

which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill (H.R. 2203) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, and that I be permitted to include tabular and extraneous materials.

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

There was no objection.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NUSSLE). Pursuant to House Resolution 194 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. 2203.

□ 2143

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. 2203) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, with Mr. OXLEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCDADE], and the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO], each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCDADE].

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

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

Mr. Chairman, as I indicated when the Committee on Rules kindly yielded time to us to consider colloquies, we have a number of Members who have colloquies which are very important to each one of them and we are going to take care of them with expedition and try to get that done.

Before I say anything about the bill or anything else, however, I want to express my appreciation to the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO], my dear friend the ranking member, who performed with great diligence and made great impact on the bill. And I want to say to the gentleman that it is a pleasure to work with him. I appreciate all of his efforts and guidance.

Let me say too, Mr. Chairman, that I want to tell every single member of this subcommittee how grateful I am for their diligence and their efforts. Every one of them put a footprint on this bill and added to its unanimous nature.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is reported unanimously from the subcommittee and unanimously from the full com-

mittee. It is because all of us as Members worked together, aided by one of the ablest staffs on Capitol Hill. I have nothing but thanks to the staff for their diligence, their efforts, their intelligence, their persistence, and their patience. All of them worked extremely hard and we are grateful to them.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2203, the Energy and Water Development appropriations bill for fiscal year 1998. The Energy and Water bill is a fiscally responsible measure which continues to protect important priorities of Congress. At \$20 billion, the bill is \$52 million above the fiscal year 1997 level and \$2.6 billion below the budget request. The bill is within its allocation of both budget authority and outlays.

The subcommittee has worked diligently to strike the right balance between the energy and water programs funded in this bill. Unfortunately, the administration's request underfunds vital water resource activities across the country, including flood control, shore protection activities, and harbor maintenance. The subcommittee has been deluged with a crushing number of requests from Members regarding water resource projects in their districts. Recognizing the value of these investments, the subcommittee has been as accommodating as possible to Members within the constraints of a severe budgetary environment.

Mr. Chairman, the Energy and Water bill includes \$4 billion for the Corps of Engineers. This amount includes an increase of \$550 million, or 16 percent, over the budget request for the water resource activities of the corps. Still, this amount is \$188 million below the amount appropriated last year. Although the subcommittee was unable to fund all the worthy requests it received for water projects, it did commit a substantial amount to protect and enhance our vital investment in the country's water resource infrastructure.

Notably, the recommendation rejects the proposed policies of the administration that would: First, require full upfront funding of Corps of Engineers construction projects, and second, severely restrict the role of the corps in shoreline protection and small harbor navigation projects. With respect to these administration initiatives, the committee was confronted with enormous opposition and no visible support.

The Formerly Utilized Site Remedial Action Program [FUSRAP], previously funded as a program of the Department of Energy, is included in this bill as a program of the Army Corps of Engineers. The committee has increased the budget for this program—established to clean up sites participating in the country's early development of nuclear weapons materials—by nearly 50 percent over last year to \$110 million. This increase, coupled with the transfer of programmatic responsibilities to the corps, is intended to accelerate the cleanup of contaminated sites, enhance program efficiency, and reduce costs to the taxpayer.

Title II of the bill includes funding for programs of the Department of the Interior, including the Bureau of Reclamation. The \$910 million recommended in title II is \$23 million below the budget request and an increase of \$86 million over the current fiscal year. The recommendation includes \$120 million—\$23

million below the budget request—for a new initiative: the Bay-Delta Enhancement and Water Supply project. This new program is designed to protect and enhance water resources in northern California's Bay-Delta region. It is worth noting that voters in the State of California have passed a \$1 billion bond issue for purposes complementary to the Federal investment.

Title III includes funding for both defense and nondefense functions of the Department of Energy. The recommendation for the Department of Energy is \$15.3 billion, \$3.2 billion below the budget request. The reduction from the request is largely due to the rejection of the administration's proposals for Environmental Management privatization and full upfront funding of construction projects.

