

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 850

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a sponsor of the bill, H.R. 850.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1621

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as cosponsor of the bill, H.R. 1621.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO DELETE RE- MARKS FROM CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to delete from the RECORD my remarks in debate on the conference report to accompany H.R. 2488 earlier today.

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

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

The Speaker pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Appropriations:

JAMES E. CLYBURN,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, August 5, 1999.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER:

Please accept this correspondence as my resignation from the House Committee on Appropriations for the 106th Congress, effective this date.

With kindest regards, I am

Sincerely,

JAMES E. CLYBURN,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND FINANCIAL SERVICES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services:

GARY L. ACKERMAN,
CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
5th District, New York, August 5, 1999.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This letter is to inform you of that I do hereby resign from the Com-

mittee on Banking and Financial Services, effective immediately.

Sincerely,

GARY L. ACKERMAN,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTION OF MEMBER TO COM- MITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS AND COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND FINANCIAL SERVICES

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 277) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

HOUSE RESOLUTION 277

Resolved, that the following named Member be, and is hereby, elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Appropriations: Mr. Forbes of New York, to rank immediately after Mr. Price of North Carolina; and

Committee on Banking and Financial Services: Mr. Forbes of New York.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 507, WATER RESOURCES DEVELOP- MENT ACT OF 1999

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the Senate bill (S. 507) to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration and that the conference report be considered as read and adopted.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

Mr. OBERSTAR. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that we are bringing to the House a conference report on the Water Resources Development Act of 1999, a culmination of 3 years work of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) for any comment that he may make.

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I support this wonderful product.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report accompanying S. 507, the Water Resources Development Act of 1999.

This bill is a comprehensive authorization of the Water Resources Programs of the Army Corps of Engineers. It represents two and a half years of bi-partisan effort to preserve and

develop the water infrastructure that is vital to the nation's safety and economic well-being.

First, let me congratulate my colleagues on the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure for their vision and tireless efforts in helping move this legislation. I want to give special thanks to committee ranking member JIM OBERSTAR, subcommittee chairman SHERY BOEHLERT, and subcommittee ranking member BOB BORSKI. Their leadership and contributions have been outstanding.

These members and the other House conferees from the committee provided invaluable assistance.

Mr. Speaker, in the 105th Congress, the House and Senate worked tirelessly to enact a Water Resources Development Act of 1998. Unfortunately, that bill did not become law, essentially because of the lingering controversies surrounding the American River in California.

This year we committed ourselves to moving a WRDA '99, resolving any remaining issues, and charting a course for a WRDA 2000, as well.

I am proud to say we have delivered: first by passing a bill in April by a vote of 418 to 5 and second, by bringing this conference report to the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, S. 507 accomplishes three important objectives:

First, it reflects the committee's continued commitment to improving the Nation's water infrastructure.

Second, it responds to policy initiatives to modernize Corps of Engineers activities and to achieve programmatic reforms.

Third, and this is very important, it takes advantage of the Corps capabilities and recognizes evolving national priorities by expanding and creating new authorities for protecting and enhancing the environment.

S. 507 is a strong bipartisan bill. It reflects a balanced, responsible approach to developing water infrastructure, preserving and enhancing the environment and strengthening federal-state-and-local partnerships.

Several provisions merit particular attention and, in some cases, clarification:

We are modifying current cost-sharing requirements on shore protection and, as a result, expect the administration to budget accordingly for shore protection projects.

We are making several important changes to the Environmental Dredging Program authorized in section 312 of WRDA 1992. Section 312, as amended by section 205 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996, created a partnership with the expectation that the Corps' authority would supplement EPA CERCLA actions. We believe the Corps policy guidance letter no. 49 inappropriately attempts to limit opportunities for Corps participation at sites that could benefit from the section 312 program.

We are authorizing a new program for flood mitigation and riverine restoration, with 23 sites listed for priority consideration. One of those sites, Coachella Valley, Riverside California, includes a project for flood protection and environmental restoration at the delta area of the Whitewater River as it flows into the Salton sea. The \$8.5 million project includes restoration of Salton Sea Wetlands. I thank Rep. MARY BONO for her efforts in sponsoring this provision.

