

DELAY) and myself, which has strengthened the core and local sponsor role in giving the local sponsor a greater responsibility.

Recently, the local sponsor, the Harris County, Texas, Commissioners Court, approved the Brays redesign per the WRDA 1996 Act, and now this project can move forward with strong public support.

I am also gratified the subcommittee decided to fully fund the Sims Bayou project at \$11.8 million. This is a project that also affects an area of southeastern Harris County that is heavily residential. This project is 2 years ahead of schedule. It is about midstream right now, scheduled to be completed in 2004. It is critically important to a number of my constituents who live in areas that are otherwise ravaged by continual flooding.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I am gratified that the committee chose to fully fund the request for the Houston Ship Channel deepening and widening project. This is the largest deepening and widening project that the Corps of Engineers has been involved in since the Panama Canal. It is important to the local economy that I and my colleagues in the Houston area represent. It is also being done in a very environmentally sound manner in reestablishing natural habitat throughout the Galveston Bay.

I appreciate the fact that the committee has kept this project on track and fully funded the administration's request.

I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON).

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

Mr. LARSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKEY) for his outstanding work, and the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), as well.

I would note to my colleagues that victory has many fathers, and defeat, of course, is an orphan. But defeat is not an option, especially for those who are dependent upon home heating oil and have to make the awful choice between heating their homes, providing themselves with prescription drugs that they need, or in fact the food that they place on their table.

Mr. Speaker, I associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Maine (Mr. BALDACCI) who spoke eloquently about the coalition of those of us in the Northeast who have sought bipartisan support, especially in the area of the release of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve and the establishment of a strategic home heating oil fuel base for those who need this kind of relief.

I further concur with the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. KIL-

PATRICK) about the need for the Federal Trade Commission to further pursue these companies with respect to what seems to be gouging at the gas lines.

Further, I would also note that there is an important need for an investment that is not addressed in this legislation. We currently import somewhere in the area of \$5 billion worth of oil a month. That is \$60 billion a year. We are making cuts in the very area of research and development, specifically in the area of fuel cells, that could benefit us and allow us to compete in a global economy, and get us to a point where we are not dependent upon foreign sources of oil, so we can provide ourselves with efficient home heating oil and the means to provide us with transportation to and from our jobs.

□ 1515

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS).

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the specific rule to permit an amendment on the floor offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON), and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) authorizing the establishment of a Northeast Home Heating Oil Reserve. Not only do we need to pass this rule, but what we really need to do is to appropriate funding for the creation of a Northeast Home Heating Oil Reserve.

Mr. Speaker, we are experiencing an energy crisis in this country. The price of gasoline is skyrocketing. In the Midwest and other parts of the country, the price of a gallon of gas is now over \$2 a gallon. Throughout the rest of the country, including my State of Vermont, it is well over \$1.50 a gallon, and that is unacceptable.

Mr. Speaker, the price of crude oil has more than tripled since last year and is the highest it has been since the Gulf War. The reason the prices are high is because the supply for gasoline is low. This can only mean one thing. If we do not adequately prepare for next winter, we will have a home heating oil disaster on our hands.

But my colleagues do not have to take my word for it. I quote from an article that appeared in USA Today just yesterday: "Those who heat with oil will shiver this winter and pay a premium. Just 15.3 million barrels of heating oil are stockpiled for the East Coast, which uses 75 percent of the Nation's heating oil in the winter. That's well down from 41.3 million barrels on hand last June."

Mr. Speaker, we all know what happened last year. Home heating oil prices were the highest they have ever been in history. And now we are faced with a home heating oil stockpile that is 37 percent lower than last year. It does not take a genius to figure out that we are setting ourselves up for a

huge heating oil crisis next year unless Congress acts now.

According to Bill O'Grady, oil analyst at A.G. Edwards & Sons, "If we have a cold winter early, we could end up seeing in heating oil what we're seeing in gas prices in spades."

Mr. Speaker, we must not let this happen. We must make certain that the huge increase in home heating oil prices that we experienced last winter never happens again. Too many people were hurt by that huge increase in home heating oil prices. The astronomical prices that our constituents were forced to pay for home heating oil in order to stay warm last winter was unconscionable. Let us unite behind the creation of a Northeast Home Heating Oil Reserve, and let us make sure that we have adequate funding to guarantee that it is up and running as soon as possible.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill, H.R. 4733, and that I may be permitted to include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT REGARDING LIMITATION OF AMENDMENTS DURING CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4733, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to advise all Members that we are working on a unanimous consent request to bring about a time agreement on all amendments to the bill. Any Members who have not yet contacted us regarding possible amendments should do so as soon as possible so that we can protect their right to offer amendments. Otherwise, we will be asking for unanimous consent that the amendments that have now been submitted will be the only amendments that will be considered.

#### ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 532 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. 4733.

□ 1520

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. 4733) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, with Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska 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. VISLOSKY) 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. Chairman, it is a privilege for me to present to the Committee of the Whole for its consideration the bill, H.R. 4733, making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001.

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

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 this bill as reported by the Committee on Appropriations, and I believe it merits the support of every Member of this body.

Total funding for H.R. 4733 is \$21.7 billion. This is over \$500 million more than the fiscal year 2000 for energy and water development programs, but almost a billion dollars below the President's budget request.

We were presented with an additional constraint in fiscal year 2001 because our 302(b) allocation consisted of two distinct parts: defense and nondefense. While the defense allocation in the bill is \$12.9 billion, and that is about \$755 million over the fiscal year 2000 and \$191 million below the budget request, the nondefense portion of the allocation is significantly less. For the nondefense portion of our bill we received \$8.8 billion, which is about \$210 million below the last fiscal year.

Despite the bill's constrained funding levels for nondefense programs, it provides adequate funding for the continuation of high-priority programs, promising the greatest return on the investment of taxpayer dollars.

Title I of the bill provides funding for the civil works program of the Corps of

Engineers. This includes, of course, projects for flood control, navigation, shoreline protection, and a variety of other things. The bill acknowledges the importance of water infrastructure by funding the civil works program at the same level as last year, a little over \$4 billion.

Within the amount appropriated for the Corps of Engineers, \$153 million is for general investigations and \$1.38 billion is for the construction program, and about \$1.8 billion for the operation and maintenance.

Mr. Chairman, funding for title II, most of which is for the Bureau of Reclamation, totals \$770 million, a reduction of \$35 million from last year's fiscal level. The bill also includes no funding for the CALFED Bay-Delta restoration program, a project which I have been greatly interested, in California. The reason for this is because we did not fund any unauthorized projects and the authorization for CALFED expired this year. Therefore, it was not funded, to my regret. But to be consistent with all of the Members, we followed that rule.

There are reductions in title III of the bill, which includes the budget of the Department of Energy, particularly the nondefense programs. Despite constrained funding levels, most DOE non-defense programs are funded at last year's level or slightly below. One exception to that policy is the Yucca Mountain program to site a permanent geologic repository for spent nuclear fuel, high-level nuclear fuel. This program was increased about \$413 million to maintain its schedule which calls for the Department of Energy to issue a site recommendation during the fiscal year 2001. We wanted to keep that on schedule, and thus we funded it accordingly.

We sought to maintain the level of funding for science programs, and we increased that area over fiscal year 2000. We also recognized that there are delays in some ongoing projects such as the Spallation Neutron Source, and we were unable to fund several new science initiatives as proposed in the fiscal year 2001.

Funding for the energy supply programs of the Department totals \$576 million. This includes about \$350 million for research and development of renewable energy technologies. We recognize that this is a little bit short of what the administration requested, and we wished that we had the funds to beef that up; but we feel that it is adequate to fund the renewable research effort.

The bill provides \$301 million for uranium facilities maintenance and remediation, a new account established to consolidate uranium programs that were spread through many other accounts.

The largest spending category for the Energy and Water bill is that of environmental restoration and waste management of the Department of Energy. Funding for cleanup activities at the

variety of sites in title III of the bill exceeds \$6.4 billion for defense and non-defense programs.

The bill also includes \$6.1 billion for new National Nuclear Security Administration, a semiautonomous agency within the Department of Energy. Title IV of the bill provides \$107 million reduction of \$21 million in fiscal year 2000 for certain independent agencies of the Federal Government, including the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the Appalachian Regional Commission, the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board, and the Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board.

Mr. Chairman, I owe a great deal of gratitude to the hard-working members of my Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development. They have labored with difficult fiscal constraints to produce a bill that I think is fair and balanced. I particularly want to thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the chairman and ranking member of the full Committee on Appropriations, who helped us and cooperated with us in crafting the bill.

Perhaps more importantly than any, I thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISLOSKY), the ranking minority member of the subcommittee. It has been a joy to work with him. He has been extremely helpful in crafting the bill. And then I certainly want to pay tribute to our staff on both sides of the aisle for their hard work in constructing an excellent bill.

Mr. Chairman, I have been pleased to hear during the debate in the Committee on Rules the willingness of virtually, well, not virtually, every Member that spoke of a willingness to support this bill. I would hope that every Member of the House would support this bill. We feel it is an excellent bill within the constraints that we had to live with, and I would encourage every Member to support it.

It is my privilege to present to the Committee of the Whole for its consideration H.R. 4733, making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001. Mr. Chairman, this bill provides annual funding for a wide array of Federal government programs which include 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, and I believe it merits the support of the entire membership of this body.

Total funding for H.R. 4733 is \$21.7 billion. This is \$546 million more than fiscal year 2000 for energy and water development programs, but \$951.8 million below the President's budget request.

We were presented with an additional constraint in fiscal year 2001 because our 302b allocation consisted of two distinct parts: defense and non-defense. While the defense allocation in the bill is \$12.893 billion which is

\$755.5 million over fiscal year 2000 and \$191 million below the budget request, the non-defense portion of the allocation is significantly less. For the non-defense portion of our bill, we received \$8.85 billion which is \$209.5 million below fiscal year 2000 and \$760.7 million below the budget request. This was a severe constraint on our ability to provide funding for many programs in this bill.

