

Weller said should Congress continue to approve funding for the project, area residents will begin to experience relief around the turn of the century. The entire project is scheduled to be completed in 14 to 15 years, provided federal funding is not interrupted.

On Friday, DeGraff said he's been pleased with the response from Weller and other officials.

"We're very appreciative of the attention from federal and state legislators," DeGraff said. "We haven't seen this kind of response from federal regulators in quite some time."

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

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill (H.R. 3816) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes and that I be permitted to include tabular and extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HUTCHINSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1997

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 483 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 3816.

□ 1605

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3816) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes, with Mr. OXLEY in the chair.

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

Under the rule, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL] each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS].

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, your Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development for

the Committee on Appropriations brings this bill to the floor as the 13th appropriations bill this year.

Back when the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL] and I went on the committee many, many years ago, back in the dark ages, this was known as the Public Works Committee. The bill was also affectionately remembered as the all-American bill because it touches every congressional district, every area of the continental United States and the territories. It was called the all-American bill for that reason back then, but it is even more encompassing today in the fact that now we have energy programs that certainly touch all of us, not only in this country but from all over the world.

Mr. Chairman, today we have a bill that is not the bill that many of us would like to see. We have had to work very hard this year on it as was mentioned previously by the Rules Committee. When we got to allocations this year, we were originally \$1.3 billion below last year's 602(b) allocation. Last year the House bill cut almost a half a billion dollars from our 602(b) allocation voluntarily and we cut 120 programs out last year and finally the House in agreement with the Senate cut out about 50 new programs and reduced many more.

This year we were expected to do even more with a \$1.3 billion cut below last year. All of us are interested in balancing the budget, in cutting spending, but because each of these that we appropriate in this bill touches so many areas of concern, whether it be in the Department of Energy, be it in national defense, be it in water resources and conservation, the proper use of our water resources, all of these touch every one of us every day. It was just something that we could not cut that much. We did not bring that bill to the floor. We are today, instead of being the first bill as we were a great many years under the able leadership of my predecessor and now ranking member TOM BEVILL, we were the first bill out and usually the first one signed by the President. I apologize to the House that we have taken so long, but there has been hard work and a great many people that we need to thank, including the members but particularly staff members who worked long hours here to bring this bill to the floor: Our chief of staff Jim Ogsbury who worked such very, very long hours and did a great job for us; Jeanne Wilson, Bob Schmidt, Don McKinnon, Roger Butler, Melanie Marshall, Don Medley, as well as Claudia Wear and Doug Wasitis of my personal staff. All of us put in a lot of long, hard hours of work to bring this bill to the floor.

Today we bring before the House a bill totaling \$19.4 billion. It is \$95 million more than the final bill last year. But that is misleading, because of where some of the dollars find themselves.

A lot of people do not realize and many Members do not realize that this

bill contains a lot of money for national defense. We have \$10.9 billion in national defense items here. More than 56 percent of our bill is for national defense, having to do with nuclear weapons, with the naval reactors, just to name a few; the surveillance and the maintenance of our nuclear weapons, since we are not building any, we have to maintain the inventory and make sure that they are properly cared for and properly monitored. This is a tremendous responsibility that the Defense Department has and the Department of Energy has to supervise the control and inventory of our national weapons.

Only \$8.5 billion goes into domestic discretionary where we have actually any choice, \$8.5 billion or slightly over 43 percent of our bill. So when we had the drastic cuts that were first imposed upon the committee, it just made it impossible for us to meet our responsibilities.

The bill consists of 5 titles. Title I is the civilian, Corps of Engineers, water projects. This year we have \$3,449,192,000, which is \$156 million more than was requested by the administration. It is \$83 million more than last year.

Title II is the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, \$830 million, \$5.5 million less than last year.

Title III is Department of Energy. This is where the big bucks are because this is where most of the defense dollars are—\$15,279,926,000, which is \$902 million less than last year. The biggest cut of our bill is in the Department of Energy.

Independent agencies is \$281,531,000, which is \$48 million less than last year and title V is general provisions of the bill.

Getting into what is in each of these titles, in title I, again the Corps of Engineers, their major responsibility is the more than 25,000 miles of inland waterways, the major deep seaports of our United States that make our American industry competitive and able to do business in the rest of the world; flood control which has been mentioned here today already. Major floods hopefully can be avoided but flood control, municipal, and industrial water for many people in the country provided in the provisions of title I. We provide \$1.035 billion for construction. Construction is going on by the Corps of Engineers in 38 States and Puerto Rico.

For General Investigations, we have \$1.7 billion. This is to examine projects that are being considered for cost effectiveness and environmental issues. These general investigations are very necessary in the process before they ever go to construction. We have general investigations now in 41 States and again Puerto Rico.

