fiscal year 2002 request. This bill provides an additional $181 million for these crucial cleanup activities and should ensure that SRS will stay on schedule to meet its future regulatory commitments to the State of South Carolina as well as the Environmental Protection Agency.

While I am supportive of most elements of this bill there were some issues which concerned me. Specifically, the report which accompanies this bill included a directive that the Department of Energy transfer the Accelerator for the Production of Tritium (APT) project from the Office of Defense Programs within the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) to the Office of Nuclear Energy, Science and Technology for inclusion in the Advanced Accelerator Applications office.

I disagree with this proposal and will oppose such a move. First and foremost, this is an this year Bush Administration initiative and not an authorization. The APT program was authorized in section 3134 of the Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2000 as a defense program. I wholeheartedly support exploring additional options for the development and demonstrations with this superb technology and I believe this work may yield dramatic advances. However, APT is and should remain a Defense Program. Last year, the Department established a facility to serve as a backup source of tritium for our nation’s strategic arsenal.

Finally, I would like to discuss the Fissile Materials Disposition Programs as discussed in the bill. This bill correctly describes the excess weapons grade plutonium in Russia as a ‘‘clear and present danger to the security of the United States.’’ I believe it is in the best interest of all Americans to move forward with this program expeditiously. I am further pleased that the administration fully funded the Mixed Oxide Fuel Fabrication Facility to be constructed at the Savannah River Site. Unfortunately, I have recently heard some troubling stories regarding the commitment of the White House to this important program.

The New York Times ran a story this Monday, July 16, 2001 entitled ‘‘U.S. Review on Russia Urges Keeping Most Arms Control,’’ which greatly concerned me.

According to the article, while most of the programs initiated in the previous Administration will be retained, ‘‘the White House plans to overhaul a hugely expensive effort to enable Russia and the United States to each destroy 34 tons of stored plutonium . . .’’ Mr. President, what the White House is discussing here is the Mixed Oxide Fuel Program, known as MOX. This facility is planned for the Savannah River Site. As you likely already know, the MOX program has an invaluable counter-proliferation mission. Thanks to an agreement with the Russian Government, signed last year, the MOX program will help develop the Mixed Oxide Fuel Program out of former Soviet stockpiles, and will also divert such materials from potentially falling into the hands of rogue nations, terrorists, or criminal organizations. In and of itself, this clearly makes the MOX program worth every penny. Earlier this year I asked Secretary of Energy Abraham where he stands on this program and he responded that MOX is his ‘‘highest non-proliferation priority.’’
Beyond the important national security aspects of this program there are many domestic issues which must be considered before approving this program.

From the standpoint of providing a much needed source of energy, MOX makes good sense. Presently, there are quite literally tons of surplus nuclear weapons materials stored throughout the Department of Energy (DOE) industrial complex that could be processed in our MOX facility and reintroduced as a fuel for commercial nuclear reactors. Here is the beauty of this program, once MOX is burned in selected reactors it is gone for good. It cannot be used for weapons ever again and there is no more need for storage.

Furthermore, I am convinced that not dealing with the existing stockpiles of nuclear materials and oxides that eliminates the need of the six DOE materials and research sites will ultimately cost substantially more than the construction of the MOX facility. According to the previously mentioned news article, “the administration insists it is still exploring less expensive options.” According to a November 29, 1996 DOE report entitled Technical Summary for Long Term Storage of Weapons-Useable Fissile Materials, the costs of maintaining the current infrastructure far exceeds the costs of building and operating the MOX plant according to the current plan. According to the report, the cost for storage of plutonium in constant 1999 dollars is estimated to be approximately $380 million per year and the operating cost for 50 years of operation at approximately $3.2 billion. The cost is insensitive to where the plutonium is stored at any one of the four sites.” The status quo simply does not make fiscal sense.

Perhaps the most critical domestic consideration regarding the MOX program is that it creates a “path out” for materials currently being stored at SRS and awaiting processing as well as those materials that could be shipped to the site and processed there in the future. South Carolina agreed to accept nuclear materials shipments into SRS based on the understanding that an expeditious “path out” would exist. Canceling the Plutonium Disposition Program omits the “path out” for materials. Neither I nor anyone else who represents South Carolina at the Federal or State level is willing to see the Savannah River Site become the de facto dumping ground for the nation’s nuclear materials. If the “path out” for these materials disappears, then the “path in” to the Savannah River Site is likely to become muddy. That is bad for cleanup nationwide.

Ambassador Howard Baker and Mr. Lloyd Cutler reached a series of conclusions in their recent report from the Russia Task Force, any one of which justifies aggressive support for the MOX program. However one statement struck me as particularly poignant. Specifically, as stated in the report, “the national security benefits to U.S. citizens from securing and destroying the equivalent of more than 80,000 nuclear weapons and potential weapons would constitute the highest return on investment in any current U.S. national security and defense program.”

The administration’s endorsement of most of the nonproliferation programs begun by the Clinton administration will not surprise me. A Bush administration is now trying to avoid being portrayed as single-minded on national security matters in its pursuit of a missile shield, and as unresponsive to European support for arms control.

Officials said that although cabinet officials had discussed the review’s findings, no final decisions on the recommendations would be made until Congress reacted to the proposals. The administration has begun arranging to brief key legislators on the results of its review, which was conducted by an expert on Russia on loan from the State Department to the National Security Council office that deals with nonproliferation strategy. That office is headed by Bob Joseph.

In interviews, administration officials said the White House would not overlook Russian efforts to weaken the programs by restricting access to weapons plants or by erecting obstacles to meeting nonproliferation commitments. “We have a high standard for Russian behavior,” one official said.