Despite the bill's constrained funding levels for non-defense programs, it provides adequate funding for the continuation of high-priority programs promising the greatest return on the investment of taxpayer dollars.

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 and shoreline protection demonstrably exceed project costs. The bill acknowledges the importance of water infrastructure by funding the civil works programs at \$4.1 billion, an increase of \$59.9 million over the amount requested by the Administration, and level with fiscal year 2000.

Within the amount appropriated to the Corps of Engineers, \$153.3 million is for general investigations, \$1.38 billion is for the construction program, and \$1.85 billion is for operation and maintenance. In addition, the bill includes \$323.4 million for Flood Control, Mississippi River and Tributaries, project. The bill also fully funds the budget request of the regulatory program and the Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program.

Mr. Chairman, funding for Title II, most of which is for the Bureau of Reclamation, totals \$770.5 million—a reduction of \$35.3 million from the fiscal year 2000 level. The bill includes no funding for the CALFED Bay-Delta restoration program whose authorization expires in fiscal year 2000 and fully funds the budget request of \$38.4 million for the Central Valley Project restoration fund.

There are reductions in Title III of the bill which includes the budget of the Department of Energy, particularly in the non-defense programs. Despite constrained funding levels, most DOE non-defense programs are funded at last year's level or slightly below. The one exception is the Yucca Mountain program to site a permanent geologic repository for spent nuclear fuel. This program was increased to \$413 million to maintain its schedule which calls for the Department of Energy to issue a site recommendation in fiscal year 2001.

We sought to maintain level funding for science programs and provided \$2.83 billion, an increase of \$43.3 million over fiscal year 2000. However, there are delays in some ongoing projects such as the Spallation Neutron Source, and we were unable to fund several new science initiatives proposed in fiscal year 2001.

Funding for energy supply programs of the Department totals \$576.5 million. This includes \$350.5 million for research and development on renewable energy technologies. Although this falls short of the Administration's unrealistic budget request, it is a substantial and credible level of funding. The energy supply account also includes \$231.8 million nuclear energy programs. The bill provides \$22.5 million for the nuclear energy research initiative and \$5 million, the full amount of the budget request, for the nuclear energy plant optimization program.

The bill provides \$301.4 million for uranium facilities maintenance and remediation, a new account established to consolidate uranium programs that were spread throughout other accounts. These programs were merged to enhance coordination and eliminate duplication in the environmental remediation work performed at the uranium enrichment facilities in Tennessee, Kentucky, and Ohio.

The largest spending category in the Energy and Water Bill is that of environmental restoration and waste management at Department of Energy sites. Funding for cleanup activities in title III of the bill exceeds \$6.4 billion for defense and non-defense programs. The Com-

mittee is dedicated to the environmental restoration of areas that participated in the development and maintenance of our nuclear security complex. This bill reflects the Committee's continued efforts to promote actual, physical site cleanups and to accelerate the completion of remediation work at DOE sites. Accordingly, the Committee has provided \$1.08 billion, the full amount of the budget request, for defense facilities closure projects. This account concentrates funding on discrete sites that are on schedule for cleanup completion by the year 2006. The Committee has also directed the Department to establish a cleanup program for those sites and projects that can be completed by 2010.

The bill includes \$6.16 billion for the new National Nuclear Security Administration, a semi-autonomous agency within the Department of Energy. The bill provides \$4.6 billion for stewardship of the Nation's nuclear weapons stockpile, \$861.5 million for defense nuclear nonproliferation programs, and \$677.6 million for the naval reactors program.

Title IV of the bill provides \$107.5 million, a reduction of \$21 million from fiscal year 2000, for certain independent agencies of the Federal Government, including the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the Appalachian Regional Commission, the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board, and the Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board.

Mr. Chairman, I owe a debt of gratitude to the hard-working and dedicated Members of the Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development. They have labored under difficult fiscal constraints to produce a bill that is balanced and fair. I am especially grateful to the Ranking Minority Member, the Honorable PETE VISCLOSKY. It is in large part due to his efforts that we present a bill that merits the support of all Members of the House.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all Members to support H.R. 4733 as reported by the Committee on Appropriations, and I reserve the balance of my time.

**ENERGY AND WATER APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2001 (H.R. 4733)**  
**(Amounts in thousands)**

	FY 2000 Enacted	FY 2001 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
<b>TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - CIVIL</b>					
<b>DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY</b>					
<b>Corps of Engineers - Civil</b>					
General investigations.....	161,994	137,700	153,327	-8,667	+15,627
Construction, general.....	1,385,032	1,346,000	1,378,430	-6,602	+32,430
Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, and Tennessee.....	309,416	309,000	323,350	+13,934	+14,350
Operation and maintenance, general.....	1,853,618	1,854,000	1,854,000	+382	.....
Regulatory program.....	117,000	125,000	125,000	+8,000	.....
FUSRAP.....	150,000	140,000	140,000	-10,000	.....
General expenses.....	149,500	152,000	149,500	.....	-2,500
<b>Total, title I, Department of Defense - Civil.....</b>	<b>4,126,560</b>	<b>4,063,700</b>	<b>4,123,607</b>	<b>-2,953</b>	<b>+59,907</b>
<b>TITLE II - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR</b>					
<b>Central Utah Project Completion Account</b>					
Central Utah project construction.....	22,436	19,566	19,566	-2,870	.....
Fish, wildlife, and recreation mitigation and conservation.....	10,476	14,158	14,158	+3,682	.....
Utah reclamation mitigation and conservation account.....	5,000	5,000	5,000	.....	.....
<b>Subtotal.....</b>	<b>37,912</b>	<b>38,724</b>	<b>38,724</b>	<b>+812</b>	.....
Program oversight and administration.....	1,321	1,216	1,216	-105	.....
<b>Total, Central Utah project completion account.....</b>	<b>39,233</b>	<b>39,940</b>	<b>39,940</b>	<b>+707</b>	.....
<b>Bureau of Reclamation</b>					
Water and related resources.....	605,992	643,058	635,777	+29,785	-7,281
Loan program.....	11,577	9,369	9,369	-2,208	.....
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(43,000)	(27,000)	(27,000)	(-16,000)	.....
Central Valley project restoration fund.....	42,000	38,382	38,382	-3,618	.....
California Bay-Delta ecosystem restoration.....	60,000	60,000	.....	-60,000	-60,000
Policy and administration.....	47,000	50,224	47,000	.....	-3,224
<b>Total, Bureau of Reclamation.....</b>	<b>766,569</b>	<b>801,033</b>	<b>730,528</b>	<b>-36,041</b>	<b>-70,505</b>
<b>Total, title II, Department of the Interior.....</b>	<b>805,802</b>	<b>840,973</b>	<b>770,468</b>	<b>-35,334</b>	<b>-70,505</b>
<b>TITLE III - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY</b>					
Energy supply.....	637,962	752,895	576,482	-61,480	-176,413
(By transfer).....	(5,821)	.....	.....	(-5,821)	.....
Non-defense environmental management.....	332,350	286,001	281,001	-51,349	-5,000
Uranium enrichment decontamination and decommissioning fund.....	249,247	303,038	.....	-249,247	-303,038
Uranium facilities maintenance and remediation.....	.....	.....	301,400	+301,400	+301,400
Science.....	2,787,627	3,151,065	2,830,915	+43,288	-320,150
Nuclear Waste Disposal.....	239,601	325,500	213,000	-26,601	-112,500
Departmental administration.....	205,581	213,339	153,527	-52,054	-59,812
Miscellaneous revenues.....	-106,887	-128,762	-111,000	-4,113	+17,762
<b>Net appropriation.....</b>	<b>98,694</b>	<b>84,577</b>	<b>42,527</b>	<b>-56,167</b>	<b>-42,050</b>
Office of the Inspector General.....	29,500	33,000	31,500	+2,000	-1,500
Environmental restoration and waste management:					
Defense function.....	(5,716,037)	(6,148,824)	(5,864,004)	(+147,967)	(-284,820)
Non-defense function.....	(581,597)	(589,039)	(582,401)	(+804)	(-6,638)
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>(6,297,634)</b>	<b>(6,737,863)</b>	<b>(6,446,405)</b>	<b>(+148,771)</b>	<b>(-291,458)</b>
<b>Atomic Energy Defense Activities</b>					
<b>National Nuclear Security Administration:</b>					
Weapons activities.....	4,427,052	4,594,000	4,625,684	+198,632	+31,684
Defense nuclear nonproliferation.....	729,100	906,035	861,477	+132,377	-44,558
Naval reactors.....	677,600	677,600	677,600	.....	.....
<b>Subtotal, National Nuclear Security Administration.....</b>	<b>5,833,752</b>	<b>6,177,635</b>	<b>6,164,761</b>	<b>+331,009</b>	<b>-12,874</b>
Defense environmental restoration and waste management.....	4,467,308	4,551,527	4,522,707	+55,399	-28,820
Defense facilities closure projects.....	1,060,447	1,082,297	1,082,297	+21,850	.....
Defense environmental management privatization.....	188,282	515,000	259,000	+70,718	-256,000
<b>Subtotal, Defense environmental management.....</b>	<b>5,716,037</b>	<b>6,148,824</b>	<b>5,864,004</b>	<b>+147,967</b>	<b>-284,820</b>
Other defense activities.....	309,199	555,122	592,235	+283,036	+37,113
Defense nuclear waste disposal.....	111,574	112,000	200,000	+88,426	+88,000
Energy employees compensation initiative (proposal).....	.....	17,000	.....	.....	-17,000
<b>Total, Atomic Energy Defense Activities.....</b>	<b>11,970,562</b>	<b>13,010,581</b>	<b>12,821,000</b>	<b>+850,438</b>	<b>-189,581</b>
<b>Power Marketing Administrations</b>					
Operation and maintenance, Southeastern Power Administration.....	39,579	3,900	3,900	-35,679	.....
Operation and maintenance, Southwestern Power Administration.....	27,891	28,100	28,100	+209	.....
(By transfer).....	(773)	.....	.....	(-773)	.....
Construction, rehabilitation, operation and maintenance, Western Area Power Administration.....	192,802	164,816	160,930	-31,872	-3,986
Falcon and Amistad operating and maintenance fund.....	1,309	2,670	2,670	+1,361	.....
<b>Total, Power Marketing Administrations.....</b>	<b>261,381</b>	<b>199,586</b>	<b>195,600</b>	<b>-65,781</b>	<b>-3,986</b>