Eleven billion dollars—over half of the bill—is committed to the atomic energy defense activities of DOE. Of this amount, nearly \$5.3 billion is devoted to the cleanup of our nuclear defense production complex. Other defense activities funded in this bill include the maintenance of our nuclear weapons stockpile, non-proliferation efforts, and the disposal of defense nuclear waste. The defense portion of the bill is generally consistent with the House National Security authorization bill for fiscal year 1998.

The remaining \$4.3 billion appropriated to the Department of Energy is to continue the important civilian activities of the Department. The committee has been especially protective of basic science and energy research conducted by the Department, appropriating \$2.2 billion to a newly created science account. This account funds efforts involving nuclear physics, high energy physics, basic energy sciences, and biological and environmental research.

The bill includes \$225 million for fusion energy sciences, including funding for the International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor project. High energy physics and nuclear physics programs are funded at \$680 million and \$321 million, respectively—a \$5 million increase over the budget request for each program. Furthermore, the bill fully funds the budget request for the human genome project, \$85 million; the large hadron collider, \$35 million; the National Spallation Neutron Source, \$23 million; and other high-value basic research programs.

Mr. Chairman, the bill provides a grand total of \$329.3 million in direct support of solar and renewable energy activities of the Department of Energy. The bill includes \$285 million for solar and renewable energy programs directly administered by the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy. This represents an increase of \$18.7 million over the fiscal year 1997 level. In addition, the recommendation includes \$44 million for basic renewable energy research activities of the Office of Energy Research.

The bill also includes a total of \$350 million for the nuclear waste disposal activities of DOE, including the continued characterization of Yucca Mountain in Nevada as a potential geologic repository. This is \$30 million less than the budget request and \$32 million less than the amount provided in fiscal year 1997. Of the total amount, \$160 million is to be derived from the Nuclear Waste Fund, capitalized by contributions of nuclear utility ratepayers, and \$190 million represents the Federal contribution for disposal of high-level defense waste.

I would note, Mr. Chairman, that the bill does not provide funding for two new spending programs proposed by the administration for fiscal year 1998: the Nuclear Energy Security Program and the Next Generation Internet initiative. Given the severe budgetary environment, as well as the committee's concerns about DOE mission creep, the committee was disinclined to initiate these new spending proposals.

The bill applies several management reforms to the Department of Energy. These reforms are designed to promote efficiency, enhance accountability, and control departmental mission creep. There are general provisions in the bill, which, among other things: Require that management and operating contracts be competitively awarded; demand adherence to Federal Acquisition Regulations; permit the award of support service contracts only in instances where such contracts are demonstrably cost-effective; and require an independent assessment by the Corps of Engineers of all new DOE construction projects. The committee is confident that these reforms will help the Department achieve a higher

standard of accountability to Congress and the taxpayer.

Title IV of the bill provides \$194 billion for various independent agencies, including the Appalachian Regional Commission, the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board, and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. The amount recommended is a reduction of \$105 million below the fiscal year 1997 enacted level and \$116 million below the budget request.

The elimination of direct appropriations to the Tennessee Valley Authority accounts for the large reduction in funding for independent agencies. Earlier this year, the Chairman of TVA proposed elimination of Federal appropriations after fiscal year 1998. The committee was so enthused by this proposal that it decided to accelerate its implementation by 1 year. Although TVA—a \$5.7 billion enterprise—will not receive appropriations in fiscal year 1998, it is directed under this bill to continue its essential nonpower programs using internally generated revenues and savings. This approach preserves the prerogative of Congress and its committees to determine the long-term future of TVA's nonpower programs.