Section 357 authorizes the locally preferred project for flood control along the Upper Jordan River, Utah, notwithstanding the Corps'

current policy regarding flows of less than 800 cubic feet per second. The conferees included language regarding various secretarial determinations. These conditions, however, should not be interpreted in any way that could allow the 800 CFS policy to delay or block progress on implementation of the project. I thank Rep. MERRILL COOK for his efforts in championing this project.

Section 101 authorizes a water supply and ecosystem restoration project for Howard Hanson Dam in Washington. Through the efforts of Rep. JENNIFER DUNN, Rep. NORM DICKS, and others, we were made aware of the need to revise the current cost allocation in the bill to increase the Federal share to reflect additional costs relating to the Endangered Species Act. In response, the conferees included a specific statement of managers regarding the need to increase the Federal cost share. It is also our committee's intention to follow this issue closely. We encourage the Corps to complete its ESA negotiations expeditiously and to provide us with a revised cost reallocation in a timely manner.

Finally, I want to comment my colleague, Senator JOHN CHAFEE, the conference chair, and all the other senate conferees, as well as the Senate staff.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support the conference report.

I also wish to commend the Gentleman from South Dakota, Mr. THUNE, for his hard work on certain provisions in this bill. At his request, the House included and the conference committee retained Sec. 446, a study of the watershed in Day County, South Dakota and Sec. 555, which would require the Corps of Engineers to complete a study and make recommendations on how to resolve sedimentation build up in Lake Sharpe caused by the Oahe Dam.

Both of these provisions are aimed at providing solutions to vexing flooding problems each area faces. The quality of life for South Dakotans living in Day County and in the Pierre and Fort Pierre vicinity should not have to wonder when solutions will be posed to address the flooding they have experienced. These studies will take us closer to results.

I also am aware of the Gentleman's interest in Title VI of this bill. Legislation similar to Title VI was enacted into law last Congress as a part of the Omnibus Emergency and Supplemental Appropriations Act. Its status, however, has been uncertain.

The reason for that uncertain status is that Sec. 505 of H.R. 2605, the Energy and Water Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2000, would have deauthorized this law. Title VI of this legislation restores this program's status to where it was after last year's passage of the Omnibus bill.

I realize through discussions I have had with the Gentleman from South Dakota that this Act is a major priority for his state, and in particular for the Governor of South Dakota, William Janklow. I am pleased we were able to accommodate their interests in this bill.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that the committee has completed its arduous task and compliment the chairman on his steadfast leadership.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the Chairman, Mr. SHUSTER and the Ranking Member, Mr. OBERSTAR, as well as the Chairman and Ranking Member of the

Subcommittee, Mr. BOEHLERT and BORSKI, for their efforts to secure additional flood protection for Sacramento. Additionally, I am grateful to my colleague from California who sits on the Subcommittee, Mrs. TAUSCHER, who has been extremely helpful in working toward a consensus on this issue. Of course, I extend a sincere thank you as well to Senator BOXER for her tireless work in the Senate and role as a conferee in providing countless efforts to find resolution on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, with a mere 85-year level of flood protection, no other city of its size is as defenseless to flooding as Sacramento. In a study completed by the Army Corps of Engineers, Sacramento ranked worst among some of the most flood prone cities in America. Cities such as Kansas City, New Orleans, Santa Ana, Omaha and St. Louis, many of which have smaller populations than Sacramento, were found to have much greater levels of flood protection—more than 500-year in most cases.

I ask you to consider the catastrophic consequences a flood would pose to the Sacramento metropolitan area and Northern California. The resulting loss of life, proper damage, economic repercussions and health and safety impacts would be staggering and like no flood damage this nation has ever seen. More than 600,000 people in Sacramento live within the flood boundary. This flood area contains more than \$37 billion in property, including the California State Capitol, six major hospitals, 26 nursing home facilities, over 100 schools, and approximately 160,000 homes and apartments. The area contains headquarters for many major companies, as well as many banks and manufacturing facilities. Three major highway systems that serve as critical links through the state and surrounding region would be disrupted for an indefinite period of time. Electric, sewer and water systems would be out of service and hazardous and chemical waste vessels would break loose and pose health, safety, and environmental threats to the region.