**ENERGY AND WATER APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2001 (H.R. 4733)—Continued**  
**(Amounts in thousands)**

	FY 2000 Enacted	FY 2001 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
<b>Federal Energy Regulatory Commission</b>					
Salaries and expenses .....	174,950	175,200	175,200	+250	
Revenues applied .....	-174,950	-175,200	-175,200	-250	
<b>Total, title III, Department of Energy .....</b>	<b>16,606,924</b>	<b>18,148,243</b>	<b>17,293,425</b>	<b>+686,501</b>	<b>-852,818</b>
<b>TITLE IV - INDEPENDENT AGENCIES</b>					
Appalachian Regional Commission.....	66,149	71,400	63,000	-3,149	-8,400
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board.....	16,935	18,500	17,000	+65	-1,500
Delta Regional Authority .....		30,000			-30,000
Denali Commission .....	19,924	20,000		-19,924	-20,000
<b>Nuclear Regulatory Commission:</b>					
Salaries and expenses .....	464,913	481,900	481,900	+16,987	
Revenues .....	-442,000	-447,958	-457,100	-15,100	-9,142
<b>Subtotal .....</b>	<b>22,913</b>	<b>33,942</b>	<b>24,800</b>	<b>+1,887</b>	<b>-9,142</b>
Office of Inspector General.....	5,000	6,200	5,500	+500	-700
Revenues .....	-5,000	-6,076	-5,500	-500	+576
<b>Subtotal .....</b>		<b>124</b>			<b>-124</b>
<b>Total .....</b>	<b>22,913</b>	<b>34,066</b>	<b>24,800</b>	<b>+1,887</b>	<b>-9,266</b>
<b>Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board.....</b>	<b>2,589</b>	<b>3,200</b>	<b>2,700</b>	<b>+111</b>	<b>-500</b>
<b>Total, title IV, independent agencies.....</b>	<b>128,510</b>	<b>177,166</b>	<b>107,500</b>	<b>-21,010</b>	<b>-69,666</b>
<b>TITLE V - RESCISSIONS</b>					
<b>DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - CIVIL</b>					
<b>DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY</b>					
<b>Corps of Engineers - Civil</b>					
General investigations (rescission).....	-930			+930	
Construction, general (rescission) .....	-12,819			+12,819	
<b>Total, Corps of Engineers - Civil.....</b>	<b>-13,749</b>			<b>+13,749</b>	
<b>DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY</b>					
Nuclear Waste Disposal (rescission).....	-4,000			+4,000	
Defense nuclear waste disposal (rescission) .....		-85,000	-85,000	-85,000	
<b>Power Marketing Administrations</b>					
<b>Southeastern Power Administration:</b>					
Purchase power and wheeling (rescission).....	-3,000			+3,000	
<b>Total, title V, Rescissions.....</b>	<b>-20,749</b>	<b>-85,000</b>	<b>-85,000</b>	<b>-64,251</b>	
<b>Grand total:</b>					
New budget (obligational) authority.....	21,647,047	23,143,082	22,210,000	+562,953	-933,082
Appropriations .....	(21,667,796)	(23,228,082)	(22,295,000)	(+627,204)	(-933,082)
Rescissions.....	(-20,749)	(-85,000)	(-85,000)	(-64,251)	
(By transfer) .....	(6,594)			(-6,594)	

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I would begin by also commending the gentleman from California (Chairman PACKARD) and would point out to every Member of the body in this institution that this will be the last Energy and Water bill that the gentleman will bring to the House floor during his tenure as a Member of Congress, given the fact that he will now retire after the 106th Congress.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California is a very decent man. He is a God-fearing man whose family is the most important thing in his life, his wife, Jean, as well as his seven children. Clearly as important to him is his country. And whether it was his service in defense of this country as a member of the United States Navy; whether it was his service as a member of a school board ensuring that the youth of his community receive the best education possible for their future; whether it be as the mayor and chief executive of his local community or his years of service in this Congress, I certainly respect the gentleman's three great passions in life.

□ 1530

But I would be remiss, as I would have been remiss in full committee, Mr. Chairman, if I did not mention for one moment the other great passion in life of the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD), and that is golf. For those who do not yet know the good work, the foursome of the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD) did win the recent Bob Michael's, Founder, Golf Tournament with the lowest team score.

I salute the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD). He has been a gentleman, a friend, and we will all miss him.

I also want to add my thanks, my deepest thanks as a former staff member myself, to all of the staff involved on both sides of the aisle, whether they be professional committee staff, detailees, or associate staff.

But today, because this is the last bill of the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD), I would also point out to the House, this is John McNutt's last bill. He is my associate staff member and has been for the last 7 years 6 months and 27 days, not that we are counting.

But as I pointed out in my previous remarks before the full committee, Mr. McNutt is moving on with his life. He is going to be attending the University of Virginia Law School and made the wise choice, from an academic consideration, when he had the option of going to either UVA or the University of Notre Dame, that he chose Virginia. I do wish him well in his endeavor.

I would advise all of the Members that I do support this bill. I do believe that the gentleman from California

(Mr. PACKARD) has done the best job humanly possible with this bill given the allocations the subcommittee had.

But I would note that I for one did not vote for the budget resolution adopted by this institution, and I did not vote for the allocations adopted by the committee and have not agreed with the allocation we were given.

On the civilian side particularly of the legislation, it gives us great trouble. The fact is we are \$210 million today under a freeze level for civilian purposes. Let me note for the Members of this Chamber several problems that it causes.

In the area of water projects, and there is hardly a Member in this institution who does not have a problem one way or the other with water in their district, the spending this year, while \$60 million over the President's request, is \$6 million under a freeze. Given the fact that the Corps today has responsibilities of over 400 multipurpose reservoirs, 12,000 miles of navigation channels, hundreds of ports, and 11.6 million acres of land, we fall woefully short.

It is anticipated just to fully fund authorized active construction projects, those projects that this Congress has authorized, that are economically justified, and are supported by a non-Federal entity, we would need an additional \$30 billion.

It is further anticipated that if the shadows of the future are not unaltered, the backlog for critically deferred maintenance this coming fiscal year will amount to \$450 million.

The Assistant Secretary of the Army, Mr. Westphal, has indicated that, to ensure that projects proceed on the most efficient schedule possible, we should probably be spending almost \$700 million more a year.

People have noted in the past that there has been mission creep by the Corps, that, first, it is flood control projects, then it is navigation, then it is hydropower, shoreline protection, and recreation.

But I would point out to the body that those are all responsibilities we collectively have given to the Corps. We have also seen fit, both the legislative branch and the executive branch, to give them additional responsibilities as far as environmental restoration, water treatment facilities, sewer treatment facilities, and the clean up of contaminated sites.

Within the last couple of weeks, we had a very controversial debate and vote relative to trade with China. I would point out that global commerce is projected to double over the next 20 years, and the harbors and inland waterways that lead to them will have to be expanded and maintained for us to stay competitive, and that nearly half of the inland waterway locks and dams today are over 50 years old.

To put it in another perspective, in 1999 constant dollars, in the 1960s, we were spending nearly \$5 billion on water construction projects. Today for

inflation adjusted dollars, we are spending about \$1.7 billion.

There is no money in the bill for a new recreation facility modernization initiative by the administration. There is no money for the Challenge 21 Riverine Restoration Program to move towards more nonstructural solutions to many of our flooding and water problems. They would also be looking to have greater coordination with environmental restoration. Given the fact that we have at least a two to one cost benefit ratio, I think it is a mistake not to further fund these programs.

In the arena of science, I would mention renewables. There was a debate during the rule about gas prices going up. Whether one blames OPEC, the oil companies, EPA, ethanol, the fact is they have gone up. Funding in this bill currently as we debate it has gone down \$12 million from last year's level. It is my anticipation and I appreciate the fact that it would appear that later today that figure will go up.

Finally, I would point to an initiative that the administration asks for in the area of nanoscience and nanotechnology. In 1959, Richard Feynman delivered a famous lecture; and in it he challenged his audience to envision a time when materials could be manipulated and controlled on the smallest of scales. He said then in 1959 that, when they looked back at this age, they will wonder why it was not until 1960 that anybody began seriously to move in this direction, and here we are 40 years later.

Nanoscale science and synthesis would result in a number of benefits: significant improvements in solar energy conservation, more energy efficient lighting, stronger, lighter materials that would improve efficiency in transportation, greatly improved chemical and biological sensing, and others. Again, a new science initiative would not be funded.

I would simply close again by assuring Members that, within the allocations provided, the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD) has done a very good job. I do support the bills, but I would have been remiss in my remark for not pointing out the deficiencies given the allocations that we were given that I did not support.

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

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, yield such time she may consume to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY) for purposes of a colloquy.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to enter into the colloquy with the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD), chairman of the Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from California knows, I had intended to offer an amendment today on an issue of great importance to my district. I am not going to offer this amendment, however, with the understanding that the gentleman from California is willing to work with me on this matter.

I wish to bring to the gentleman's attention some serious concerns I have regarding the Indian Point 2 nuclear power facility in my district.