The sum of \$160 million is provided for the Appalachian Regional Commission and \$16 million is included for the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board. These amounts represent level funding for both agencies. In addition, the bill includes \$463 million for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and \$2.4 million for the Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the Members of the Energy and Water Subcommittee who have worked so hard to make this a well-balanced bill. This balance would not be possible without their full cooperation and dedicated efforts. I am especially grateful to my esteemed colleague and ranking minority member, the Honorable VIC FAZIO, with whom I have worked hand in hand to develop the recommendations in this bill. He is a formidable advocate of the programs within the subcommittee's jurisdiction, and I thank him for his considerable efforts.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all of my colleagues to support the Energy and Water Development appropriations bill, 1998.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1998 (H.R. 2203)

	FY 1997 Enacted	FY 1998 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	153,872,000	150,000,000	157,260,000	+3,388,000	+7,260,000
Construction, general	1,081,942,000	1,062,470,000	1,475,892,000	+393,950,000	+413,422,000
(By transfer).....	(1,000,000)			(-1,000,000)	
Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, and Tennessee	310,374,000	266,000,000	285,450,000	-24,924,000	+19,450,000
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 105-18).....	20,000,000			-20,000,000	
Operation and maintenance, general	1,687,015,000	1,618,000,000	1,726,955,000	+28,940,000	+108,955,000
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 104-208).....	19,000,000			-19,000,000	
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 105-18).....	150,000,000			-150,000,000	
Regulatory program.....	101,000,000	112,000,000	112,000,000	+11,000,000	
Flood control and coastal emergencies.....	10,000,000	14,000,000	14,000,000	+4,000,000	
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 105-18).....	415,000,000			-415,000,000	
Formerly utilized sites remedial action program			110,000,000	+110,000,000	+110,000,000
General expenses.....	149,000,000	148,000,000	148,000,000	-1,000,000	
Total, title I, Department of Defense - Civil	4,107,203,000	3,370,470,000	4,029,557,000	-77,646,000	+659,087,000
(By transfer).....	(1,000,000)			(-1,000,000)	
TITLE II - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR					
Central Utah Project Completion Account					
Central Utah project construction.....	25,827,000	23,743,000	23,743,000	-2,084,000	
Fish, wildlife, and recreation mitigation and conservation.....	11,700,000	11,610,000	11,610,000	-90,000	
Utah reclamation mitigation and conservation account	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000		
Program oversight and administration	1,100,000	800,000	800,000	-300,000	
Total, Central Utah project completion account	43,627,000	41,153,000	41,153,000	-2,474,000	
Bureau of Reclamation					
General investigations	16,650,000			-16,650,000	
Construction program.....	394,056,000			-394,056,000	
Operation and maintenance.....	267,876,000			-267,876,000	
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 105-18).....	7,355,000			-7,355,000	
Water and related resources.....		651,552,000	651,931,000	+651,931,000	+379,000
California Bay-Delta ecosystem restoration		143,300,000	120,000,000	+120,000,000	-23,300,000
Loan program	12,715,000	10,425,000	10,425,000	-2,290,000	
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(37,000,000)	(31,000,000)	(31,000,000)	(-6,000,000)	
Policy and administration	46,000,000	47,658,000	47,658,000	+1,658,000	
Colorado River Dam fund (by transfer, permanent authority).....	(-3,774,000)			(-3,774,000)	
Central Valley project restoration fund.....	38,086,000	39,130,000	39,130,000	+1,034,000	
Total, Bureau of Reclamation	782,748,000	892,065,000	869,144,000	+86,396,000	-22,921,000
Total, title II, Department of the Interior	826,375,000	933,218,000	910,297,000	+83,922,000	-22,921,000
(By transfer).....	(-3,774,000)			(-3,774,000)	
TITLE III - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY					
Energy supply.....	2,699,728,000	2,999,497,000	880,730,000	-1,818,998,000	-2,118,767,000
Energy assets acquisition.....		43,582,000			-43,582,000
Uranium supply and enrichment activities.....	43,200,000			-43,200,000	
Gross revenues	-42,200,000			+42,200,000	
Net appropriation.....	1,000,000			-1,000,000	
Non-defense environmental management			497,619,000	+497,619,000	+497,619,000
Uranium enrichment decontamination and decommissioning fund.....	200,200,000	248,788,000	220,200,000	+20,000,000	-28,588,000
Science	996,000,000	875,910,000	2,207,632,000	+1,211,632,000	+1,331,722,000
Science assets acquisition		110,250,000			-110,250,000
Nuclear Waste Disposal Fund	182,000,000	190,000,000	160,000,000	-22,000,000	-30,000,000
Departmental administration	215,021,000	232,604,000	214,723,000	-298,000	-17,881,000
Miscellaneous revenues	-125,388,000	-131,330,000	-131,330,000	-5,942,000	
Net appropriation.....	89,633,000	101,274,000	83,393,000	-6,240,000	-17,881,000
Office of the Inspector General.....	23,853,000	29,499,000	27,500,000	+3,647,000	-1,999,000
Environmental restoration and waste management:					
Defense function.....	(5,619,304,000)	(6,058,499,000)	(5,263,270,000)	(-356,034,000)	(-795,229,000)
Non-defense function	(791,911,000)	(933,472,000)	(717,819,000)	(-74,092,000)	(-215,653,000)
Total	(6,411,215,000)	(6,991,971,000)	(5,981,089,000)	(-430,126,000)	(-1,010,882,000)

