

Staff, Jennifer Baxendell and Alec Vachon from Senator ROTH's staff, and Kristen Testa from Senator MOYNIHAN's staff.

In addition to staff, I would like to recognize the contributions of the Work Incentives Task Force of the Consortium for Citizens with Disabilities who met weekly with staff for over a year to build the consensus necessary to get us here today.

Thank you, Mr. President.

OBJECTIONABLE PROVISIONS IN S. 1186, ENERGY AND WATER APPROPRIATIONS FOR FY 2000

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, the energy and water appropriations bill is fundamental to our Nation's energy and defense-related activities, and takes care of vitally important water resources infrastructure needs. Unfortunately, this bill diverts from its intended purpose by including a multitude of additional, unrequested earmarks to the tune of \$531 million.

This amount is substantially less than the earmarks included in the FY '99 appropriations bill and I commend my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee for their hard work in putting this bill together. In fact, this year's recommendation is about 60 percent lower than the earmarks included in last year's appropriation bill. My optimism was raised upon reading the committee report which states that the Committee is "reducing the number of projects with lower priority benefits." Unfortunately, while the Committee attempts to be more fiscally responsible, there is a continuing focus on parochial, special interest concerns.

Funding is provided in this bill for projects where it is very difficult to ascertain their overall importance to the security and infrastructure of our nation.

Let me highlight a few examples:

\$3,000,000 is provided for an ethanol pilot plant at Southern Illinois University; \$300,000 is provided to the Vermont Agriculture Methane project; \$400,000 is included for aquatic weed control at Lake Champlain in Vermont, and, \$100,000 in additional funding for mosquito control in North Dakota.

How are these activities connected to the vital energy and water resource needs of our nation? Why are these projects higher in priority than other flood control, water conservation or renewable energy projects? These are the type of funding improprieties that make a mockery of our budget process.

Various projects are provided with additional funding at levels higher than requested by the Administration. The stated reasons include the desire to finish some projects in a reasonable timeframe. Unfortunately, other projects are put on hold or on a slower track. The inconsistency between the Administration's request, which is responsible for carrying out these projects, and the views of the Appropri-

ators on just how much funding should be dedicated to a project, is troubling. As a result, various other projects that may be equally deserving or higher in priority do not receive an appropriate amount of funding, or none at all. Many of my objections are based on these types of inconsistencies and nebulous spending practices.

Another \$92 million above the budget request is earmarked in additional funding for regional power authorities. I fail to understand why we continue to spend millions of federal dollars at a time when power authorities are increasingly operating independent of federal assistance. Even the Bonneville Power Administration, one of these power entities, is self-financed and operates without substantial federal assistance.

We must stop this practice of wasteful spending. It is unconscionable to repeatedly ask the taxpayers to foot the bill for these biased actions. We must work harder to focus our limited resources on those areas of greatest need nationwide, not political clout.

I remind my colleagues that I object to these earmarks on the basis of their circumvention of our established process, which is to properly consider, authorize and fund projects based on merit and need. Indeed, I commend my colleagues for not including any projects which are unauthorized. However, there are still too many cases of erroneous earmarks for projects that we have no way of knowing whether, at best, all or part of this \$531 million should have been spent on different projects with greater need or, at worst, should not have been spent at all.

I supported passage of this bill, but let me state for the record that this is not the honorable way to carry out our fiscal responsibilities.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this list of objectionable provisions in S. 1186 and its accompanying Senate report be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OBJECTIONABLE PROVISIONS IN S. 1186—FY 2000 ENERGY AND WATER APPROPRIATIONS BILL

BILL LANGUAGE

Department of Defense, Army Corps of Engineers

General Investigations

Earmark of \$226,000 for the Great Egg Harbor Inlet to Townsend's Inlet, New Jersey.

General Construction

Earmark of \$2,200,000 to Norco Bluffs, California.

Earmark of \$3,000,000 to Indianapolis Central Waterfront, Indiana.

Earmark of \$1,000,000 to Ohio River Flood Protection, Indiana.

Earmark of \$800,000 to Jackson County, Mississippi.

Earmark of \$17,000,000 to Virginia Beach, Virginia (Hurricane Protection).

An additional \$4,400,000 to Upper Mingo County (including Mingo County Tributaries), Lower Mingo County (Kermit), Wayne County, and McDowell County, ele-

ments of the Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River project in West Virginia.

Earmark of \$2,000,000 to be used by the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to construct bluff stabilization measures at authorized locations for Natchez Bluff, Mississippi.