This plant was shut down in February after a steam generator started leaking radioactive material into the atmosphere. It goes without saying that this was a distressing situation for my community. What merits mentioning, and what brings me to the floor today, however, are the string of revelations in the months following this incident which have fundamentally undermined the community's confidence in the safety of the plant.

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission itself admitted in March that previous inspections of the plant were "weak and incomplete."

The NRC determined in May that operational deficiencies at the plant were serious enough to place it on the agency's watch list.

Then we learned that the conduct of the NRC staff responsible for plant safety is now the subject of an investigation by the Inspector General. Despite my repeated requests, the NRC will not postpone their decision on the restart of this plant at least until the investigation is complete, as they would have us believe that it is somehow irrelevant.

Just last week, an internal memo from the plant's operator was discovered revealing serious problems which occurred at the plant on the night of the leak. Mr. Chairman, it appears that the NRC saw this document only after stories were written about it in local newspapers.

Mr. Chairman, there is a problem here. These are legitimate concerns, and it is reasonable for me and my constituents to expect for them to be given full and fair deliberation before that plant is restarted. I would like to make it clear on this floor that this is not the case, that this issue is not being dealt with reasonably, and it is unsettling my community.

Mr. Chairman, I feel strongly that the NRC should postpone a decision on restart of Indian Point 2 until the serious and legitimate concerns that have arisen on this issue are addressed. At the very least, it would seem prudent to postpone the NRC's decision on restarting the plant until the final investigation report of the Inspector General's office is released and carefully reviewed by the NRC officials to ensure that the outstanding issues are identified and corrected.

Would the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD) agree to work with me in ensuring that the committee continue to provide strict oversight of this serious matter?

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD).

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much the gentlewoman from New York bringing this serious matter to the attention of the House, and I share her concerns over the serious nature of the problem at Indian

Point 2 nuclear facility, and agree that the NRC inspector general should provide to the NRC all relevant information that its investigation developed prior to the decision and restart. Let me say to the gentlewoman that I will work closely with her to see that this issue is provided with continued congressional attention in the coming months.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California for his attention to this matter. I hope that this matter will be resolved in the interest of my constituents.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking minority member.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise, not so much to comment on the content of the legislation, as to take note, as has the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) that the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD) is bringing this bill to the floor for the last time.

Without getting into the merits of the bill, which are considerably constricted because of the budget resolution, which I find to be ill-advised, I simply, Mr. Chairman, wanted to say that I think that the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD) is one of the people who have added to the decency of this institution.

In the years that he has been on the committee, I think he has been an extremely genial Member. I think he has been extremely fair-minded as chairman. I think he has worked very hard to try to produce a rational set of priorities in an irrational situation. I for one want to say that it has been a distinct pleasure for me to share our service in this institution.

What I admire about the gentleman from California most of all is that he does not, he is not one of those Members who is prone to cheapshot the institution. He recognizes that this institution is a precious asset to the American people and tries to remind others of that fact in virtually everything he does.

I simply want to congratulate him for the service he has provided to his district, to the country, to his State, to his party, and to this institution, and wish him good luck in whatever he does after he leaves this place.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) on the same issue that the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY) addressed.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to engage the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD) in a colloquy.

Mr. Chairman, for more than 25 years, along with my colleagues in my area, I have been working with the communities throughout our Hudson Valley region to ensure the safety of the Indian Point 2 nuclear power plant

in Buchanan, New York. Over the past year, that plant has had to be shut down on two separate occasions. Prior thereto, over the past 25 years, this nuclear plant has had to be shut down on a number of occasions due to the failure of the plant's outmoded steam generators, insufficient emergency preparedness, and questions about the integrity of the nuclear plant.

The facility has been plagued with safety problems over the years. It is the only nuclear power reactor in the entire country which is still operating with the outmoded Westinghouse Model 44 steam generators. Nevertheless, the NRC is presently considering an application by Consolidated Edison to restart the plant.

During a recent public meeting, I joined with Senator SCHUMER, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY), and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), and the citizens of our Hudson Valley region in requesting that the application for restarting this plant not be approved until the existing steam generators have been replaced and emergency and safety deficiencies outlined in the NRC's inspection team's report are remedied.

Mr. Chairman, this nuclear facility is located only 35 miles from New York City and in the heart of our heavily populated Hudson Valley region. It is obvious that the replacement of these outmoded steam generators and the remediation of emergency and safety procedures at Indian Point 2 is vital to the safety and welfare of millions of our citizens.

□ 1545

Will the chairman be able to assist us in assuring the future safety of this nuclear facility?

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILMAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PACKARD. I advise the gentleman from New York that I would be pleased to offer any assistance that I may be able to in monitoring this situation at Indian Point 2 and work with the gentleman to resolve the situation.

Mr. GILMAN. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I thank our distinguished chairman for his time and attention on this pressing matter.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for yielding me this time. I also wish to thank our chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD), as well as our ranking member, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), for their support, and the whole committee's hard work, both the full committee and the subcommittee. I also want to thank my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS), for his dedication and hard work and especially for his advice.

Because of the committee's efforts, the Houston-Galveston Navigation Project is appropriated the full \$53.5 million needed to maintain the optimal construction schedule for the deepening and widening of the Houston Ship Channel. This subcommittee had the foresight to maintain this construction schedule. By providing the necessary funds now, this project's return on investment will save taxpayers many millions of dollars in increased construction costs.

Also, the Port of Houston generates \$300 million annual customs fees and \$213 million annually in State and local taxes, which demonstrates that the Houston-Galveston Navigation Project will more than pay for itself in the long run, both for the local taxpayers but also for the Federal taxpayers of the United States.

The continued expansion of the Port of Houston is important on many levels. More than 7,000 vessels navigate the ship channel each year. The port provides 5.5 billion in annual business revenues and creates directly and indirectly 196,000 jobs.

It is anticipated that the number and size of vessels will only increase. Completing the widening and deepening of the ship channel in a timely manner will increase the safety and economic viability of the port and of the City of Houston.

In addition to the Houston Ship Channel, there are several flood control projects that the Corps of Engineers, in partnership with our Harris County Flood Control District, have undertaken. Hunting Bayou Flood Control Project, \$337,000 in this bill. This project will affect 29 square miles of the Hunting Bayou watershed and benefit over 7,000 homes and businesses located within that watershed. The environmental evaluation and the General Reevaluation Report should be completed on that and submitted to the Corps by November of this year.

Another project of importance is the Greens Bayou Flood Control Project. This 213 square miles of watershed will provide important protection for hundreds of homes that are currently extremely vulnerable to flooding.

Mr. Chairman, I again thank the committee for their hard work.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS), for the purpose of colloquy. (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD) for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman is aware, the Office of River Protection at the Hanford site in my district is currently engaged in the world's largest and most pressing environmental cleanup project. The President's fiscal year 2001 budget request for the privatization account at Hanford was \$450

million. However, due to recent developments, privatization is no longer a viable option at this time.

In light of these developments, the Department of Energy has identified a new path forward to ensure the timely cleanup of the waste. As a result of this new path forward, the Department identified an updated funding requirement of \$370 million instead of the \$450 million for FY 2001 to fully fund the necessary design and long-lead procurement to keep the project on schedule.

I would like to ask the gentleman if he will insist that the necessary \$300 million of design and long-lead procurement needs for this project will be preserved during the conference with the other body.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I would respond to the gentleman by saying, absolutely, we will continue to press for that figure and do all we can to make sure the amount of money is available for fiscal year 2001.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for that commitment. The gentleman's assurance certainly gives me and my constituents in central Washington, and for that matter all of us in the Pacific Northwest, confidence that the final legislation will contain the full funding that has been identified for the work that is required this year.

Finally, I wish to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD) personally for all the efforts the gentleman has given on behalf of me and my constituents in my district. I want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and wish the gentleman the very best in his retirement.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN), a valuable member of the subcommittee.

(Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise in support of our energy and water appropriation bill. I also wish to thank our chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD), and ranking member, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VIS-CLOSKY), for their bipartisan approach to our bill.

Unfortunately, this is our chairman's last year in Congress and his last energy and water bill. The gentleman from California has achieved many things during his tenure as chairman. He has been the driving force for reform of the Department of Energy. He has made sure that we honor our commitment to a balanced Federal budget and that we focus our scarce resources where they really need to go. I will miss the gentleman from California, as

I am sure all of us will; and I want to thank him personally for his leadership, his friendship, and his very good nature.

I want to also say a word to the staff of the Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development for their tireless work on all our behalf.

Mr. Chairman, our bill addresses important national priorities at the same time it honors our commitment to a balanced Federal budget. As the chairman can attest, there are always more requests for funding than our budget allocation can provide for. The no new-start policy contained in this bill is difficult but necessary. We need to focus our dollars on ongoing projects that are on schedule and on budget. And even with this strict requirement, our bill provides funding for projects that will benefit virtually every congressional district in our Nation.

This is in stark contrast to the President's budget request for the Army Corps of Engineers, which was wholly inadequate. It is a poor reflection on the White House that each and every year this committee must add funds for our Nation's waterways and coastal areas.

This is particularly true for my home State of New Jersey, where we have 137 miles of ocean coast that we need to protect. In addition, New Jersey has experienced severe and devastating floods, and the only long-term solution is effective flood mitigation. Our State is also committed to the preservation of wetlands. All of these important priorities were shortchanged in the President's budget.

For over 170 years, the Army Corps of Engineers has provided solutions to flooding, dredging and environmental problems, as well as shore and beach protection. Our bill also maintains funding for flood safety, coastal protection, dredging, and environmental restoration. It restores funds for these vital projects in order to protect lives and property.

Our bill also provides funding for the Department of Energy. Most importantly, we have increased our commitment to scientific research, providing \$2.8 billion for the Office of Science, a \$43 million increase. With this funding, important scientific research will continue in the area of high energy and nuclear physics, technology, basic energy sciences, biological and environmental research.

