

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

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

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

There are two provisions that are aimed at Bonneville Power Administration and other Federal power marketing agencies that are damaging and very ill-informed. One is incredibly broad, and it would repeal legislation Congress passed by a large majority in the 1992 Energy Policy Act.

□ 1615

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

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

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

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

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

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

At virtually no incremental cost, they could provide excess capacity to remote rural communities who will

never see in this century or even in the next century for 20 or 30 years a private provider stringing fiberoptics to their communities.

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

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

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

Mr. LINDER. Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this open rule. I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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

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

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

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

[Roll No. 339]
YEAS—227

Aderholt	Castle	Franks (NJ)	Houghton	Morella	Sherwood
Archer	Chabot	Frelinghuysen	Hulshof	Myrick	Shimkus
Armey	Chambliss	Gallegly	Hunter	Nethercutt	Shuster
Bachus	Coble	Ganske	Hutchinson	Ney	Simpson
Baker	Coburn	Gekas	Hyde	Northup	Skeen
Ballenger	Collins	Gibbons	Isakson	Norwood	Smith (MI)
Barr	Combest	Gilcrest	Istook	Nussle	Smith (NJ)
Barrett (NE)	Cook	Gillmor	Jenkins	Ose	Smith (TX)
Bartlett	Cooksey	Gilman	Johnson (CT)	Oxley	Souder
Barton	Cox	Goode	Johnson, Sam	Packard	Spence
Bass	Crane	Goodlatte	Jones (NC)	Paul	Stearns
Bateman	Cubin	Goodling	Kasich	Pease	Stump
Bereuter	Cunningham	Goss	Kelly	Petri	Sununu
Biggert	Davis (VA)	Graham	King (NY)	Pickering	Sweeney
Bilbray	Deal	Granger	Kingston	Pitts	Talent
Bilirakis	DeLay	Green (TX)	Knollenberg	Pombo	Tancredo
Biley	DeMint	Green (WI)	Kolbe	Porter	Tauzin
Blunt	Diaz-Balart	Greenwood	Kuykendall	Portman	Taylor (MS)
Boehlert	Dickey	Gutknecht	LaHood	Pryce (OH)	Taylor (NC)
Boehner	Doolittle	Hall (OH)	Largent	Quinn	Terry
Bonilla	Dreier	Hansen	Latham	Radanovich	Thomas
Bono	Duncan	Hastings (WA)	LaTourette	Ramstad	Thornberry
Brady (TX)	Dunn	Hayes	Lazio	Regula	Thune
Bryant	Ehlers	Hayworth	Leach	Reynolds	Tiahrt
Burr	Ehrlich	Hefley	Lewis (CA)	Riley	Toomey
Burton	Emerson	Herger	Lewis (KY)	Rogan	Traficant
Buyer	English	Hill (MT)	LoBiondo	Rogers	Upton
Callahan	Everett	Hilleary	Lucas (KY)	Rohrabacher	Vitter
Calvert	Ewing	Hobson	Lucas (OK)	Ros-Lehtinen	Walden
Camp	Fletcher	Hoekstra	Manzullo	Roukema	Walsh
Campbell	Foley	Hooley	McCollum	Royce	Wamp
Canady	Fossella	Horn	McCrary	Ryan (WI)	Watkins
Cannon	Fowler	Hostettler	McHugh	Ryun (KS)	Watts (OK)
			McInnis	Salmon	Weldon (FL)
			McIntosh	Sanford	Weldon (PA)
			McIntyre	Saxton	Weller
			McKeon	Scarborough	Whitfield
			Metcalf	Schaffer	Wicker
			Mica	Sensenbrenner	Wilson
			Miller (FL)	Sessions	Wolf
			Miller, Gary	Shadegg	Young (AK)
			Moran (KS)	Shaw	Young (FL)
				Shays	