A 500-year flood in Sacramento would far surpass total damages the 10 states in the 1993 mid-western floods incurred. Sacramento knows from experience that such an event is not hypothetical. In 1986, storms left Sacramento at the brink of such catastrophe. Operators of the region's flood control facilities estimated that just one additional inch of rain would have resulted in major flooding.

Given the perilous situation confronting the region, I am disappointed that the conferees did not adopt the Senate language pertaining to the American River, favoring instead the insufficient language contained in the House bill. This language provides only incremental improvements to Sacramento's flood control facilities. These provisions will correct original design deficiencies of Folsom Dam by installing new river outlets and modifying existing outlets. These additions will allow Dam operators to optimize Folsom Dam performance by releasing more water faster and earlier during storms and would reduce the amount of temporary storage space needed in anticipation of bad weather. The modifications will increase Sacramento's level of flood protection to approximately 135 years, a step in the right direction, yet far short of the level of flood protection needed to protect Sacramento against catastrophic flooding, and far short of the protections enjoyed by most other major river cities.

I am thankful however, that the conferees recognized these inadequacies and have directed the Corps of Engineers to complete further studies by March 1, 2000 and report back to the Congress on additional steps that may improve the level of protection for Sacramento.

Mr. Speaker, the flood threat confronting my constituents clearly is the most pressing public safety issue facing the community. Although this Congress was unable to find resolution and incorporate provision capable of providing Sacramento with a level of protection it must have, the measures included in this bill represent a key step required to advance our needs for future work on this issue. I remain grateful to the Members on the Committee and those who were conferees for their patience in dealing with this issue. I look forward to working with them in the coming months on resolution to the flood threat facing Sacramento in preparation of the next WRDA.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of Wednesday, August 3, 1999, Part II.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the conference report is agreed to.

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 2724) to make technical corrections to the Water Resources Development Act of 1999.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 2724

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE.

(a) JACKSON COUNTY, MISSISSIPPI.—Section 219 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 110 Stat. 3757) is amended:

(1) by striking subsection (e)(1) and inserting:

“(1) \$20,000,000 for the project described in subsection (c)(5);”;

(2) by striking subsection (c)(5) and inserting:

“(5) JACKSON COUNTY, MISSISSIPPI.—Provision of an alternative water supply and a project for the elimination or control of combined sewer overflows for Jackson County, Mississippi.”.

(b) ELIZABETH AND NORTH HUDSON, NEW JERSEY.—Subsection (f) of section 219 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 is amended:

(1) in paragraph (33) by striking “\$20,000,000” and inserting “\$10,000,000”;

(2) in paragraph (34) by striking “\$10,000,000” and inserting “\$20,000,000”;

(3) in paragraph (34) by striking “city of North Hudson” and inserting “for the North Hudson Sewerage Authority”.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

S. 944. An act to amend Public Law 105-188 to provide for the mineral leasing of certain Indian lands in Oklahoma.

EXTENSION OF AIRPORT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate bill (S. 1467) to extend the funding levels for aviation programs for 60 days, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, under my reservation. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking member on the Committee on Appropriations.

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

□ 2350

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me and let me apologize to the House ahead of time for the length of time of this reservation but this will in fact save time by avoiding the necessity to use a rule.

Mr. Speaker, this process will have the unfortunate but completely avoidable effect of shutting down the Airport Improvement Program. On Saturday, the authorization for the airport program, AIP, will expire and the program will shut down for the rest of this fiscal year unless an extension is provided. S. 1467, as passed by the Senate, would provide the simple extension needed to keep this program afloat.

Nonetheless, this process makes in order a motion to amend that simple extension with the text of AIR-21, the multiyear FAA reauthorization bill that is replete with controversial provisions, including taking \$39 billion in spending off budget, airport slot extensions at O'Hare and National Airports, and other matters that will not be easily resolved. Since we know that no conference on the FAA reauthorization could possibly be completed by tomorrow, in fact the Senate has not even passed their version of the reauthorization bill, adoption of the pending motion to amend S. 1467 will have the effect of shutting down the AIP program.

Mr. Speaker, last year the Committee on Appropriations sought to

provide a full year of funding at \$1.95 billion for the AIP program for fiscal 1999. We were denied in that effort by authorizers who insisted on less than a full year's funding.