I especially want to thank the chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD), for his support of \$255 million for fusion research and \$25 million for laser research. While I would have preferred more funding for this, we did increase fusion research above the current level. Fusion energy has the potential to be an unlimited and ultraclean source of energy for the world. And after a number of years of declining budgets for this program, and with the chairman's help, this is the second year of increased funding for fusion research.

The committee has also provided \$19.6 million for the decommissioning of the Tokamak Fusion Test Reactor at Princeton University. This decommissioning must stay on schedule and on budget, and this funding will allow us to do so.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to support the bill. I thank the chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD), and the ranking member, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), for their support.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), a member of the committee.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I want to have a colloquy with the distinguished chairman of the committee, but I just noticed that both the chairman of the Whole House and the chairman of the subcommittee are both retiring this year, and I have to express my own personal regrets that they are retiring. They are both very distinguished gentlemen, and I have enjoyed serving with them.

I have really enjoyed serving with the chairman of the subcommittee, not only as a fellow Californian; but we have been engaged together in issues for the State, and I remember when I was in the State legislature his work with the supercollider, where I really got to know him well; and I have appreciated his leadership here in the Congress.

I want to thank him for the opportunity to discuss with him the funding for a critical project in my district, which is the central part of California. This is the second year I have sought appropriations to carry out a preconstruction engineering design of a flood control measure on the Pajaro River, which runs right through the City of Watsonville, California, as well as funding for the Pajaro River Basin Study. This is an area in my district with substantial flood control problems, which threatens homes and businesses in Santa Cruz and Monterey Counties. I have worked extensively with officials in both of these counties and the Corps of Engineers to resolve this problem in order to provide safety for the residents there.

I recognize that the Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development is under significant budgetary constraints this fiscal year and has thus adopted a policy to fund investigations at a level no higher than requested by the administration. The administration's request for investigations on the Pajaro River was \$600,000, with an additional \$50,000 request for the basin study. However, this request was prepared prior to the agreement between the Corps and the local sponsors, which subsequently set a higher level of funding for the project.

The Corps has revised their earlier estimates, and has developed a new work plan and budget that calls for a

total of \$1.95 million in fiscal year 2001. They have submitted a revised estimate on their ability to spend which reflects this new higher amount. I would like to request that my good friend, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development of the Committee on Appropriations, amend the amount as we go along to allocate to the investigations on the Pajaro River to reflect this agreement with the Corps and the new estimate of their ability to pay.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARR of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from California for yielding, and I want to state that I recognize the importance to his constituents to improve flood control on the Pajaro River. The Corps has demonstrated their ability to spend \$1.95 million on the investigations of these two projects.

Given the revision of the Corps's estimates since the submission of the President's budget, I pledge to do everything I can to help the gentleman receive additional monies from the Corps for purposes of implementing these worthy projects.

Mr. FARR of California. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for working on this matter; and I look forward to working with him in the future.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire what time is remaining on each side.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD) has 8½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP), for the purposes of a colloquy.

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Chairman, I hope I can do it in 2 minutes.

Before I engage in a colloquy, I do want to associate myself quickly with all the outstanding comments that have been made about the brilliant political career, the public service, and especially the attitude of the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD). People from one end of this place to the other really appreciate the spirit of the gentleman from California. The gentleman from California has done a great job and brought so much to public service in this country. And I hope the gentleman enjoys the game of golf from this point on, because the gentleman deserves his retirement.

Mr. Chairman, the Spallation Neutron Source is one of the most important science initiatives of our generation and represents a \$1.4 billion major construction project supported by the Department of Energy's Office of Science to build the world's most powerful source of pulsed beams for scientific research and development.

□ 1600

With its advanced accelerator technology and world-class instrument design, SNS will be more than 12 times as powerful as the world's current leading neutron source in the U.K. and offer unprecedented research opportunities for up to 2,000 scientists each year. This research is crucial to supporting advances in biology, polymers, magnetic materials, superconductivity, and materials research that will continue to keep the U.S. economy strong and keep us at the forefront of scientific endeavors around the globe.

SNS has been subject to many technical and management reviews in the past 4 years, including review by the DOE, several external independent review teams, the GAO, and the House Committee on Science. These reviews have shown conclusively that the technical basis of the SNS is sound and that the SNS management is on a solid path to complete the project within budget by 2006 as planned. All conditions prescribed in the committee report on last year's Energy and Water appropriations bill have been satisfied, and the House Committee on Science has recommended full funding of the SNS in fiscal year 2001.

The SNS will fully obligate \$190 million in this fiscal year, including the fiscal year 2000 appropriation of \$100 million in construction funds and \$17.9 in R&D, plus the fiscal year 1999 balances brought forward of about \$71.4 million. Significant design and construction activity has taken place in the last year, with most title I design completed, approximately \$75 million in procurements being awarded and major excavation and grading of the 100-acre site well underway.

Fully funding the fiscal year 2000 requested level is essential to maintain the current schedule to complete SNS in 2006 within the total project cost of \$1.4 billion.

I know how hard the chairman and his staff have worked to get this project to where we are today, and I appreciate that. I acknowledge the budget constraints that we are currently under and that so far we have not been able to provide the necessary funding that this project needs to meet the necessary milestones over the next 12 months.

I am asking the commitment of the chairman that, as we work together during conference, we will do everything possible to significantly increase the funding for the Spallation Neutron Source.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD) for his response.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the request of the gentleman. I will certainly work in conference to adequately fund the Spallation Neutron Source and, of course, additional funds if that will help.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) a member of the

committee, as well as the subcommittee.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to engage the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD) in a short colloquy.

As the gentleman knows, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission now has before it certain legal issues relating to the off-site disposal of FUSRAP material.

My question to the chairman is, will the gentleman confirm that the Committee on Appropriations does not wish to influence the judgment of the Commission on those issues?

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWARDS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is correct. If any committee of Congress wishes to take action regarding the off-site disposal issue the Commission is now considering, it ought to be the relevant authorization committee of the House that does it.

I would have no objections to the authorizers of this body taking up such issues. But the Committee on Appropriations, appropriately, has chosen not to do so.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. Chairman, even more importantly, I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD) for a lifetime of service to his Nation. He served this country with great distinction in military uniform. And much like my mentor in politics, the late Olin E. "Tiger" Teague, who served this country in such a distinguished way for so many years, the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD) continued to serve his country after he took off the uniform and put on the civilian uniform of public servant.

As someone who worked with the chairman both when he was chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Construction of the Committee on Appropriations, now the Subcommittee on Energy and Water, I want to say it was an honor to work with him, to work under him, and to know him. He gives the name "public service" the very best of meaning because of his lifetime of service to our country. And there are military families living in better housing today, there are people in communities that are less prone to flood control today, there are millions of American citizens who, whether they know the name of the gentleman or not, are living a better life today and for many years to come for their families because of the service of the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD) to our country.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for those kind remarks, and I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG), a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding me

the time, and I rise in very, very strong support of this bill.

I wish good luck to the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD). He has done a great job here. We salute him.

If the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKEY) is still about, we salute him. And the staff has done a remarkable job, as well.

The fiscal year 2001 Energy and Water appropriations bill is a balanced piece of legislation balancing the Corps of Engineers, the Department of Energy, along with important portions of the Department of Interior and other agencies. This is a good and fiscally responsible bill, with the non-defense portion of it being some \$200 million below last area.

The Nation's energy policy is a prime focus of this bill. We have the opportunity here to improve what we can all agree is a lacking and flawed energy policy on the part of the Clinton-Gore administration.

The bill provides for a variety of important education funding for our universities, as well as research and development at our national labs which are related to the energy supply. This includes nuclear energy research under NERI, under NEPO, and under the NEER programs along with investment in the future energy source called fusion and the Advanced Scientific Computing Research initiative that will bridge the software gap, thereby substantially improving our scientific research capacity.

This bill also contains some fantastic work, I believe, on nuclear fuel supply, from the beginning of the fuel cycle involving mining, conversion and enrichment, to the end of the fuel cycle involving Yucca Mountain.

A new potential cancer cure is advanced in this bill.

One of the most successful on-time, on-budget programs at the Department of Energy is the fusion energy program. Fusion energy is treated fairly.

The cleanup, finally, of our World War II legacy, our nuclear waste sites, is another important priority in this bill. It contains some excellent work that will refocus the Department of Energy on its responsibilities with a new priority on accomplishments by 2010.

We have all the various interests of the American people at heart when we all have programs we hope will be strongly supported. If we have more money at some future time, I cannot say at that time or at this time that we will, but I am confident we will have an even better bill.

I urge support of this bill.

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

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN).

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Energy and Water Development appropriations bill. I thank the distinguished chairman for recognizing the need for two flood projects in my area, the Elmsford Saw Mill River area and the Ramapo River area, and for providing adequate funding for these projects. We thank the distinguished chairman for his good work.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4733, the Energy and Water Development Appropriations bill, 2001 and want to thank the distinguished Committee chairman, the gentleman from California, Mr. PACKARD for his diligent work on producing this important bill.

The Energy and Water Appropriations bill provides funding for the Army Corps of Engineers to provide necessary flood control protection against the devastating impact of flooding on lives and property.

My constituents in Elmsford and Suffern, New York have and continue to suffer from the flooding of the Saw Mill River, as evidenced in 1999, when Hurricane Floyd dropped over 11 inches of rain on my congressional district, creating a devastating impact on human life and property. Included in Floyd's destruction were constituents who were faced with flood waters from both the Saw Mill River and the Ramapo River in southwestern N.Y.—destroying homes, businesses and creating severe financial stress. After witnessing the destruction in my district first-hand, I contacted the U.S. Army Corps and Chairman PACKARD for assistance.

Accordingly, Chairman PACKARD has provided the Army Corps with adequate funding to begin the phases necessary to prevent such destruction in the future.