Title II of the bill again is the Bureau of Reclamation where we have in central Utah \$43 million plus, Bureau of Reclamation General Investigation,

we have \$14,518,000. We have 345 reservoirs operated by the Bureau of Reclamation in the Midwestern States. We have 54 hydrogenating stations generating 60 billion kilowatt hours per year, providing water for more than 28 million people in the West in the Bureau of Reclamation, a very, very large responsibility that the Bureau of Reclamation has. We have some construction going on there amounting to \$398 million.

Operation and maintenance of all of the water, all of the reservoirs on all the locks and dams that are operating in the West, providing the hydropower. We have \$286 million for operation and maintenance.

The loan program has been reduced this year to \$13 million because we do provide loans for water conservation districts in the Western States to provide for these necessities. For irrigation the Bureau of Reclamation provides irrigation water for more than 10 million acres of agricultural land.

Title III again going to the Department of Energy, \$15.3 billion for the Department of Energy. Again \$10.9 billion is for defense. The energy and supply research and development is \$2.6 billion. This is \$372 million less than was requested, a very large cut.

We have solar energy, which has already been mentioned. From 1991 to 1995, this committee increased the solar research by almost 100 percent. Since last year, we reduced it by 26 percent because we reached the point where solar was no longer cost effective. We just did not feel it was necessary to continue putting more research into solar energy.

□ 1615

We have photovoltaics now produced, and almost 100 industries are presently producing photovoltaics. We have more than 300 companies providing support for the solar industry, so it is a big, growing industry in this country. So we have cut back on solar, and we are going to hear about it in the amendment process later on.

In the administrative account is where we made the significant cuts, and probably we are going to hear about this. Last year this committee did reduce the number of dollars for the administrative accounts, because today we are not producing nuclear weapons, we are not doing any testing of nuclear weapons.

There are a lot of things that 10 years ago the Department of Energy was doing when it was first created in 1977 that they are not doing today. So we attempted last year, by cutting the funds in the administrative accounts for the Department of Energy, to help downsize DOE.

Now DOE has been threatened to be eliminated. Most of us on this committee realize the necessity of energy for our children and grandchildren, the research we are doing today for the future of our energy, that we need a strong department. But we felt after

last year, when we tried to downsize and, at the end of the year, realized that that had not been done, that we had to tighten the grip just a little bit. So we made about a one-third reduction in the Washington headquarters personnel who are not needed any longer, had people holding each other's hands.

So we have cut and we have gone to micromanaging. We have told them specifically where they had to make the cuts, because after we made strong suggestions last year and cut the dollars, it was not accomplished by the Secretary or her staff, so this year we have gone much further and have directed where those cuts must be made.

We have in the environmental management and waste the largest item in our budget today, \$5,400,000,000 in the Department of Energy for management of the waste and growing each year. Last year we did reduce this account. We found after we reduced the account we got more bang for the buck.

Most of this work is done by contract, not by Department of Energy personnel, but it is done by contracts. We have kept that to almost exactly what the President requested, \$5,400,000,000.

We have also the civilian waste management where we take care of the civilian waste, the environmental management. Here, what we are talking about is defense waste. But in environmental waste for civilian, we did make some reduction.

In the 1982 Nuclear Waste Policy Act, we provided that the waste would be removed from the utilities around the country, the nuclear waste, and taken to a repository someplace. In 1987, we started the examination of the Yucca Mountain in Nevada, exploring the advisability, the suitability of Yucca Mountain.

That moved very slowly; in the last year, again they started moving more rapidly. But in the meantime the commitment in the 1982 act required that the U.S. Department of Energy would take the waste from the reactor sites, the nuclear reactors producing electricity, by 1998. That is fast coming upon us.

So last year we made a decision there had to be something done about interim storage. This year we provide for \$382 million for this waste problem, \$182 million of it coming from the waste fund, which is paid into by every utility consumer who uses nuclear energy. The other \$200 million is to come out of general appropriated funds.

The fusion program has been around here as long as the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL] and I have been here. Back 26 years ago when he and I first went on this committee, we were promised that we would have a fusion prototype reactor by now. We are not too much closer now than we were then. But, we are still strong supporters of fusion.

We have fission now in many reactors, but we have not finally produced

a fission reactor that is producing power but we are still supporting it.

Last year we had \$244 million for a fusion program; this year we have cut it back to \$225 million. We still support fusion, but the Fusion Energy Advisory Committee has suggested a reorganization, realignment for the fusion program in the Department of Energy. We are not going quite as fast as they would like to see it, but we do provide for \$225 million, including funds for the ITER Program, which is an international fusion program; \$55 million goes for the ITER Program.

General science and research activities, that is all-encompassing. That is the advanced science, nuclear science, what makes up the matter of our Earth and our universe. It is rather vague. It is something that is not going to put bread on our tables, it is not going to introduce us tomorrow to something that is going to make the country a better place to live in, but over the long pull, these are scientific programs that will help make American industry more competitive. So we have put \$996 million in this program because it is research and it is very vital.

It will help the general science, it will help us understand the nature of matter, what makes up these atomic nuclei that are around us. So we do support the general science, which is very expensive.