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1998 (H.R. 2203)—Continued

	FY 1997 Enacted	FY 1998 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
Atomic Energy Defense Activities					
Weapons activities.....	3,911,198,000	3,576,255,000	3,943,442,000	+32,244,000	+367,187,000
Defense environmental restoration and waste management.....	5,459,304,000	5,052,496,000	5,263,270,000	-196,034,000	+210,771,000
Defense environmental management privatization.....	160,000,000	1,006,000,000	-160,000,000	-1,006,000,000
Other defense activities.....	1,605,733,000	1,605,981,000	1,580,504,000	-25,229,000	-25,477,000
Defense nuclear waste disposal.....	200,000,000	190,000,000	190,000,000	-10,000,000
Defense asset acquisition.....	2,166,859,000	-2,166,859,000
Total, Atomic Energy Defense Activities.....	11,336,235,000	13,597,594,000	10,977,216,000	-359,019,000	-2,620,378,000
Power Marketing Administrations					
Operation and maintenance, Alaska Power Administration.....	4,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	-3,000,000
Operation and maintenance, Southeastern Power Administration.....	16,359,000	14,222,000	12,222,000	-4,137,000	-2,000,000
Operation and maintenance, Southwestern Power Administration.....	25,210,000	26,500,000	25,210,000	-1,290,000
Construction, rehabilitation, operation and maintenance, Western Area Power Administration.....	182,230,000	194,334,000	189,043,000	+6,813,000	-5,291,000
(By transfer, permanent authority).....	(3,774,000)	(-3,774,000)
Falcon and Amistad operating and maintenance fund.....	970,000	1,065,000	970,000	-95,000
Total, Power Marketing Administrations.....	228,769,000	237,121,000	228,445,000	-324,000	-8,676,000
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission					
Salaries and expenses.....	146,290,000	167,577,000	162,141,000	+15,851,000	-5,436,000
Revenues applied.....	-146,290,000	-167,577,000	-162,141,000	-15,851,000	+5,436,000
Total, title III, Department of Energy (By transfer).....	15,757,418,000	18,433,515,000	15,282,735,000	-474,683,000	-3,150,780,000
TITLE IV - INDEPENDENT AGENCIES					
Appalachian Regional Commission.....	160,000,000	165,000,000	160,000,000	-5,000,000
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board.....	16,000,000	17,500,000	16,000,000	-1,500,000
Nuclear Regulatory Commission:					
Salaries and expenses.....	471,800,000	476,500,000	462,700,000	-9,100,000	-13,800,000
Revenues.....	-457,300,000	-457,500,000	-446,700,000	+10,600,000	+10,800,000
Subtotal.....	14,500,000	19,000,000	16,000,000	+1,500,000	-3,000,000
Office of Inspector General.....	5,000,000	4,800,000	4,800,000	-200,000
Revenues.....	-5,000,000	-4,800,000	-4,800,000	+200,000
Subtotal.....
Total.....	14,500,000	19,000,000	16,000,000	+1,500,000	-3,000,000
Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board.....	2,531,000	3,200,000	2,400,000	-131,000	-800,000
Tennessee Valley Authority: Tennessee Valley Authority Fund.....	106,000,000	106,000,000	-106,000,000	-106,000,000
Total, title IV, independent agencies.....	299,031,000	310,700,000	194,400,000	-104,631,000	-116,300,000
Grand total:					
New budget (obligational) authority.....	20,960,027,000	23,047,903,000	20,416,989,000	-573,038,000	-2,630,914,000
Appropriations.....	(20,378,672,000)	(23,047,903,000)	(20,416,989,000)	(+38,317,000)	(-2,630,914,000)
Emergency appropriations.....	(611,355,000)	(-611,355,000)
(By transfer).....	(1,000,000)	(-1,000,000)