I look forward to continuing my work with Chairman PACKARD as the flood control work proceeds in both Elmsford and Suffern.

I thank Chairman PACKARD for his efforts and I urge my colleagues to support this important measure.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM), a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman very, very much. I rise today in support of this very excellent bill under tight budget constraints.

I would like to also extend my thanks to the chairman. This is my first term on this subcommittee, and he has done an outstanding job, being actually new to the subcommittee himself. But the learning curve that I have had on this committee has been quite steep; and, with his leadership, it has made it much easier.

And also, anyone who knows the chairman, much has been said about the golf, but he attacks his work the same way that he attacks the golf course and never stopping, and we have to be on our toes all the time. I just want to say how much I appreciate his friendship and really the honor of serving here with him.

This bill is something under the tight budget constraints, like I said before, with no new starts as far as projects. The chairman is very well aware, and I think the Congress is, that there are

scores of billions of dollars that are authorized in projects which are waiting to be started; and because of the tight constraints that we have, it was impossible to have any new starts.

I also want to emphasize how important this bill is for the upper Midwest, for the State of Iowa, as far as the Army Corps of Engineers, the projects that they have to deal with in my district as far as navigation on the rivers, and what an excellent job I think that they do and the constraints that we have.

If I have a disappointment in the bill, it is in the area of renewable energy and as far as biorenewable energy research that I think is so very, very important for the future.

Just in closing, again, I want to thank the chairman and extend my gratitude for the great job that he has done.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA) for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA).

Mr. FOSSELLA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlemen for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, let me add my words of praise to the gentleman from California (Chairman PACKARD) for his great service to this county. He is a great man and a friend. I am sure not only his constituents appreciate his service, but all his colleagues here and people of this great country.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the chairman for giving me the opportunity to discuss a dredging project that is vital to the Port of New York and New Jersey. As the gentleman knows, the Arthur Kill channel serves the Howland Hook Marine Terminal on Staten Island, one of the United States Army's strategic seaports of embarkation. The present 35-foot depth of the Arthur Kill serves as a considerable obstacle to large commercial and military vessels that may forestall any future growth or endanger the existence of these seaport facilities.

The Port of New York and New Jersey, the Eastern Seaboard's largest, is an economic engine for the region and the entire Nation. Locally, Port commerce serves as a consumer market of 18 million Americans and is estimated to provide 165,000 jobs and \$20 billion in economic activity.

As a result of its location, goods that enter the United States through the Port can reach the homes of 110 million Americans within 24 hours. The New York site of the Arthur Kill was for years an eyesore, however, vacant of any real activity.

Today, I am happy to note, that the New York-side is a vibrant and expanding area bursting at the seams with almost 1,000 good paying jobs and adding \$20 million to the existing tax base.

This new activity can all be predicated on the responsible measure to deepen the Arthur Kill channel, which will not only maintain the current business but will attract new businesses to the entire region, including New Jersey.

The modernization and dredging efforts of the Arthur Kill is one of the most important economic issues for the New York and New Jersey region, as well as the entire Eastern Seaboard.

In addition to the new jobs that will come with the adequate dredging, the completion of this project will help to ensure that the United States does not continue to lose more shipping business to Canadian shipping competitors in Halifax.

Last year, the two largest shippers on the New York City side nearly relocated their operations to Halifax and have indicated they will do so unless considerable harbor improvements are completed by the year 2009.

The chairman and the committee have done an excellent job in putting this bill together and crafting what I think is a fiscally responsible bill and has taken the key step in recognizing the importance of the Port of New York and New Jersey by providing funding to dredge the Kill Van Kull in Newark Bay. This is welcome news, Mr. Chairman, but it does not go far enough to ensure that the Port maintains its position to provide millions of consumers with low-cost goods in a timely fashion.

The Arthur Kill is a natural waterway and tributary to the Kill Van Kull. It is not only vital but common sense to begin construction to dredge the waterway since the Kill Van Kull is already being dredged today.

The Water Resources Development Act of 1999 authorized the deepening of the Arthur Kill channel from 35 to 41 feet. This is prudent. Construction to deepen the channel has been included in the President's fiscal year 2001 budget for \$5 million.

The Army Corps and the Port Authority, which is the local partner in this project, estimate that they will be ready to begin construction in November. We have been waiting for years for this opportunity, and I think it would be a big mistake not to take action now.

The chairman has been a terrific leader in all of this, and I would like to thank him for allowing me, again, this opportunity to discuss with him this important project vital to my district.

I respectfully request that the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD), the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) and other members of the Committee on Appropriations help to make this project a reality.

□ 1615

Before I hear from the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD), I respectfully yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, first let me join in the encomiums to the dis-

tinguished chairman of the subcommittee for his great work over the years and the decades, and we will miss him.

Let me say that it is true that part of the port of New York is now bustling again and part of it still needs major development. The channels we are talking about are in the district of the gentleman from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA), and I appreciate his leadership on this project.

I rise on this because I believe this project is vital not only to the district of the gentleman from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA) but to the entire port region of New York and New Jersey.

The Kill Van Kull is the boundary between Staten Island on the south and Bayonne on the north and leads from New York Harbor to New York Bay, and we are presently dredging that to achieve a depth of 45 feet, blasting through solid rock to get to 45 feet.

If achieved or when achieved, I should say, this will open up access to the ports of Newark and Elizabeth. The Arthur Kill is an extension of the Kill Van Kull where the shore of Staten Island turns a little south, and that has to be part of the same project. That will afford access to Howland Hook and Staten Island.

Without that part of it, the Kill Van Kull project helps New Jersey but does not help New York.

With that part, the Kill Van Kull project helps both States.

It was always anticipated and intended that the ports of New York and New Jersey would be for the benefit of both States, and the little added piece of the Arthur Kill is critical to enabling the New York as well as the New Jersey side of the port to be accessed by the existing Kill Van Kull project.

So this project has to be looked at as a unified whole, and the Arthur Kill as an extension of the existing Kill Van Kull project. When completed, the project together will afford the ability of bigger ships to get to New York, Elizabeth, and Howland Hook and will give us a leg up on retaining our port business in the United States as against the port of Halifax, Nova Scotia, which is not in the United States, obviously.

So I appreciate the cooperation of the gentleman in helping us to achieve this dual nature project.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOSSELLA. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA), and I would like to say that I can see how a reasonable person would conclude that the Arthur Kill is an extension of the Kill Van Kull. I understand how the completion in totality of this project will benefit both New York and New Jersey.

I thank the gentleman much for his efforts to ensure that this project moves expeditiously forward. I will do what I can in conference to find the funds to fund the project.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to thank Chairman PACKARD and the Ranking Member, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, and the Members of the Committee, for their support of Sacramento flood control projects included in the FY 2001 Energy and Water Appropriations bill. Flooding remains the single greatest threat to the public safety of the Sacramento community, posing a constant risk to the lives of my constituents and to the regional economy. Thanks to your efforts and the efforts of this Committee, Sacramento can continue to work toward improved flood protection.

With a mere 85-year level of protection, Sacramento remains the metropolitan area in this nation most at risk to flooding. More than 400,000 people and \$37 billion in property reside within the Sacramento flood plain, posing catastrophic consequences in the event of a flood. While Congress will continue to consider the best long-term solution to this threat, funding in this bill will provide much needed improvements to the existing flood control facilities throughout the region.

Specifically, this legislation will allow for the continuation of levee improvements and bank stabilization projects along the lower American and Sacramento Rivers, increasing levee reliability and stemming bank erosion. Additionally, I greatly appreciate the Committee's willingness to provide funding for projects—including the Strong Ranch and Chicken Ranch Sloughs, and Magpie Creek—aimed at preventing flooding from a series of smaller rivers and streams that present substantial threats separate from those posed by the major rivers in the region. Importantly, the Committee's willingness to include funding for the American River Comprehensive Plan will allow for ongoing Corps of Engineers general investigation work on all area flood control needs, including a permanent long-term solution.

As this legislation moves to a House and Senate conference committee, I also would like to ask conferees to support two "new start" projects of critical importance to the long-term safety of the Sacramento region that were included in the 1999 Water Resources Development Act. The first would make modifications to the outlet works on Folsom Dam, improving its flood control efficiency. The second would begin construction on the South Sacramento Streams, which will provide a 500-year level of protection for a portion of south Sacramento that has long been vulnerable to rising flood waters.

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Chairman, I have concerns about the impact of language in the House Energy and Water bill that requires competition for aspects of the Department of Energy's (DOE) nonproliferation programs. DOE serves a unique role in our nation's nonproliferation efforts, and these efforts could be threatened by micro-management that forces a piecemeal approach to nonproliferation. The DOE laboratories fulfill an essential role in developing and integrating advanced scientific techniques and equipment into large-scale prototype systems which are critically necessary for our nonproliferation efforts. Unlike the National Science Foundation (NSF) and the Department of Defense (DOD), the DOE selects lead laboratories to serve as overall coordinators to facilitate these large-scale development projects. The laboratories rely on universities and industry to provide their unique expertise to make these efforts suc-

cessful. Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL) out-sources approximately 20 percent of the funds it receives to universities and industry as appropriate with the sensitive nature of these projects. Many aspects of these projects are very sensitive and/or classified. Success requires a knowledge and focus on customer requirements, which may also be classified. They require a multi-disciplinary approach to accomplish deliverables to the intelligence and defense communities. DOE needs to maintain its flexibility in using universities and laboratories to meet its critical needs in this arena. This work is far too important to experiment with. Furthermore, we need to expeditiously pursue all possible advances to protect this nation against weapons of mass destruction. We need to empower the new National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) Administrator, General John Gordon, and give him the necessary flexibility and the resources to strengthen our atomic energy defense and nonproliferation activities. We must give General Gordon the freedom to make the decisions he needs to make.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my strong concerns about a provision inserted in House Report 106-693, the report to accompany H.R. 4733, the Fiscal Year Energy and Water Development Appropriations bill. This provision, which relates to the Army Corps of Engineers' hopper dredge fleet, was not in the report considered by the House Appropriations Committee and was inserted at the last minute without any public debate.