Title IV is independent agencies. We have reduced the Appalachian Regional Commission by \$15 million this year from last, down to \$155 million. Many of the Members live under the authority of the Tennessee Valley Authority which provides power, electric power, as well as some recreation and navigation on streams in Kentucky, Tennessee, and Alabama. For TVA, we provide \$97 million, which is \$12 million less than last year.

We are right at our 602(B) allocation right now. Anyone who offers an amendment for more dollars must have an offset. This committee feels, after months of hearings and examination, we have a bill that we hope every Member will support today, and hopefully Members will defeat any amendments that would weaken the bill.

We had, I believe, 394 Members request programs or some help in this bill, the most we have ever had in the 25 years, the 26 years I have been on the committee, the most requests from Members. A great many Governors testified. A great many Members sent letters to us requesting programs. We could not do all of them.

I realize there are going to be some people here today, some of our friends, who are going to ask for changes. I hope Members will understand it is just not possible. Using the best judgment we have been able to come up with, these are the highest priority items with the limited dollars that we had this year.

So we ask for your support and we ask that our colleagues reject any amendments. We will have to summarily reject any amendments that

raise dollar programs without any off-set.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 3816, the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 1997, is a fiscally austere and socially responsible bill. It makes significant contributions to deficit reduction while maintaining sufficient funding for programs and activities critical to the well-being of the Nation. It represents the best efforts of the committee to balance the multiple demands on the energy and water bill against a notably constrained allocation of budgetary resources.

The energy and water development appropriations bill funds most programs of the Department of Energy—including atomic energy defense activities—and the water resources activities of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. The bill also funds several independent agencies, including the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Appalachian Regional Commission.

The bill appropriates a total of \$19.4 billion in new budget authority for fiscal year 1997. This amount, which is within the subcommittee's 602(b) allocation, is a modest increase of \$94.68 million over the fiscal year 1996 level. Nevertheless, the bill is \$800 million less than requested by the administration and \$887 million less than the energy and water development appropriations bill recently reported by the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

The grand total of the bill masks the measure's substantial reductions in funding for domestic discretionary programs. The bill's reduction of \$147.58 million below last year's level is more than offset by its increase of \$242.26 million for atomic energy defense activities. Discounting for the defense increases, the bill is largely a deficit reduction measure, having reduced new domestic outlays for programs within its jurisdiction by 16 percent over the last 2 years.

In targeting these reductions, the bill terminates a number of programs and activities, including: the TVA Environmental Research Center, in-house energy management, and a number of low-priority research and development programs of the Department of Energy and water resource agencies. It also discontinues Federal appropriations for regional river basin commissions and effects significant reductions in programs throughout the bill. The committee has been especially conscientious in reducing administrative accounts and downsizing the bureaucracies of agencies within the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development.

The demands on the fiscal year 1997 energy and water development appropriations bill have been unprecedented. Hundreds of Members, associations, public interest groups, companies, agencies, and individuals have contacted the committee to communicate their priorities and concerns in connection with the energy and water bill. The committee has received over 2,500 discrete requests from Members alone. Unable to provide funding for all such requests, the committee has attempted to accommodate the interests of Members and the public to the extent possible within an extremely constrained budget allocation.

Title I of the bill funds programs and projects of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Total spending for the corps is \$3.4 billion, \$83 million above last year and \$156 million above the budget request.

Last year, the administration proposed a new policy to severely limit the corps' role in local flood control, beach erosion, and small harbor maintenance. The committee and Congress soundly rejected that policy. This year, the administration has proposed a similar, albeit narrow, policy which would, among other things, essentially terminate corps assistance for beach erosion control activities. The committee has again rejected the administration's proposal and has funded a number of beach erosion control projects, notwithstanding the misguided policy.

Although appropriations for the corps have increased, the additional funds are intended to save money over time by accelerating corps construction works in progress and by committing adequate resources to the operation and maintenance of completed projects. Funding for corps construction is \$1.035 billion, \$121 million over the budget request. Operation and maintenance funding is \$1.7 billion, \$38 million over the budget request.

The administration's budget request demonstrably underfunds corps activities. Funding at the budget request would result in slipped construction schedules for works in progress and inadequate maintenance of completed projects.

Title II provides funding for programs under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior: the Bureau of Reclamation and the Central Utah Project Completion Account. Appropriations for title II total \$838 million, \$15 million less than fiscal year 1996 and \$5.5 million less than the budget request. Funding for the Bureau of Reclamation is \$794 million, \$14.5 million less than fiscal year 1996 and \$5.5 million less than the budget request. These reductions continue the downsizing of the Bureau in recognition that the agency's original mission has been largely accomplished and that the Bureau's role in Western life will be increasingly diminished as more communities take responsibility for the operation of water delivery systems.

Title III of the bill funds most programs and activities of the Department of Energy. Total funding for title III is \$15.3 billion, including \$10.9 billion for atomic energy defense activities.