Earmark of \$200,000 to be used by the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, to initiate a Detailed Project Report for the Dickenson County, Virginia, elements of the Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River, West Virginia, Virginia and Kentucky, project.

An additional \$35,630,000 above the budget request to flood control, Mississippi River and Tributaries, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, and Tennessee.

Power Marketing Administrations

\$39,594,000 restored to the Southeastern Power Administration above the budget request.

An additional \$60,000 above budget request for operation and maintenance at Southwestern Power Administration.

An additional \$52,084,000 above the budget request for Western Area Power Administration.

Independent Agencies

An additional \$5,000,000 above the budget request is provided for the Appalachian Regional Commission.

An amount of \$25,000,000 above the budget request is provided for the Denali Commission.

General Provisions

Language which stipulates all equipment and products purchased with funds made available in this Act should be American-made.

REPORT LANGUAGE

Department of Defense, Army Corps of Engineers

General Investigations

Earmark of \$100,000 to the Barrow Coastal Storm Damage Reduction, AK.

Earmark of \$100,000 to Chandalrr River Watershed, AK.

Earmark of \$100,000 to Gastineau Channel, Juneau, AK.

Earmark of \$100,000 to Skagway Harbor, AK.

Earmark of \$150,000 to Rio De Flag, Flagstaff, AZ.

Earmark of \$250,000 to North Little Rock, Dark Hollow, AR.

Earmark of \$250,000 to Llagas Creek, CA.

An additional \$450,000 to Tule River, CA.

An additional \$450,000 to Yuba River Basin, CA.

Earmark of \$250,000 to Bethany Beach, South Bethany, DE.

Earmark of \$100,000 to Lake Worth Inlet, Palm Beach County, FL.

Earmark of \$100,000 to Mile Point, Jacksonville, FL.

An additional \$170,000 to Metro Atlanta Watershed, GA.

Earmark of \$100,000 to Kawaihae Deep Draft Harbor, HI.

Earmark of \$100,000 to Kootenai River at Bonners Ferry, ID.

Earmark of \$100,000 to Little Wood River, ID.

Earmark of \$100,000 to Mississinewa River, Marion, IN.

Earmark of \$100,000 to Calcasieu River Basin, LA.

Earmark of \$500,000 to Louisiana Coastal Area, LA.

Earmark of \$100,000 to St. Bernard Parish, LA.

Earmark of \$100,000 to Detroit River Environmental Dredging, MI.

Earmark of \$400,000 to Sault Ste. Marie, MI.

An additional \$400,000 to Lower Las Vegas Wash Wetlands, NV.

Earmark of \$75,000 to Truckee Meadows, NV.

Earmark of \$200,000 to North Las Cruces, NM.

Earmark of \$100,000 to Lower Roanoke River, NC and VA.

Earmark of \$300,000 to Corpus Christi Ship Channel, LaQuinta Channel, TX.

Earmark of \$200,000 to Gulf Intracoastal Waterway Modification, TX.

Earmark of \$100,000 to John H. Kerr, VA and NC.

Earmark of \$100,000 to Lower Rappahannock River Basin, VA.

Earmark of \$500,000 to Lower Mud River, WV.

Earmark of \$400,000 to Island Creek, Logan, WV.

Earmark of \$100,000 to Wheeling Waterfront, WV.

Language which directs the Corps of Engineers to work with the city of Laurel, MT to provide appropriate assistance to ensure reliability in the city's Yellowstone River water source.

Construction

An additional \$1,200,000 to Cook Inlet, AK. An additional \$900,000 to St. Paul Harbor, AK.

An additional \$13,000,000 to Montgomery Point Lock and Dam, AR.

An additional \$8,000,000 to Los Angeles County Drainage Area, CA.

Earmark of \$500,000 to Fort Pierce Beach, FL.

Earmark of \$500,000 to Lake Worth Sand Transfer Plant, FL.

An additional \$2,000,000 to Chicago Shoreline, IL.

An additional \$10,000,000 to Olmstead Locks and Dam, Ohio River, IL and KY.

An additional \$2,000,000 to Kentucky Lock and Dam, Tennessee River, KY.

An additional \$2,000,000 to Inner Harbor Navigation Canal Lock, LA.

An additional \$5,000,000 to Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity, LA.

An additional \$1,000,000 to West Bank Vicinity of New Orleans, LA.

An additional \$2,500,000 to Poplar Island, MD.

Earmark of \$250,000 to Clinton River, MI Spillway.

Earmark of \$100,000 to Lake Michigan Center.

Earmark of \$1,100,000 to St. Croix River, Stillwater, MN.