Although I plan to vote in favor of H.R. 4733, I am concerned about the Committee's statement of support for placing the hopper dredge *McFarland* in ready reserve, which was included in House Report 106-693. Placing the *McFarland* in ready reserve would be bad public policy and likely mean higher costs to taxpayers.

The Committee justifies its support for placing the *McFarland* in ready reserve on a report recently issued by the Corps touting the success of placing another hopper dredge, the *Wheeler*, home-ported in Louisiana, in ready reserve in 1996. However, I am dubious about the validity of this report. An earlier draft of the report, prepared at the working level in the New Orleans District, directly contradicts the final report, revised at Corps headquarters, by recommending that the *Wheeler* be put back in active status and that no other hopper dredge be placed in ready reserve.

The draft *Wheeler* report, authored by the New Orleans District office of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers states, "Based on the findings of this report, there is no other logical recommendation, except for the Secretary [of the Army] to report to Congress that the Dredge *Wheeler* is needed to be returned to active status and that no other Federal hopper dredges should be placed in ready reserve at this time." This is a compelling statement.

The earlier, more substantive draft, found that keeping the *Wheeler* in ready reserve resulted in insufficient response times to meet port dredging needs and higher costs to taxpayers because of a lack of capacity and competitive bids. The final draft makes no mention of any of these problems and makes conclusions and assertions without supplying any supporting data or analysis.

The final Corps report is seriously undermined by the substantive conclusions of the draft report. This raises serious questions that

need to be fully investigated. The House Committee report should not rely on this final report as a basis for making further changes to the hopper dredge fleet.

To remain competitive in world markets, to meet domestic transportation needs, and to serve the fishing industry, Northwest ports and their customers rely on hopper dredges for low-cost and timely completion of dredging projects. Without the *McFarland* to do needed work on the East Coast, the Northwest dredges might be obligated to meet needs outside the region.

Timely availability of dredges to perform both planned and emergency dredging work remains a concern in the Pacific Northwest. Sufficient capacity must be available to conduct the necessary annual dredging at numerous ports during the short dredging season. In addition, emergency dredging is often needed to restore the federal navigation channel to allow commerce to pass. Shoaling can occur rapidly with potentially dangerous impact on export shipping and the sport and commercial fishing fleet. Shippers and ports cannot afford to wait several weeks or even months for dredging while private contractors are engaged and move their dredges to the site of the work, often from long distances. Trade commitments and vessel safety are at risk. At this time, it does not appear that the private dredge industry has sufficient capacity to conduct all the needed dredging work in the Pacific Northwest.

Even with expanded capacity, I am also concerned that the low number of private industry bids for work in the Northwest could force dredging costs higher without the availability of the federal dredges. In 1996, an Army's Audit Agency report raised serious questions about private dredge company bidding practices.

In 1997, the Corps itself released a study outlining eight options for the future of its hopper dredge fleet. Of these options, the one that showed the lowest cost to the U.S. taxpayers required full active status of the Corps hopper dredge fleet. All the other options, while providing more work for the private industry, meant higher costs to the taxpayer.

The federal dredges designed specifically for Corps navigation projects, are uniquely capable of performing the required maintenance dredging work at Northwest coastal ports. The experience of these ports is that when the private dredges have been contracted by the Corps, they have often not performed the work in a manner consistent with the navigation and operational needs of the local port authorities and port users. From reports that reach me from the field, the quality of the dredging work performed by the private dredges is not equal to the level of the federal dredges, resulting in disruption to navigation and port operations. In short, the private dredges have not shown that they can perform the work presently being performed by the federal dredges in the Northwest.

For these reasons, it would be imprudent to make changes in the operation of the Corps minimum dredge fleet at this time. I hope that the provisions in the House Report will not be endorsed in the final product of this Congress.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to thank the committee for providing \$5 million for the Brevard County Beach Renourishment Project. This \$5 million, when combined with the \$5 million we approved last

year and the 37 percent local match will provide a total of \$14 million in renourishment funding this year. Beginning in October, just a few short months from now, the contractor will move into place and begin placing sand on these beaches. This is a great accomplishment and everyone who has worked on this effort should be commended.

This \$5 million appropriation matches last year's earmark of \$5 million and moves the project forward. Last year's Water Resources and Development Act (WRDA) authorized more than 150 new projects; however, the bill before us does not provide funding for any of those new starts. This clearly demonstrates the difficulty in securing an appropriation for a new Corps project. We were successful in securing funding in the fiscal year 2000 budget and this additional funding builds on that success.

This will help us make significant progress on the north reach of the renourishment project. This 9.4 mile stretch reaches from Patrick Air Force Base north to Canaveral Inlet.

Clearly, a considerable amount of the erosion along Brevard's beaches south of Canaveral Inlet is due to the federal navigation inlet which has disrupted the natural southward flow of the sand. Corps studies as far back as the early 1960s have documented the severe loss of sand along Brevard's beaches. More recently, and with more years of measured losses available, the Jacksonville District Corps of Engineers concluded, in June 1989, that "the net loss of littoral material from the shore line to the south of the harbor is estimated to be between 335,000 and 410,000 cubic yards a year."

Consistent with Section 227(A)(2) of WRDA '96, this Project should receive preference based on the mitigation of damages attributable to the Federal Navigation Project. The bill before us recognizes this preference. Over the 40 year history of the inlet, we have lost approximately 18 million cubic yards of sand along Brevard's beaches, primarily as a result of the federal navigation channel. Houses that once stood great distances from the shore now literally have waves at their doorstep. This funding will help us take some significant steps toward addressing this concern and will add another 75 to 100 feet of beach along Brevard's coast.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, this Member would like to commend the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD), the chairman of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Subcommittee, and the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), the ranking member of the subcommittee for their exceptional work in bringing this bill to the Floor.

This Member recognizes that extremely tight budgetary constraints made the job of the subcommittee much more difficult this year. Therefore, the subcommittee is to be commended for its diligence in creating such a fiscally responsible bill. In light of these budgetary pressures, this Member would like to express his appreciation to the subcommittee and formally recognize that the Energy and Water Development appropriations bill for fiscal year 2001 includes funding for several water projects that are of great importance to Nebraska.

This Member greatly appreciates the \$12 million funding level provided for the four-state

Missouri River Mitigation Project. The funding is needed to restore fish and wildlife habitat lost due to the federally sponsored channelization and stabilization projects of the Pick-Sloan era. The islands, wetlands, and flat floodplains needed to support the wildlife and waterfowl that once lived along the river are gone. An estimated 475,000 acres of habitat in Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, and Kansas have been lost. Today's fishery resources are estimated to be only one-fifth of those which existed in predevelopment days.

In 1986, the Congress authorized over \$50 million to fund the Missouri River Mitigation Project to restore fish and wildlife habitat lost due to the construction of structures to implement the Pick-Sloan plan.

In addition, this bill provides additional funding for flood-related projects of tremendous importance to residents of Nebraska's 1st Congressional District. Mr. Chairman, flooding in 1993 temporarily closed Interstate 80 and seriously threatened the Lincoln municipal water system which is located along the Platte River near Ashland, NE. Therefore, this Member is extremely pleased the committee agreed to continue funding for the Lower Platte River and Tributaries Flood Control Study. This study should help formulate and develop feasible solutions which will alleviate future flood problems along the Lower Platte River and tributaries.

This Member is also particularly pleased that this bill includes \$220,000 for the planning, engineering and design phase of the Sand Creek Watershed project in Saunders County, NE.

Mr. Chairman, additionally, the bill provides \$275,000 for the ongoing flood control project for Antelope Creek which runs through the heart of Nebraska's capital city, Lincoln. The funding is to be used for preconstruction engineering and design work. The purpose of the project is to implement solutions to multi-faceted problems involving the flood control and drainage problems in Antelope Creek as well as existing transportation and safety problems all within the context of broad land use issues. This Member continues to have a strong interest in the project since he was responsible for stimulating the city of Lincoln, the Lower Platte South Natural Resources District, and the University of Nebraska-Lincoln to work jointly and cooperatively with the Army Corps of Engineers to identify an effective flood control system for downtown Lincoln.

Antelope Creek, which was originally a small meandering stream, became a straightened urban drainage channel as the city of Lincoln grew and urbanized. Resulting erosion has deepened and widened the channel and created an unstable situation. A ten-foot by twenty-foot (height and width) closed underground conduit that was constructed between 1911 and 1916 now requires significant maintenance and major rehabilitation. The current situation represents a dangerous flood threat to adjacent public and private facilities.

The goals of the project are to construct a flood overflow conveyance channel which would narrow the flood plain from up to seven blocks wide to the 150-foot wide channel. The project will include trails and bridges and improve bikeway and pedestrian systems.

Finally, this Member is also pleased that the bill provides funding for the Missouri National Recreational River Project. This project addresses a serious problem by protecting the

river banks from the extraordinary and excessive erosion rates caused by the sporadic and varying releases from the Gavins Point Dam. These erosion rates are a result of previous work on the river by the Federal Government.

Again Mr. Chairman, this Member commends the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD), the chairman of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Subcommittee, and the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), the ranking member of the subcommittee for their support of projects which are important to Nebraska and the 1st Congressional District, as well as to the people living in the Missouri River Basin.

To Chairman PACKARD, who is retiring from Congress at the end of this term, this Member wants you to know what your courteous and conscientious contact with this Member and all of our colleagues is very widely recognized. You and your contributions to the public interest through your service in the House will be greatly missed.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the FY 2001 Energy and Water Development Appropriations bill.