It has been somewhat despairing to witness the continuing meltdown of managerial accountability and responsibility at the Department of Energy. Among other things, this managerial breakdown is manifested by: failures to follow explicit congressional direction; liberal execution of reprogrammings without notification; improper augmentations of appropriations; travel process irregularities; an apparent absence of any corporate view or vision; a failure to ameliorate impacts of inevitable budget reductions; irresponsible budgeting; wasteful expenditures of scarce resources; and undue investments in congressional lobbying efforts.

It is of especial concern that the Department's budget so closely conforms to the administration's model of unrealistic outyear projections. Pretending to support a balanced budget, the administration defers significant budget reductions to later years. If there were any intention whatsoever of actually effecting those reductions, then it would be unconscionable to request the substantial programmatic increases included in the fiscal year 1997 budget. Building programs up only to cut them down is shortsighted, unnecessarily disruptive, and fiscally irresponsible.

The committee has been compelled to impose efficiencies on the Department through significant budget reductions. The Department must reverse course and sharpen its focus on a limited number of core missions. The Department, seduced by new wave management theories and wholly lacking resistance to the kudzu-like nature of bureaucratic growth, seems to have lost its way in a murky morass of visionless activity.

It is in the domestic programs of the Department of Energy where the committee has made its most serious reductions. Energy supply, research and development, for example, is funded at \$2.6 billion. This represents a reduction of \$372 million below the budget request of \$3 billion. Included in this amount is a reduction of \$132 million, or 36 percent, from the request for solar and renewable energy programs. While this reduction may appear severe, it represents a correction of the dramatic, unjustified, and unsustainable increases that the programs have enjoyed in recent years. In fact, the recommendation of \$231 million represents an 18-percent increase over the amount appropriated for these programs just 6 years ago.

The energy supply, research and development account also includes: \$225 million for fusion energy sciences, \$379 million for biological and environmental research, \$643 million for basic energy sciences, and \$183 million for nuclear energy programs. The committee's decision to fully fund the budget requests for most basic research programs has required reductions to other programs throughout the account.

The committee has done its best to preserve maximum funding for basic research and pure science activities of the Department. Operating in an environment of severe funding constraints, the committee has determined that these activities should receive higher priority than applied research and technology development, for which funding by private industry is more appropriate. The bill includes \$996 million for general science and research activities of the Department of Energy. This is an increase of \$15 million over the amount appropriated in fiscal year 1996.

Funding for activities of the Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management totals \$382 million. Of this amount, \$200 million is appropriated as the Federal share of repository development for the disposal of high level defense waste. The remaining \$182 million, appropriated from the nuclear waste fund, is available subject to authorization. The committee, which required the Department last year to focus its efforts on characterization activities, is pleased with recent progress in the analysis of Yucca Mountain. Nevertheless, there is great frustration that the Nation's nuclear waste policy remains unresolved. Consequently, the bill requires and anticipates the enactment of reforms to the Nuclear Waste Policy Act by making the appropriation of funds from the nuclear waste fund subject to authorization.

Atomic energy defense activities of the Department are, for the most part, funded at or near the requested levels. Defense Environmental Management, the program responsible for cleaning up the contaminated sites of the nuclear weapons production complex, is funded at the budget request level of \$5.4 billion. The bill also includes \$3.7 billion for weapons activities and \$1.4 billion for other

defense activities. The bill fully funds the national ignition facility at \$191 million. The committee will continue to scrutinize the facility, a centerpiece of the Department's stockpile stewardship program, to assure its cost-effectiveness and continued relevance to national defense needs.

Administrative accounts throughout the Department are substantially reduced. Headquarters employees funded from the departmental administration account, for example, are reduced by one-third. Moreover, the bill prescribes FTE ceilings for certain headquarters offices. The Office of Congressional, Intergovernmental and Public Affairs, for instance, is reduced from 94 FTE to 35. The policy office is reduced from 172 FTE to 20.

Title IV of the bill funds various independent agencies with energy and water resource responsibilities. Total funding for title IV is \$281.5 million. This is a reduction of \$30 million below fiscal year 1996 and \$48 million below the budget request.

The Appalachian Regional Commission is funded at \$155 million, a reduction of \$15 mil-

lion—or 8.6 percent—from the fiscal year 1996 and budget request level of \$170 million. Appropriated programs of the Tennessee Valley Authority are funded at \$97 million, a reduction of \$12 million—or 11 percent—from fiscal year 1996 and \$23 million—or 19 percent—from the budget request. The bill also includes: \$12 million for the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board; \$472 million for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission; and \$2.5 million for the Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board.