The review has concluded that most of the $420 million worth of the Pentagon’s programs—called Cooperative Threat Reduction—are “effectively managed” and advance American interests.

The White House also intends to expand State Department programs that help Russian scientists engage in peaceful work through the Moscow-based International Science and Technology Center, which the European Union and Japan also support, and other institutions.

But some big-ticket programs whose budgets have already been slashed or criticized on Capitol Hill are likely to be shut down or “refocused.”

Though it is no longer very expensive, another program, the Nuclear Cities Initiative, has already been scaled back by Congress. It was begun in 1998 to help create nonmilitary work for Russia’s 122,000 nuclear scientists and to help Russia downsize geographically and economically isolated nuclear cities, where 700,000 people live.

Unhappy with both the cost and the Russian reluctance to open these cities.

Unhappy with both the cost and the Russian reluctance to open these cities to Western visitors, Congress has repeatedly slashed money for the program. Under the Bush review, the undefined “positive aspects” would be merged into other programs, and most of the program closed.

The Clinton administration had begun the program to provide civilian work for Russian nuclear cities and to prevent nuclear scientists there from leaving for Iraq, Iran and other aspiring nuclear powers. Under the program, the Russians would also have to adhere to the nuclear nonproliferation agreements to which they’re bound.

The administration will be making an opportunity for China to shut down some of its nuclear production plants if it abandons the Nuclear Cities Initiative,” said Rose Gottemoeller, a senior

President Bush is expected to discuss some of these programs when he meets with President Vladimir V. Putin next weekend. That meeting, in Genoa, Italy, is expected to focus on Russian plans to build a missile shield, which the Americans admit would violate a longstanding treaty between the two nations.

The administration’s endorsement of most of the nonproliferation programs begun by the Clinton administration will not surprise me. A Bush administration is now trying to avoid being portrayed as single-minded on national security matters in its pursuit of a missile shield, and as unresponsive to European support for arms control.
Energy Department official during the Clinton administration. The administration says Russia plans to close those two facilities in any event.

The White House also intends to overhaul a hugely expensive effort to enable Russia and the United States each to destroy 34 tons of stored plutonium by building facilities in Russia and the United States. The program, as currently structured, will cost Russia $12 billion and the United States $6.5 billion, at a minimum. The administration has pledged $400 million and has already appropriated $240 million.

In February 2000, the Clinton administration wrested a promise from Russia to stop making plutonium out of fuel from its civilian power reactors as part of a research and aid package. While Russia was supposed to stop adding to its stockpile of 190 tons of military plutonium by shutting down three military reactors last December, Moscow was unable to do so because the reactor near Tomsk and Krasnoyarsk, provide heat and electricity to those cities.

The Clinton program was too costly and was not moving forward. But supporters say the Bush administration should try harder to solicit funds from European and other governments before shelving the effort and walking away from the accord.

The administration insists it is still exploring less expensive options.

The administration also has deferred a decision on a commitment to help Russia build facilities to destroy 40,000 tons of chemical weapons, the world’s such stockpile. The first plant has been completed at Gorny, 660 miles southeast of Moscow, but American assistance to build a second plant at Shchuchye, 1,000 miles southeast of Moscow, has been frozen by Congress.

Many legislators have complained that the Russians have not fully declared the total and type of chemical weapons they made, and that they have put up too little of their own money for the project.

In February, however, Russia announced that it had increased its annual budget for destroying chemical weapons sixfold, to $105 million, and presented a plan to begin operating the first of three destruction plants. The administration has also determined to “establish greater and more cost-efficient ways” of achieving its nonproliferation goals and integrating such programs into a comprehensive strategy toward Russia. He said the White House planned to form a White House steering group “to assure that the programs are well managed and better coordinated.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any further amendments?

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I have no further amendments. I thank the seven members of the staff on both sides who worked diligently on a very complicated bill. On Senator Reid’s staff: Drew Willisson, Roger Cockrell, Nancy Olkewicz; members of my staff: Tammy Perrin, Jim Crum, Camille Anderson, and Clay Sell.

The Senator’s staff has been a pleasure to work with, and I hope mine has. I thank you for the pleasantry and the way we have been able to work this bill out.

Mr. REID. Not only the staff has been a pleasure to work with, but you have been a pleasure to work with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read the third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second and the clerk will call the roll. The legislative clerk called the roll. Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Mr. ENSIGN) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 97, nays 2, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 240 Leg.]
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NOT VOTING—1

Ensign

The bill (H.R. 2111), as amended, was passed.

(The bill will be printed in a future edition of the RECORD.)

Mr. REID. I move to reconsider the vote and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. REID. I move that the Senate in its amendment, request a conference with the House, and the Chair be allowed to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate, with no intervening action or debate.

The motion was agreed to and to the Presiding Officer (Mr. COZBY) appointed Mr. REID, Mr. BYRD, Mr. HOLINGS, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. DORGAN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BURNS, and Mr. CRAIG conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I asked, along with Senator DOMENICI, the Chair to appoint conferees, which the Chair did. We would like to add to the conferees Senators INOUYE and STEVENS. I ask unanimous consent that Senators INOUYE and STEVENS be added to the list of conferees on the energy and water appropriations bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. It is the intention of the minority leader now to move to the Graham nomination. The leader indicated there will be a number of votes tonight.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I inquire what the parliamentary situation is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no business pending at this time.

The NOMINATION OF ROGER WALTON FERGUSON, JR.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I want to speak briefly with respect to the nomination of Roger W. Ferguson to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. I understand