An additional \$5,000,000 to Blue River Channel, Kansas City, MO.

An additional \$1,000,000 to Missouri National Recreational River, NE and SD.

An additional \$8,900,000 to Tropicana and Flamingo Washes, NV.

Earmark of \$250,000 to Passaic River, Minish Waterfront Park, NJ.

Earmark of \$750,000 to New York Harbor Collection and Removal of Drift, NY & NJ.

An additional \$4,000,000 to West Columbus, OH.

An additional \$90,000 to the Lower Columbia River Basin Bank Protection, OR and WA.

An additional \$10,000,000 to Locks and Dams 2, 3 and 4, Monongahela River, PA.

An additional \$1,000,000 to Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe, Lower Brule Sioux, SD.

Earmark of \$1,000,000 to James River Restoration, SD.

Earmark of \$1,000,000 to Black Fox, Murfree Springs, and Oakland Wetlands, TN.

Earmark of \$1,000,000 to Tennessee River, Hamilton County, TN.

Earmark of \$800,000 to Greenbrier River Basin, WV.

Earmark of \$1,000,000 to Lafarge Lake, Kickapoo River, WI.

Earmark of \$400,000 for aquatic weed control at Lake Champlain in Vermont.

An additional \$960,000 for various earmarks under Section 107, Small Navigation Project.

An additional \$5,675,000 for various earmarks under Section 205, Small flood control projects.

An additional \$1,760,000 for various earmarks under Section 206, Aquatic ecosystem restoration.

An additional \$1,500,000 for various earmarks under Section 1135, Projects Modifications for improvement of the environment.

An additional \$12,500,000 for the Mississippi River Levees, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri and Tennessee.

An additional \$500,000 to St. Francis Basin, Arkansas and Missouri.

An additional \$2,000,000 for the Louisiana State Penitentiary Levee, Louisiana.

An additional \$500,000 for Backwater Pump, Mississippi.

An additional \$585,000 for the Big Sunflower River, Mississippi.

An additional \$5,000,000 for Demonstration Erosion Control, Mississippi.

An additional \$2,000,000 for the St. Johns Bayou and New Madrid Floodway, Missouri.

An additional \$2,764,000 for the Mississippi River Levees, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, and Tennessee.

An additional \$1,500,000 for the St. Francis River Basin, Arkansas and Missouri.

An additional \$2,250,000 for the Atchafalaya Basin, Louisiana.

An additional \$1,000,000 for Arkabutla Lake, Missouri.

An additional \$1,000,000 for End Lake, Missouri.

An additional \$1,000,000 for Grenada Lake, Mississippi.

An additional \$1,000,000 for Sardis Lake, Mississippi.

An additional \$31,000 for Tributaries, Mississippi.

Corps of Engineers—Operation and Maintenance, General

An additional \$2,000,000 for Mobile Harbor, Alabama.

Earmark of \$1,000,000 for Lowell Creek Tunnel (Seward), Arkansas.

An additional \$1,500,000 for Mississippi River between Missouri River and Minneapolis, Illinois, Indiana, Minnesota, Missouri.

An additional \$525,000 for John Redmond Dam and Reservoir, Kansas.

An additional \$2,000,000 for Red River Waterway, Mississippi River to Shreveport, Louisiana.

Earmark of \$250,000 for Missouri National River.

An additional \$35,000 for Little River Harbor, New Hampshire.

Earmark of \$20,000 for Portsmouth Harbor, Piscataqua River, New Hampshire.

An additional \$1,500,000 for Delaware River Philadelphia to the Sea, New Jersey, Pennsylvania and Delaware.

Earmark of \$800,000 for Upper Rio Grande Water Operations Model.

An additional \$100,000 for Garrison Dam, Lake Sakakawea, North Dakota.

An additional \$500,000 for Oologah Lake, Oklahoma.

An additional \$2,300,000 for Columbia and Lower Willamette River Below Vancouver, Washington and Portland.

An additional \$50,000 for Port Orford, Oregon.

Earmark \$400,000 for Corpus Christi Ship Channel, Barge Lanes, Texas.

An additional \$1,140,000 for Burlington Harbor Breakwater, Vermont.

An additional \$3,000,000 for Grays Harbor and Chehalis River, Washington.

Language which directs the Army Corps of Engineers to address maintenance at Humboldt Harbor, CA; additional maintenance dredging of the Intracoastal Waterway in South Carolina from Georgetown to Little River, and from Port Royal to Little River; dredging at the entrance channel at Murrells Inlet, SC; additional dredging for the Lower Winyah Bay and Gorge in Georgetown Harbor, SC.