Mr. Chairman, although the energy and water bill will not please everyone, I am certainly proud of the bipartisan spirit in which the committee has worked to produce this legislation. It has been necessary to effect painful reductions, but the committee has exercised its best collective judgment to target these reductions to less essential activities of the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, I would be remiss if I failed to pay special tribute to the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, the Honorable TOM BE-

VILL. I don't know of anyone who would disagree with the observation that he is one of the finest and most honorable gentlemen ever to have served in this distinguished body. In his years of service as a Member of Congress and as chairman of the Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, he has always been fair and honest—a man of virtue and impeccable integrity. It has been an honor to follow in his footsteps. In my 2 years as chairman, I have attempted to continue Mr. BEVILL's tradition of bipartisanship and fair treatment of all Members. I must say, though, that to match Mr. BEVILL's record of dedicated service is a daunting task, to say the least. I wish my good friend the very best in his upcoming retirement and look forward to continuing our friendship for years to come.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all Members to support H.R. 3816, the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 1997.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1997 (H.R. 3816)

	FY 1996 Enacted	FY 1997 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - CIVIL					
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY					
Corps of Engineers - Civil					
General investigations	121,767,000	142,500,000	153,628,000	+31,861,000	+11,128,000
Construction, general	804,573,000	914,000,000	1,035,394,000	+230,821,000	+121,394,000
Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, and Tennessee	307,885,000	292,500,000	302,990,000	-4,895,000	+10,490,000
Operation and maintenance, general	1,703,697,000	1,663,000,000	1,701,180,000	-2,517,000	+38,180,000
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 104-134).....	30,000,000	-30,000,000
Regulatory program.....	101,000,000	112,000,000	101,000,000	-11,000,000
Flood control and coastal emergencies.....	10,000,000	15,000,000	10,000,000	-5,000,000
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 104-134).....	135,000,000	-135,000,000
General expenses.....	151,500,000	153,000,000	145,000,000	-6,500,000	-8,000,000
Oil spill research	850,000	850,000	-850,000	-850,000
Total, title I, Department of Defense - Civil	3,366,272,000	3,292,850,000	3,449,192,000	+82,920,000	+156,342,000
TITLE II - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR					
Central Utah Project Completion Account					
Central Utah project construction.....	18,905,000	25,827,000	25,827,000	+6,922,000
Fish, wildlife, and recreation mitigation and conservation.....	18,503,000	11,700,000	11,700,000	-6,803,000
Utah reclamation mitigation and conservation account	5,485,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	-485,000
Program oversight and administration	1,246,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	-146,000
Total, Central Utah project completion account	44,139,000	43,627,000	43,627,000	-512,000
Bureau of Reclamation					
General investigations	12,684,000	15,095,000	14,548,000	+1,864,000	-547,000
Construction program.....	411,048,000	392,524,000	398,069,000	-12,977,000	+5,545,000
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 104-134).....	9,000,000	-9,000,000
Operation and maintenance.....	273,076,000	292,876,000	286,232,000	+13,156,000	-6,644,000
Loan program	11,668,000	12,715,000	12,715,000	+1,047,000
(Limitation on direct loans)	(37,000,000)	(37,000,000)	(37,000,000)
General administrative expenses	48,150,000	48,971,000	45,150,000	-3,000,000	-3,821,000
Colorado River Dam fund (by transfer, permanent authority).....	(-4,556,000)	(-3,774,000)	(-3,774,000)	(+782,000)
Central Valley project restoration fund.....	43,579,000	38,000,000	38,000,000	-5,579,000
Total, Bureau of Reclamation	809,203,000	800,181,000	794,714,000	-14,489,000	-5,467,000
Total, title II, Department of the Interior	853,342,000	843,808,000	838,341,000	-15,001,000	-5,467,000
(By transfer).....	(-4,556,000)	(-3,774,000)	(-3,774,000)	(+782,000)
TITLE III - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY					
Energy Supply, Research and Development Activities	2,727,407,000	3,020,497,000	2,648,000,000	-79,407,000	-372,497,000
Uranium Supply and Enrichment Activities.....	64,197,000	70,000,000	53,972,000	-10,225,000	-16,028,000
Gross revenues	-34,903,000	-42,200,000	-42,200,000	-7,297,000
Net appropriation.....	29,294,000	27,800,000	11,772,000	-17,522,000	-16,028,000
Uranium enrichment decontamination and decommissioning fund.....	278,807,000	240,200,000	200,200,000	-78,607,000	-40,000,000
General Science and Research Activities.....	981,000,000	1,009,150,000	996,000,000	+15,000,000	-13,150,000
Nuclear Waste Disposal Fund	151,600,000	200,028,000	182,000,000	+30,400,000	-18,028,000
Departmental Administration	366,897,000	244,863,000	195,000,000	-171,697,000	-49,863,000
Miscellaneous revenues	-122,306,000	-125,388,000	-125,388,000	-3,082,000
Net appropriation.....	244,391,000	119,475,000	69,612,000	-174,779,000	-49,863,000
Office of the Inspector General.....	25,000,000	29,605,000	24,000,000	-1,000,000	-5,605,000
Environmental Restoration and Waste Management:					
Defense function.....	(5,557,532,000)	(5,591,310,000)	(5,543,810,000)	(-13,722,000)	(-47,500,000)
Non-defense function.....	(900,348,000)	(891,614,000)	(822,346,000)	(-78,002,000)	(-69,268,000)
Total	(6,457,880,000)	(6,482,924,000)	(6,366,156,000)	(-91,724,000)	(-116,768,000)
Atomic Energy Defense Activities					
Weapons Activities.....	3,460,314,000	3,710,002,000	3,684,378,000	+224,064,000	-25,624,000
Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management.....	5,557,532,000	5,409,310,000	5,409,310,000	-148,222,000
Fixed asset acquisitions (sec. 621).....	182,000,000	134,500,000	+134,500,000	-47,500,000
Other Defense Activities.....	1,388,212,000	1,547,700,000	1,459,533,000	+71,321,000	-88,167,000
Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal	248,400,000	200,000,000	200,000,000	-48,400,000
Total, Atomic Energy Defense Activities	10,654,458,000	11,049,012,000	10,887,721,000	+233,263,000	-161,291,000
Power Marketing Administrations					
Operation and maintenance, Alaska Power Administration.....	4,260,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	-260,000
(By transfer).....	(5,500,000)	(-5,500,000)
Operation and maintenance, Southeastern Power Administration.....	19,843,000	20,900,000	18,859,000	-984,000	-2,041,000
Operation and maintenance, Southwestern Power Administration.....	29,778,000	26,900,000	25,210,000	-4,568,000	-1,690,000