□ 2145

Mr. MCDADE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER] for purposes of a colloquy.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to add my congratulations to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCDADE], to the ranking member, the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO], to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] and to all those who are involved in this piece of legislation. It is in keeping with the great tradition, I might add, of Tom Beville, who did such a terrific job in heading this subcommittee, and Mr. Myers.

And, of course, all of these efforts over the years have been marked in this subcommittee by bipartisanship, and that is deeply appreciated on this Congressman's part.

I appreciate not only the gentleman's bipartisanship but also the great way he has been handling himself in the expertise behind this bill.

As the chairman and other House conferees prepare for conference with the Senate, I would like to call their attention to the water infrastructure restoration study in Huntington Beach, California. This study was initiated by the Corps of Engineers last year to assess the current status of the city's water infrastructure and to identify improvements to withstand an earthquake.

I would also like to mention the cost-shared feasibility study to determine the appropriate measures to shore up the coastal bluffs at Blufftop Park in Huntington Beach. Unfortunately funding was not included in the committee bill this year for these projects. I would ask if the chairman would be willing to work during the conference to identify funding to continue these critical studies.

Mr. MCDADE. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend my colleague for bringing these studies to my attention. The committee considered numerous projects and studies including studies of the seismic reliability of infrastructure in southern California similar to the Huntington Beach study. I look forward to working with my colleague regarding these studies that he mentioned as the bill moves through the process.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman and I thank the ranking member.

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

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Ms. SANCHEZ] to engage the chairman in a colloquy.

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

I would like to bring to the attention of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCDADE] an item that was authorized in the Water Resources and Development Act of 1996 and merits the committee's consideration for the energy

and water appropriations bill for fiscal year 1998.

In January of 1995, heavy rains led to extensive flooding and property damage in the western portion of Garden Grove. Over 160 homes in Garden Grove were flooded. Due to this flooding a feasibility study for the Bolsa Chica Channel project was authorized in the Water Resources and Development Act of 1996.

Mr. MCDADE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. SANCHEZ. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MCDADE. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentlewoman for bringing this problem to our attention. I want to assure the gentlewoman from California [Ms. SANCHEZ] that we will work with her and with my friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] as the bill moves through the process to make every effort to address the problem.

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

I am at this juncture happy to announce to the House that I have a unanimous consent request to make that I think will be of interest to the Members.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all votes on the pending bill and amendments on the pending bill be reserved until tomorrow morning.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair informs the gentleman that the Chair has that authority under the rule and does not need unanimous consent. So with that, the gentleman may proceed.

Mr. MCDADE. I appreciate the Chair's indulgence.

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

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I first would like to congratulate my good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCDADE] for the very hard work and dedication that he has exhibited in bringing this bill to the floor. As the new chairman of the Energy and Water Subcommittee, he has taken hold and demonstrated a unique spirit of bipartisanship and his strong leadership in guiding the energy and water policy of this country.