Bureau of Reclamation—Water and Related Resources

Earmark of \$5,000,000 for Headgate Rock Hydroelectric Project.

An additional \$1,500,000 for Central Valley Project: Sacramento River Division.

Earmark of \$250,000 for Fort Hall Indian Reservation.

Earmark of \$4,000,000 for Rock Peck Rural Water System, Montana.

Earmark of \$2,000,000 for Lake Mead and Las Vegas Wash.

Earmark of \$1,500,000 for Newlands Water Right Fund.

Earmark of \$800,000 for Truckee River Operation Agreement.

Earmark of \$400,000 for Walker River Basin Project.

An additional \$2,000,000 for Middle Rio Grande Project.

Earmark of \$300,000 for Navajo-Gallup Water Supply Project.

Earmark of \$750,000 for Santa Fe Water Reclamation and Reuse.

Earmark of \$250,000 for Ute Reservoir Pipeline Project.

An additional \$2,000,000 for Garrison Diversion Unit, P-SMBP

Earmark of \$400,000 for Tumalo Irrigation District, Bend Feed Canal, Oregon.

An additional \$2,000,000 for Mid-Dakota Rural Water Project

Earmark of \$600,000 for Tooele Wastewater Reuse Project.

Department of Energy

Earmark of \$1,000,000 is for the continuation of biomass research at the Energy and Environmental Research Center.

Earmark of \$5,000,000 for the McNeil biomass plant in Burlington, Vermont.

Earmark of \$300,000 for the Vermont Agriculture Methane project.

Earmark of \$2,000,000 for continued research in environmental and renewable resource technologies by the Michigan Biotechnology Institute.

Earmark of \$500,000 for the University of Louisville to research the commercial viability of refinery construction for the production of P-series fuels.

No less than 3,000,000 for the ethanol pilot plant at Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville.

Earmark of \$250,000 for the investigation of simultaneous production of carbon dioxide and hydrogen at the natural gas reforming facility in Nevada.

Earmark of \$350,000 for the Montana Trade Port Authority in Billings Montana.

Earmark of \$250,000 for the gasification of Iowa switchgrass and its use in fuel cells.

Earmark of \$1,000,000 to complete the 4 megawatt Sitka, Alaska project.

Earmark of \$1,700,000 for the Power Creek hydroelectric project.

Earmark of \$1,000,000 for the Kotzebue wind project.

Earmark of \$300,000 for the Old Harbor hydroelectric project.

Earmark of \$1,000,000 for a demonstration associated with the planned upgrade of the Nevada Test Site power substations of distributed power generation technologies.

Earmark of \$3,000,000 for the University of Nevada at Reno Earthquake Engineering Facility.

An additional \$35,000,000 to initiate a new strategy (which includes \$5,000,000 for activities at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, \$10,000,000 for Los Alamos National Laboratory, and \$20,000,000 for work at Sandia National Laboratory).

An additional \$15,000,000 for the Nevada Test Site.

An additional \$15,000,000 for future requirements at the Kansas City Plant compatible with the Advanced Development and Production Technologies [ADAPT] program and Enhanced Surveillance program.

An additional \$10,000,000 for core stockpile management weapon activities to support work load requirements at the Pantex plant in Amarillo, Texas.

An additional \$10,000,000 to address funding shortfalls in meeting environmental restoration Tri-Party Agreement compliance deadlines, and to accelerate interim safe storage of reactors along the Columbia River.

An additional \$10,000,000 for spent fuel activities related to the Idaho Settlement Agreement with the Department of Energy.

An additional \$30,000,000 for tank cleanup activities at the Hanford Site, WA.

An additional \$20,000,000 to Rocky Flats site, CO.

Total amount of Earmarks: \$531,124,000.

FISCAL YEAR 2000 ENERGY AND WATER APPROPRIATIONS BILL

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I rise today to congratulate the chairman and ranking member of the Energy and Water Appropriations Subcommittee, Senators DOMENICI and REID, for the extraordinary work they have accomplished in bringing the FY2000 energy and water appropriations bill to the floor. While this bill funds a number of vastly important national security and economic development programs and initiatives, until this year it has been relatively non-controversial, in part because of the hard work of my colleagues, Senators DOMENICI and REID.

This year, however, they have had to operate under more difficult circumstances. They have had to fashion a bill from extremely limited resources. As reported by the Appropriations Committee, the bill provides \$21.2 billion in new budget authority—\$12.6 billion within defense activities and \$8.6 billion within nondefense. In the defense accounts, that represents a \$220 million increase over the President's budget request. In the nondefense accounts, however, it represents a reduction of \$608 million from the request. This includes decreases in funding for critical water projects.