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1997 (H.R. 3816)—Continued

	FY 1996 Enacted	FY 1997 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
Construction, rehabilitation, operation and maintenance,					
Western Area Power Administration	257,652,000	217,891,000	211,582,000	-46,070,000	-6,309,000
(By transfer, permanent authority).....	(4,556,000)	(3,774,000)	(3,774,000)	(-782,000)
Falcon and Amistad operating and maintenance fund	1,000,000	970,000	970,000	-30,000
Total, Power Marketing Administrations	312,533,000	270,661,000	260,621,000	-51,912,000	-10,040,000
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission					
Salaries and expenses.....	131,280,000	159,397,000	141,290,000	+10,000,000	-18,107,000
Revenues applied	-131,280,000	-159,397,000	-141,290,000	-10,000,000	+18,107,000
Fixed asset acquisitions (sec. 621).....	216,066,000	-216,066,000
Total, title III, Department of Energy	15,404,490,000	16,182,494,000	15,279,926,000	-124,564,000	-902,568,000
(By transfer).....	(10,056,000)	(3,774,000)	(3,774,000)	(-6,282,000)
TITLE IV - INDEPENDENT AGENCIES					
Appalachian Regional Commission.....	170,000,000	170,000,000	155,331,000	-14,669,000	-14,669,000
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board	17,000,000	17,000,000	12,000,000	-5,000,000	-5,000,000
Delaware River Basin Commission:					
Salaries and expenses.....	343,000	342,000	-343,000	-342,000
Contribution to Delaware River Basin Commission	428,000	534,000	-428,000	-534,000
Total	771,000	876,000	-771,000	-876,000
Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin:					
Contribution to Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin.....	511,000	508,000	-511,000	-508,000
Nuclear Regulatory Commission:					
Salaries and expenses.....	468,300,000	475,300,000	471,800,000	+3,500,000	-3,500,000
Revenues	-457,300,000	-457,800,000	-457,300,000	+500,000
Subtotal.....	11,000,000	17,500,000	14,500,000	+3,500,000	-3,000,000
Office of Inspector General.....	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
Revenues	-5,000,000	-5,000,000	-5,000,000
Subtotal.....
Total	11,000,000	17,500,000	14,500,000	+3,500,000	-3,000,000
Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board.....	2,531,000	3,214,000	2,531,000	-683,000
Susquehanna River Basin Commission:					
Salaries and expenses.....	318,000	322,000	-318,000	-322,000
Contribution to Susquehanna River Basin Commission	250,000	380,000	-250,000	-380,000
Total	568,000	702,000	-568,000	-702,000
Tennessee Valley Authority: Tennessee Valley Authority Fund.....	109,169,000	120,000,000	97,169,000	-12,000,000	-22,831,000
Total, title IV, Independent agencies	311,550,000	329,800,000	281,531,000	-30,019,000	-48,269,000
Scorekeeping adjustments	-609,343,000	-428,000,000	-428,000,000	+181,343,000
Grand total:					
New budget (obligational) authority	19,326,311,000	20,220,952,000	19,420,990,000	+94,679,000	-799,962,000
(By transfer).....	(5,500,000)	(-5,500,000)

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the gentleman from Indiana, Chairman MYERS, for the tremendous job that he has done. Without any question, in my 30 years here, this has been the most difficult bill we have ever produced, of course, the reason being the shortage of funds. We were given a very low allocation, and this has caused many headaches and made it very difficult.

As a matter of fact, we have many good projects that we know should be funded that are not funded. Many of the Members are very unhappy about the lack of funding for their projects, very good, approved and authorized programs that have not been funded; and so we have just had to do the best we could under the circumstances.