NAYS—201

Abercrombie	Engel	Maloney (CT)
Ackerman	Eshoo	Maloney (NY)
Allen	Etheridge	Markey
Andrews	Evans	Martinez
Baird	Farr	Mascara
Baldacci	Fattah	Matsui
Baldwin	Filner	McCarthy (MO)
Barcia	Forbes	McCarthy (NY)
Barrett (WI)	Ford	McGovern
Becerra	Frank (MA)	McKinney
Bentsen	Frost	McNulty
Berkley	Gejdenson	Meehan
Berman	Gephardt	Meek (FL)
Berry	Gonzalez	Meeks (NY)
Bishop	Gordon	Menendez
Blagojevich	Gutierrez	Millender
Blumenauer	Hall (TX)	McDonald
Bonior	Hastings (FL)	Miller, George
Borski	Hill (IN)	Minge
Boswell	Hilliard	Mink
Boucher	Hinchey	Moakley
Boyd	Hinojosa	Mollohan
	Hoefel	Moore
	Holden	Moran (VA)
	Holt	Murtha
	Hoyer	Nadler
	Inslee	Napolitano
	Jackson (IL)	Neal
	Jackson-Lee	Obey
	(TX)	Olver
	Jefferson	Ortiz
	John	Owens
	Johnson, E. B.	Pallone
	Jones (OH)	Pascrill
	Kanjorski	Pastor
	Kaptur	Payne
	Kennedy	Pelosi
	Kildee	Peterson (MN)
	Kilpatrick	Phelps
	Danner	Pickett
	Kind (WI)	
	Kleczka	Pomeroy
	Davis (FL)	Price (NC)
	Davis (IL)	Rahall
	Klink	Rangel
	Kucinich	Roemer
	LaFalce	Rothman
	Lampson	Roybal-Allard
	Lantos	Rush
	Larson	Sabo
	Lee	Sanchez
	Dicks	Sanders
	Dingell	
	Dixon	
	Dole	
	Dooly	
	Edwards	

Sandlin	Stark	Velazquez
Sawyer	Stenholm	Vento
Schakowsky	Strickland	Visclosky
Scott	Stupak	Waters
Serrano	Tanner	Watt (NC)
Sherman	Tauscher	Waxman
Shows	Thompson (CA)	Weiner
Sisisky	Thompson (MS)	Wexler
Skelton	Thurman	Weygand
Slaughter	Tierney	Wise
Smith (WA)	Towns	Woolsey
Snyder	Turner	Wu
Spratt	Udall (CO)	Wynn
Stabenow	Udall (NM)	

NOT VOTING—5

Chenoweth	McDermott	Peterson (PA)
Cummings	Oberstar	

□ 1640

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

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

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). Pursuant to House Resolution 261 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2605.

□ 1642

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2605) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, with Mr. Hansen in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Under the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCOSKY) each will control 30 minutes.

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

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

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

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

Mr. Chairman, this bill provides annual funding for a wide array of Federal Government programs involving such diverse matters as national security, environmental cleanup, flood control, advanced scientific research, navigation, alternative energy sources, and the nuclear power regulation.

□ 1645

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I owe a great debt of gratitude to the hard-working members of the Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development. They have labored hard under difficult fiscal con-

straints to provide a bill that is balanced and fair.

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

I am very proud of his efforts and pleased that we have worked as well as we have together. It is in large part due to his effort that we present this bill that merits the support of all the Members on final passage.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all Members to support H.R. 2605 as reported by the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. Chairman, it is my privilege to present to the Committee of the Whole for its consideration H.R. 2605, making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000. Mr. Chairman, this bill provides annual funding for a wide array of Federal government programs, comprehending such diverse matters as national security, environmental cleanup, flood control, advanced scientific research, navigation, alternative energy sources, and nuclear power regulation. Programs funded by this bill affect multiple aspects of American life, having significant implications for domestic security, commercial competitiveness, and the advance of science. I am proud of the bill reported by the Committee on Appropriations without amendment, and I believe it merits the support of the entire membership of this body.

Perhaps the most remarkable aspect of this bill is its constrained size. The measure represents an unqualified victory for fiscal austerity, conservatism and responsibility. Total funding for energy and water programs in H.R. 2605 is \$20.19 billion. This is more than \$900 million below the fiscal year 1999 baseline for energy and water development programs. Furthermore, it is \$1.4 billion below the budget request and more than \$1 billion less than the Energy and Water Bill passed by the Senate earlier this summer.

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

Despite the bill's deep programmatic reductions, it provides adequate funding for the continuation of high-priority programs promising the greatest return on the investment of taxpayer dollars. The cost-effective civil works program of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, for example, is funded at a level significantly higher than the budget request and slightly higher than fiscal year 1999. This funding is more than offset by considerable reductions in the Department of Energy. The bill requires, for example, a reduction of \$125 million in DOE contractor travel expenses, an area of documented abuse.

Title I of the bill provides funding for the civil works program of the Corps of Engineers. The Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development is unanimous in its belief that this program is among the most valuable within the Subcommittee's jurisdiction. The national benefits of projects for flood control, navigation