As the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee noted in his opening remarks on Monday, this is the first time in his memory—and he has been here many years longer than this Senator from North Dakota—that less funding for water projects is provided than requested in the budget. This is a worrisome situation for many important and worthwhile flood control and other projects in the coming year, but that is also a situation forced upon this subcommittee, indeed on most subcommit-

tees, by the allocations received as a result of staying within the budget caps.

He also noted that he was unable to accommodate all of the funding requests of the members of this body. That was the case with this Senator, but I do want to note that he and his distinguished ranking member were able to fund a number of important flood control and water development projects in my home state of North Dakota.

For instance, as the city of Grand Forks continues its recovery from the devastating 1997 floods of the Red River, the city and State have developed a plan to reconstruct flood control dikes to protect the cities of Grand Forks, ND, and East Grand Forks, MN, from future floods. The city and State are matching Federal funds for this project, but this bill provides \$9 million in federal funds for initial construction.

It also funds the President's request of \$27 million for the Garrison Diversions project as well as over \$2 million in additional funds requested by me and Senator CONRAD for unmet water supply needs on our Indian reservations. The tribes have already reached their funding ceiling under existing authority for these needs and the Bureau of Reclamation has documented over \$200 million in critical unmet water development needs on three reservations. These funds will begin to make a dent in these needs.

I am also pleased that the bill recommends \$1 million for the Energy and Environmental Research Center, EERC, to conduct research relating to the integration of biomass with fossil fuels in conventional power systems to increase busload renewable electricity generation; development of practical methods for using biomass in advanced power systems; and improvement of efficiency and environmental performance in agricultural processing and forest-based product industries producing food, fiber, and chemicals. These funds will build upon the exciting research already being conducted at the nationally recognized EERC in Grand Forks.

The bill funds the President's request of \$5 million to purchase of easements and compensate landowners who in the Buford-Trenton area are unable to farm as a result of flooding and high water tables caused by siltation upriver from the Garrison Dam. In 1998, more than 1000 acres remained under water and represented an economic loss to the farmers and others in this area of hundreds of thousands of dollars. This year, the water level is higher and only continues to grow. This is a Federal responsibility and one which is only beginning to be met. The project was authorized in the 1996 Water Development Act at \$34 million and this represents continued progress for buying easements from willing sellers.

Finally, I appreciate the subcommittee's support for an amendment offered by me and Senator CONRAD to add

\$50,000 for a reevaluation study of the Grafton dikes project by the Army Corps of Engineers. Because the project was de-authorized, this report is needed. While not reauthorizing the project, these funds will help us jump start the process once the project is reauthorized.

Our water supply and flood control needs in North Dakota are many and growing. Not all of our requested needs are met by this bill, but this is a good bill and one I can support. I thank Chairman DOMENICI and Ranking Member REID for their support and look forward to working with them in conference.

I yield the floor.

FISCAL YEAR 2000 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS BILL

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. President, I rise today in strong support of the FY 2000 Military Construction Appropriations Bill. This legislation demonstrates a considerable investment in our military's infrastructure, and a strong commitment to improving the quality of life of our soldiers that will go a long way toward achieving retention and recruiting goals. I especially thank and acknowledge the efforts of the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Senator STEVENS, the distinguished ranking member of the Appropriations Committee Senator BYRD, the chairman of the Military Construction Subcommittee, Senator BURNS, and ranking member, Senator MURRAY.

I am particularly pleased that the committee included \$1.9 million for the Armament Software Engineering Center, ASEC, at Picatinny Arsenal in my home State of New Jersey. Throughout our Nation's history, Picatinny Arsenal has provided our men and women with the high-technology weapons that have helped achieve our military victories. The new ASEC will consolidate many of the Arsenal's operations, thus enhancing Picatinny's capability to test and upgrade "smart" weapons. In 1998, the Senate supported ASEC by providing funds for the initial design, but unfortunately, the Army has not yet moved forward with the project. I am pleased by the Senate's renewed support of the Center, and look forward to working with the Subcommittee and the Army to ensure that this state-of-the-art facility becomes a reality.

I also express my support for the committee's inclusion of \$11.8 million to modernize several facilities at the United States Military Academy Preparatory School, USMAPS, at Fort Monmouth. Currently, the cadets attending USMAPS are housed in sub-standard facilities which have not been modernized since 1979. This funding will provide for much needed improvements that will allow USMAPS to continue training cadets for the Army and admittance into the U.S. Military Academy at West Point.