But I do want to commend the gentleman from Indiana, Chairman MYERS, for his outstanding leadership in making this bill possible, as well as the subcommittee members. We have all worked together on both sides of the aisle; and certainly our fine staffs on both sides of the aisle, the committee staffs, have done their usual great job.

So we do have some good news, for example, in the operation and maintenance of the navigable waterways. As you know, we have the finest inland waterway system in the world, 25,000 miles of navigable waterways, and we are actually slipping on the operation and maintenance. This is, of course, false economics; it is like not putting oil in your automobile when it is needed. We know that that is not saving money.

So we have a good bit of that, and this concerns me a great deal, because as you know, these 25,000 miles of inland waterways that we have transport 80 percent of all of our exports to foreign countries, transferring them to the harbors so they can be exported; and that is where our jobs are created. That is very important to the Nation's economy. Our waterways play a very important role, and we cannot afford to continue neglecting our infrastructure, which is so important to the economy of this country.

In the Energy Department, of course, there is a lot of important research that this bill has protected. We have actually addressed the current needs fully, and our nuclear weapons program has been fully funded.

We have come to grips with the Department of Energy's headquarters staffing problems. There are some inefficiencies there that the committee is not happy about. Getting back to the specific cuts, we hope to be helpful, and in the appropriation process before this bill actually goes to the White House. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission was adequately funded.

On a more personal note, I just want to thank each of my colleagues on the

occasion of this, my last Energy and Water Development Appropriations bill. I would like to thank each of the Members for your support and friendship through the years. I admire your dedication to our country and to our constituents, and I wish for Members individually and as a Congress much success. The Members of this great institution have enriched my life and made it better.

Mr. Chairman, once again, I would like to commend the fine job the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] has done, and it has been my pleasure to work with him, side by side, to turn out a bill that is nonpartisan and worthy of support from each side of the aisle.

In closing, I simply ask that Members consider that this bill was not an easy bill put together, just a delicate balance. As the chairman has pointed out, we have reached the limit of the funding, and so any amendments that may be offered would have to have an offset.

All the compromises have been made, and we feel that we could not have a better bill under the circumstances.

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

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, whom we thank for helping us get the increase in the 602(b). I know we caused him some heartache because we just could not go with a lesser figure.

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend from Indiana for yielding me the time. I want to take this opportunity to express my deep appreciation to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] and to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL] who just preceded me. They have done extraordinary work on behalf of the American taxpayers, on behalf of the American people, not only in this, the 13th bill of the fiscal year 1997 appropriations cycle, the last bill in the appropriations cycle for the 104th Congress, but also the last bill that both of them will be handling on behalf of the Committee on Appropriations and the American people throughout both their very significant and distinguished careers as Members of this great body.

□ 1630

We appreciate their service and wish them both long and happy retirements in the years that follow their departure from this institution. I thank the gentlemen very much for their service.

Mr. Chairman, this is the last regular bill that the Committee on Appropriations will present from full committee in the 104th Congress. It is a pretty significant one.

This Congress has chosen to cut back on the role of Government and fulfill

the pledge of the President of the United States when he stood before this body several months ago and said to the American people that the era of big Government is now over.

I have still not figured out whether he meant e-r-a or e-r-r-o-r, but the fact is he is right, and this Congress has borne his comments out.

We have scaled back, and only with the help, in bipartisan fashion, frankly, of the Republicans and Democrats on the committee and the Republican and Democrat Members on both sides of the aisle in this body and the other body.

I thank all of the Members for their forbearance, their corporation, their hard work and their performance to enable us to make what I believe to have been significant and historic changes. Government is being downsized significantly.

Through the Committee on Appropriations' efforts beginning in fiscal year 1995, we have cut non-defense spending roughly \$53 billion. In that process we have terminated some 330 programs, give or take a program or two, but I think that is significant, and it is progress again towards taking the President at his word.

The era of big Government is now over. It is important, if we are to ever balance the budget and get the heavy of debt and escalating interest rates off the shoulders of our children and our grandchildren, that we take this first step, as we have in this Congress, to make sure that Government no longer runs us into the red and burdens the ability of our people to pay for mortgages, to educate its children, to buy cars and be productive in this country.

I am excited about the progress that we have made in this Congress, and I congratulate both the current chairman and the former chairman, who is now the ranking minority member, for their ability to work together in bipartisan fashion and hammer out what admittedly is a very, very difficult bill, but one which recognized the realities of the problems that face this country and has, in fact, helped us deescalate the cost of Government. I congratulate all Members.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. TANNER].

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Chairman, I want to engage the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] in a colloquy at this time, if I might.

First, I would like to commend the chairman and the ranking member, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL], for their hard work in this matter. I know their job has not been easy; however, I am concerned about a recent GAO report that identifies more than \$180 million in unused construction funds from prior year appropriations at the Department of Energy. Among the GAO lists are 45 completed or terminated construction projects with carry-over funds totaling around \$46 million. It is my understanding that these funds can remain on the books for years and

that DOE can reprogram those leftover funds as the need arises, sometimes on projects completely unrelated to the original intent of Congress.