We have now had two short-term extensions of that program since the fiscal 1999 transportation appropriations bill was signed into law last year because of the authorizers refusal to agree to full-year funding. The first extension continued the program from March 31 through May 31 of 1999, the second extension was included in the fiscal 1999 Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act and continued the program only through August 6 at the insistence of the authorizing committees, despite the desire of the Committee on Appropriations to extend the program through the end of the year.

Now we find ourselves facing yet another shutdown of the program because of the insistence of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure in using the AIP Program as a pawn to get the Senate to the conference table on AIR-21. I strongly object to the process that the gentleman from Pennsylvania is using to get to the conference with the Senate. There is no need to hold our airports hostage and deny them the additional funding that they are due this year because of disagreements over slots, off-budget provisions, and other controversial issues in the FAA reauthorization bill. There is absolutely no need to shut the an airport program down. It is completely avoidable. Yet that will be the result of the actions proposed by the gentleman.

If the airport grant program is shut down after August 6, airports could lose \$290 million in fiscal 1999 funding that we intended to provide this year. The loss of that \$290 million in AIP funding would mean the following:

States would not get their remaining 15 percent of their AIP apportionments, a loss of \$54 million. That means that small commercial airports and general aviation airports funded by the States are effectively cut by 15 percent. For example, California will lose \$4.5 million; Texas will lose \$3.7; New York will lose \$2.3 million; Pennsylvania, Illinois, and Michigan will lose \$1.6 million each.

Cargo airports will not get the remaining 15 percent of their entitlements, a loss of \$7 million.

Noise projects will be underfunded by 30 percent, a loss of \$71 million.

High priority capacity and safety projects, under the discretionary set-aside for larger airports, will be underfunded, a loss of \$149 million.

Military airports will not get their remaining set-aside, a loss of \$9 million.

Mr. Speaker, I will include a list in my extension of remarks of airports that will be cut.

Mr. Speaker, S. 1467, adopted by the Senate last Friday, would allow the airport program to continue for another 60 days through the end of the fiscal year and into October. This is a

simple extension of the program that will otherwise expire, and we ought to adopt it without amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this action is unwise also because I strongly disagree with the provisions of AIR-21, which take \$39 billion in aviation spending off budget over 4 years beginning in 2001. CBO estimates that \$13.6 billion of this spending will come out of the surplus revenues and that the bill would require a downward adjustment in the discretionary caps of \$26.5 billion over 4 years.

We have already exhausted the on-budget surplus for fiscal 2000 due to emergency designations, directed scorekeeping adjustments, and other actions taken by the majority in the 2000 appropriations bills considered by the House so far.

The tax bill just passed today assumes another \$792 billion in surplus revenues over 10 years. Now we are apparently going to spend surplus revenues for aviation beginning in 2001 before we consider any other domestic needs for defense, cancer research, education, drug treatment, national parks, law enforcement or other important priorities. Under AIR-21, by the year 2004 aviation spending will consume nearly \$1 out of every \$4 of the projected remaining on-budget surplus revenues not required for the massive tax cut package just adopted today.

Moreover, AIR-21 will result in \$26 billion less room under the existing discretionary caps that are already squeezing high priority programs. Under the budget that the House has already adopted for the year 2000, a 32 percent cut would be required in programs funded under the labor, health, education bill. That means a \$5 billion cut in NIH, a \$1.5 million cut in Head Start, a \$2.5 billion cut in Pell Grants for college students, and a \$2.5 billion in Title I, which would cut reading and math to help 3.8 million students.

Airport infrastructure is important, but do we really believe that airports are a higher priority than education, which could face even deeper cuts under the caps if AIR-21 is enacted? I certainly do not.

What AIR-21 offers is a choice between binge buying on aviation and thoughtful budgeting where we carefully balance all domestic priorities. If my colleagues believe we should not lavish a significant portion of the surplus on aviation without examining the competing needs in education, biomedical research, veterans care and defense, then they will not believe this action occurring tonight is the proper action.

So, Mr. Speaker, I simply state my opposition to what is happening here, and I thank the gentleman for his courtesy.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD the information referred to earlier regarding airports that will be cut: Pease International Tradeport in New Hampshire
Myrtle Beach International in South Carolina