The recommended energy and water development appropriations bill for fiscal year 1998 is essentially level with last year and is within the allocation of both budget authority and outlays to this subcommittee. Consistent with tradition, the committee has smiled more favorably, I think it is fair to say, on water development projects than the administration has requested, to the tune of some \$550 million over the budget request. The committee was literally inundated with a record number of requests from Members seeking funding for projects, many of which were newly authorized by the Water Resources Development Act of 1996.

Although we could not accommodate 100 percent of those requests, the gen-

tleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCDADE] has paid particular attention to these needs throughout the country, although the water development area is still significantly cut back by some \$188 million below last year's amount.

The energy portion of the bill has suffered some severe cutbacks. Once again, in these tight budget years, it was difficult meeting all the competing priorities between environmental cleanup, stockpile stewardship, nuclear nonproliferation, renewable energy and basic energy research as well as defense needs. I think we have done as well as we can do. But we will be obviously dealing with a number of issues in conference. We have heard some comments here on the floor tonight about issues that I am sure we will work together to resolve, hopefully to the satisfaction of the Department of Energy and the administration.

I am particularly pleased that we were able to work out an agreement on the solar and renewable budget within the very strict limitations we had. For the first time, I believe, in all the years I have been on this subcommittee, we will not have an amendment on that subject because I believe we have satisfied a broad cross-section of the Members.

I would like to congratulate my good friend and colleague, Mr. JOE MCDADE, for his hard work and dedication in bringing this measure to the floor. As the new chairman of the Energy and Water Subcommittee, he has demonstrated a unique spirit of bipartisanship and strong leadership in guiding the energy and water policy of this country.

The recommended Energy & Water Development appropriations bill for fiscal year 1998 is essentially level with last year and within the allocation of both budget authority and outlays.

Consistent with tradition, the committee has smiled far more favorably on water development projects than the administration's request—to the tune of \$550 million over the budget request.

The committee was inundated with a record number of requests from Members seeking funding for projects, many of which were newly authorized by the Water Resources Development Act of 1996.

Although we could not accommodate 100 percent of those requests, JOE MCDADE has paid particular attention to these needs throughout the country, although the water development area is still significantly cut back—by \$188 million—below last year's amount.

In particular, I wanted to cite funding for a significant new initiative in California—the Calfed Bay-Delta environmental restoration initiative.

The San Francisco Bay-Delta system is the largest estuary on the West Coast. Millions of birds and 53 species of fish migrate through and live in the Bay-Delta Estuary, including many listed as threatened or endangered.

The estuary provides drinking water for 20 million people and irrigation water for 200 crops, including 45 percent of the Nation's produce.

The Bay-Delta is in dire need of a comprehensive and lasting plan to restore its ecological health and to improve its management, and to that end, farmers, environmentalists,

and water users throughout the State have come together to find long-term solutions.

Voters in the State overwhelmingly supported a \$1 billion bond issue to fund such restoration efforts—Californians have clearly taken the initiative.

The administration requested \$143 million for the first year of funding for the Federal share of projects related to Bay-Delta restoration, knowing that effective action will require close coordination between Federal, State, and local entities.

Our committee, in a tight budgetary year, included \$120 million for this project, a significant step in getting this initiative underway and an amount that will be fully matched by funds approved by California voters.

The bipartisan California delegation as well as Governor Wilson is unanimous in their support for this initiative and grateful to our subcommittee for choosing to fund it in a tight budgetary year—we will fight to hold this funding level at conference.

The energy portion of the bill has suffered severe cutbacks. Once again in these tight budget years it was difficult meeting all of the competing priorities between environmental cleanup, stockpile stewardship, nuclear non-proliferation, renewable energy, basic energy research, and defense needs.