In the current budget climate at present, it seems to me this accounting procedure may be flawed, and as we work toward balancing our books and exercise congressional prerogatives in terms of directing how these leftover funds are used, these unneeded carry-over funds should be used for deficit reduction or at least to ease shortfalls that can occur in the otherwise austere budget climate.

I would ask the chairman if we could work together to resolve this matter. As a member of both the Committee on National Security and the Committee on Science, I would welcome the opportunity to work with my colleagues on the Committee on Appropriation on this issue.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TANNER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for bringing this to our attention. The committee is quite concerned about this problem. We have been concerned for quite some time, have tried to identify just how much there are in some of these unobligated funds. Most appropriations are good for just 1 year. Sometimes in defense they go a little longer, but we are deeply concerned about the same problems and share your concern. We get a different figure from DOE when we ask for it, but we share your concern and would be pleased to work with you and the other authorizing committee members in making certain we try to tie up this loose end.

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I appreciate that because I am concerned about the funding levels in the decontamination and decommissioning account, which funds environmental cleanup and decontamination and decommissioning activities at the Portsmouth, OH, Paducah, KY, and Oak Ridge, TN gaseous diffusion plants, plants, and the non-defense environmental restoration and waste management account.

GAO, I would note, identifies more than \$40 million in leftover unneeded funds to cancel construction projects funded in the environmental and waste management account.

May I ask if the chairman believes that at least a portion of these carry-over funds could be used to fund needed projects in the decontamination and decommissioning account and the non-defense energy restoration and waste management account?

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would continue to yield, again we share his concern about this and we are trying to monitor this as closely as we can because this is one of the most rapidly growing accounts that we have and it will continue to be a problem for us. So we have to make sure every dollar is used

effectively. We share the gentleman's concern and will be glad to work with him.

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the service that both the gentlemen have rendered, and I thank the chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise informally.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. TORKILDSEN) assumed the chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 3734. An act to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 201(a)(1) of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1997.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 3734) "An Act to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 201(a)(1) of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1997," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints from the Committee on the Budget: Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. EXON, and Mr. HOLLINGS; from the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry: Mr. LUGAR, Mr. HELMS, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. HEFLIN, and Mr. HARKIN; from the Committee on Finance: Mr. ROTH, Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HATCH, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. BRADLEY, Mr. PRYOR, and Mr. ROCKEFELLER; and from the Committee on Labor and Human Resources: Mrs. KASSEBAUM and Mr. DODD, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1997

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KNOLLENBERG].

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Indiana for yielding me this time, and I appreciate all the work he has done, particularly on this bill, but also the staff, my staff and the committee's staff. They worked hard and have done an outstanding job.

There are several things I want to talk about, but to be very brief about this, I want to focus on the fact that in this appropriations bill, like any other appropriations bill, we did not simply spread the pain evenly among the programs in our jurisdiction. Instead, we prioritized spending program by program based on their efficiency and national importance.

I would just tell my colleagues that I am encouraged by the committee's foresight to fund the basic research and development programs at the budget request level. Furthermore, the committee has reduced funding for those programs that simply give subsidies to corporations for product development. We have all heard of corporate welfare, and it seems to be in defiance of a free and open market. The market is the best indicator, of course, of the value of a product.

Programs such as the international solar energy program and the renewable energy production incentive program are an example, I believe, of the Federal Government defying the market by holding otherwise noncompetitive corporations afloat with Federal subsidies.

I want to talk about important item which, frankly, is a concern I think of everybody. It is the environmental waste end of things where we spend something over \$6 billion. If we look at the BEMR report, which was produced to give us an example of when this would come to an end, they are talking about the end of the next century. That is simply not acceptable.

I am glad to see we have report language now that will give us a program to get on track and it expresses the committee's strong views, and also, I believe, DOE's, in terms of bringing to closure these sites around the country.

In the report language for fiscal year 1998, the bill, and I certainly want to thank the gentleman from Indiana, Chairman MYERS, and the ranking member, the gentleman from Alabama, Mr. BEVILL, and all the committee for their work on this, we have in place a project closure fund.

It means simply this. The committee then directs the Department of Energy to include in its budget request to Congress an account designated as the project closure fund. As the report indicates, the purpose of a closure project is within a fixed period of time to clean up and decommission a former defense nuclear facility, or portion thereof, and to make the facility safe by stabilizing, consolidating, and removing special nuclear materials from the facility.

The site contractor must demonstrate and validate several criteria, including a project completion date, within 10 years of application. That is a lot shorter than the end of the next century. The amount of funding to be set aside for the project closure fund is 10 percent of the total defense EM Program. This funding would be available to site contractors who meet the criteria on a competitive basis.

The project closure fund is the type of program that can save the EM from becoming a century long spending fiasco. What we need and what the project closure fund provides is a responsible, manageable cleanup program to bring closure to the EM Program and free up the Department of Energy's largest fiscal expenditure for budget deficit reduction.