I am particularly pleased that we were able to work out an agreement on the solar and renewable budget within these strict limitations. In past years this issue has been in contention as an amendment on the floor of the House. In the interest of working in a renewed bipartisan fashion, Mr. MCDADE graciously offered to negotiate with myself and the 116 members of the Renewable Energy Caucus to find mutual agreement on the needed level of funding.

The level of funding agreed upon, \$185 million, is a nominal increase over last year's budget. As a long time supporter of this program, I think this represents a substantial commitment to developing an alternative to our dependency on foreign oil. We have to look to our future energy needs and prepare to rely on new sources that are cleaner and renewable. I commend the chairman once again for his cooperation and support on this issue.

I am also pleased that we were able to fund the fusion program at the President's request. We are in the last year of funding for the design phase of this program, and this funding signals our commitment as a nation to seeing this project through this initial stage.

We also managed to fully fund the National Ignition Facility which will help take us into the next century with regard to the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. This new approach to stockpile stewardship is critical to eliminating underground testing and shepherding us into a more peaceful era.

I know the administration has some concerns with this bill. As the ranking member of the subcommittee, I look forward to working with them to address whatever problems may exist during the conference committee's consideration of this bill.

But overall, I believe this bill is well balanced and demonstrates great responsiveness on the part of the chairman and the subcommittee members to meet the energy and water needs of this country.

I want to urge my colleagues to support this measure and vote for its final passage today on the floor.

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

Mr. MCDADE. Mr. Chairman, in order to expedite the procedures of the House, there was a rule pending that the parties involved in have been working on for some hours. In order to expedite consideration of that rule, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. KLUG) having assumed the chair, Mr. OXLEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2203) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2159, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that consideration of H.R. 2159 may proceed according to the following order:

(1) The Speaker may at any time, as though pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2159) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes.

(2) The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. Points of order against consideration of the bill for failure to comply with clause 7 of rule XXI are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule.

(3) Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 or 6 of rule XXI are waived except as follows: beginning with "Provided" on page 24, line 8, through "justice" on line 16. Where points of order are waived against part of a paragraph, points of order against a provision in another part of such paragraph may be made only against such provision and not against the entire paragraph.

(4) The amendments printed in House Report 105-184 may be offered only by a Member designated in the report and only at the appropriate point in the reading of the bill, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment except as specified in the report, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the

House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against the amendments printed in the report are waived. No other amendment shall be in order unless printed in the portion of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD designated for that purpose in clause 6 of rule XXIII.

(5) The chairman of the Committee of the Whole may: (1) postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment; and (2) reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any postponed question that follows another electronic vote without intervening business, provided that the minimum time for electronic voting on the first in any series of questions shall be 15 minutes.

(6) At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

(7) Notwithstanding any other provision of this order, the amendment numbered 1 in House report 105-184 shall be debatable for 40 minutes.

(8) Notwithstanding any other provision of this order, it shall be in order in lieu of the amendment numbered 2 in House report 105-184 to consider the amendment I have placed at the desk authored by Representative Gilman of New York, Representative PELOSI of California, Representative CAMPBELL of California, Representative LOWEY of New York, Representative GREENWOOD of Pennsylvania, Representative DELAURO of Connecticut and Representative SLAUGHTER of New York, which may be offered by any of the named authors, shall be debatable for 40 minutes, and shall otherwise be considered as though printed as the amendment numbered 2 in House report 105-184.

For clarification, Mr. Speaker, the perfecting amendment that I have just mentioned is to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BARCIA], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR].

AMENDMENT IN LIEU OF AMENDMENT NUMBERED 2 IN HOUSE REPORT 105-184

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In the matter proposed to be inserted by the amendment as a new subsection (h) of section 104 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961—

(1) in paragraph (1)(B), insert before the period at the end the following: "or to organizations that do not promote abortion as a method of family planning and that utilize these funds to prevent abortion as a method of family planning"; and

(2) in paragraph (2)(A), strike "or engage" and insert the following: "or (except in the