Once again, under the leadership of the chairman and the ranking member, we have before us a relatively well-balanced and bipartisan bill despite the restrictive allocations. I want to thank both of them for all of their hard work and time they have invested in this bill. I understand that they have not had an easy job, but they were able to do very well with what little they had. I also want to congratulate Chairman PACKARD for his years of public service and his leadership at the helm of the subcommittee during this Congress.

These budgetary constraints, as my colleague from Indiana has pointed out before, does not keep pace with the growing water infrastructure needs of this nation. The Army Corps of Engineers has tremendous responsibilities across this nation, and this funding bill shortchanges a number of Corps water projects when money is needed the most.

In my district, the Corps has a number of ongoing flood control projects. Unfortunately, this bill does not fully fund these important priorities. Ongoing flood control projects at Stoney Creek and Natalie Creek could provide meaningful and substantive protection from flooding to thousands of my constituents and save the communities from millions of dollars of potential damages. I believe that it is critical to ensure that these flood control projects proceed without unnecessary delays, and I will continue to work with the Corps of Engineers to make sure this happens.

I hope that as this bill goes to conference, we can all work toward a final bill that will more accurately reflect the funding needs for our nation's water infrastructure and fully fund the important Corps water projects in my district.

Again, I want to salute the chairman and ranking member for their dedication and hard work in bringing this bill to the floor. I look forward to working with them when this bill goes to conference.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 4733, the FY 2001 Energy and Water Appropriations bill. I would first like to thank Chairman PACKARD and Ranking Member VISCLOSKY for their hard work on this important legislation. I would also like to thank my good friend from Texas, Mr. EDWARDS, for

all the help he and his office have provided me.

I strongly support the decision of the Subcommittee on Energy & Water to ensure the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers receives adequate funding to continue their vital work in the areas of flood control and navigational improvement. I would also like to compliment the administration for their decision to fully fund the Corps' budget. This funding level recognizes the critical economic and public safety initiatives contained within the legislation. Because many flood and navigation projects located in my district are on accelerated construction schedules, full funding by the administration and the subcommittee will ensure the expedited completion at great savings to the taxpayers.

I am very pleased by the support this legislation provides for addressing the chronic flooding problems of Harris County, TX. H.R. 4733, includes vital funding for several flood control projects in the Houston area. These projects include Brays, Sims, Buffalo, Hunting, and White Oaks bayous.

I am most gratified that the subcommittee, for the second consecutive year, decided to fully fund the Brays Bayou project at \$6 million for FY 2001. This project is necessary to improve flooding protection for an extensively developed residential area along Brays Bayou in southwest Harris County. The project consists of 3 miles of channel improvements, three flood detention basins, and 7 miles of stream diversion and will provide a 25-year level of flood protection. The project was originally authorized in the Water Resources Development Act of 1990, as part of a \$400 million federal/local flood control project.

Subsequently, the Brays project as reauthorized was one of the original sites for a demonstration project for a new federal reimbursement program, as part of the Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) of 1996 based upon legislation drafted by Mr. DELAY and myself. This unique program has strengthened and enhanced the Corps/Local Sponsor role by giving the local sponsor a lead role and providing for reimbursement by the Federal Government to the local sponsor for the traditional Federal portion of work accomplished. Recently, the local sponsor, the Harris County Commissioners Court approved of the Brays redesign per WRDA '96 and now this project was moved forward with strong public support.

I am also gratified that the subcommittee decided to fund the Sims Bayou project at \$11.8 million, the level requested by the administration. This project is necessary to improve flood protection for an extensively developed urban area along Sims Bayou in southern Harris County. This project, authorized as part of the 1988 WRDA bill, consists of 19.3 miles of channel enlargement, rectification, and erosion control beginning at the mouth of the bayou at the Houston Ship Channel and will provide a 25-year level of flood protection. This ongoing project is scheduled to be completed 2 years ahead of schedule in 2004.

Mr. Chairman, I am also pleased that this legislation provides \$53.5 million to fully fund continuing construction on the Houston Ship Channel expansion project. Upon completion, this project will likely generate tremendous economic and environmental benefits to the Nation and will enhance one of our region's most important trade and economic centers.

The Houston Ship Channel, one of the world's most heavily trafficked ports, desperately needs expansion to meet the challenges of expanding global trade and to maintain its competitive edge as a major international port. Currently, the Port of Houston is the second largest port in the United States in total tonnage, and is a catalyst for the southeast Texas economy, contributing more than \$5 billion annually and providing 200,000 jobs.

The Houston Ship Channel expansion project calls for deepening the channel from 40 to 45 feet and widening it from 400 to 530 feet. The ship channel modernization, considered the largest dredging project since the construction of the Panama Canal, will preserve the Port of Houston's status as one of the premier deep-channel gulf ports and one of the top transit points for cargo in the world.

Mr. Chairman, I am also pleased that H.R. 4733 also reauthorizes the operation and utilization of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve through the end of FY 2001 and restores the President's authority to release oil from the reserve. In light of today's rising oil prices, it is imperative that the President has the power to access oil reserves paid for with taxpayer dollars.

Again, I thank the chairman and ranking member for their support and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, I have no other requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time under general debate, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The amendment printed in House Report 106-701 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 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, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chair may accord priority in recognition to a Member offering an amendment that he has printed in the designated place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Those amendments will be considered read.

The chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone a request for a recorded vote on any amendment and may reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the time for voting on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote, provided that the time for voting on the first question shall be a minimum of 15 minutes.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4733

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the

fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, for energy and water development, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

The following appropriations shall be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers for authorized civil functions of the Department of the Army pertaining to rivers and harbors, flood control, beach erosion, and related purposes.

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

For expenses necessary for the collection and study of basic information pertaining to river and harbor, flood control, shore protection, and related projects, restudy of authorized projects, miscellaneous investigations, and, when authorized by laws, surveys and detailed studies and plans and specifications of projects prior to construction, \$153,327,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That in conducting the Southwest Valley Flood Damage Reduction, Albuquerque, New Mexico, study, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, shall include an evaluation of flood damage reduction measures that would otherwise be excluded from feasibility analysis based on restrictive policies regarding the frequency of flooding, the drainage area, and the amount of runoff.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. HULSHOF

Mr. HULSHOF. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 5 offered by Mr. HULSHOF: In title I of the bill, under the heading "DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS" insert after the first dollar amount "(increased by \$2,000,000)".

In title I of the bill, under the heading "DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY, GENERAL EXPENSES" insert after the first dollar amount "(decreased by \$2,000,000)".

Mr. HULSHOF. Mr. Chairman, let me commence by also commending the chairman of the appropriations subcommittee and add my kudos to those that have been mentioned previously and wish him well as he begins his next chapter.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment to increase the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' general investigations account by \$2 million. Funding for this amendment would be offset by a \$2 million decrease in the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' general expense account.

The intent of this amendment is to provide the Corps with adequate funding to begin its initial study of the Upper Mississippi River Comprehensive Plan.

Now, Mr. Chairman, many Members who served this body back in 1993 and through 1995 remember the great flood, as we called it in the Midwest. The great flood of 1993 took 47 lives, left roughly 74,000 individuals homeless, and caused between \$15 billion and \$20 billion in damages. While existing flood control measures at the time did prevent nearly \$19 billion in potential

damages along the Upper Mississippi River Basin, an integrated flood control policy could have prevented further loss of life and property.

The Upper Mississippi and Illinois River Valleys currently lack a coordinated approach to address navigation, flood control and environmental restoration. I would announce to the Chair that the comprehensive plan was authorized by section 459 of the Water Resources Development Act, otherwise known as WRDA 1999, and it would be the first to focus on developing and implementing a system for integrated river management.

Specifically, the comprehensive plan will call for systemic flood control and flood damage reduction; continued maintenance and improvement of navigation; improved management of nutrients and sediment, including bank erosion; environmental stewardship and increased recreation opportunities in the Upper Mississippi and Illinois River Basins.

The plan will be a collaborative effort among three core districts, specifically the St. Paul, Rock Island and Saint Louis Army Corps district offices; other Federal agencies, including the States of Minnesota, Wisconsin, Iowa, Illinois, and of course my home State of Missouri, and a host of other non-Federal organizations. A task force will be created to guide and coordinate development of the plan. The plan will identify future management actions and make recommendations for systemic improvement of the river basin again to provide multiple benefits.

Mr. Chairman, to comply with House rules, I again want to reiterate that the \$2 million increase in the Corps' general investigations account should be used to fund this comprehensive plan. Recognizing that we were not trying to legislate on an appropriations bill, we crafted it such. It is my understanding that within the general investigations account that \$2 million for the comprehensive plan should be designated under the Illinois subheading on page 13 of the committee report.

One other point I would like for this body to consider is that WRDA 1999 gave the Army Corps of Engineers 3 years from its enactment to submit a project study on the comprehensive plan, and to the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. Chairman, WRDA 1999 was signed into law last August without adopting this amendment, this bipartisan amendment, I might add, cosponsored by my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BOSWELL), and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS), with support from the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND). Without adopting this amendment, the Corps will not have the financial resources to do as required by law.

To conclude, I do want to remind my colleagues that the comprehensive plan

enjoys bipartisan support. This is not the locks and dams study, as some have asked. This is completely offset. I, along with the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BOSWELL), the co-chair of the Mississippi River Caucus, proposed this amendment along with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS).

The Mississippi River Caucus was formed back in 1997 with the expectation that those Members whose districts include and depend on the Mississippi River could work together in a bipartisan manner to help the Corps and those river stakeholders improve the Mississippi River system as a whole. This is exactly what the comprehensive plan would do, and I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Hulshof amendment to the energy and water appropriations bill. The amendment provides \$2 million to the Corps of Engineers so they can begin implementation of The Comprehensive Plan for the Upper Mississippi River Basin. This is something that was already authorized in WRDA 1999; but it has received no funding, so the implementation has yet to take place.

The plan calls for the Corps to develop a coordinated basin-wide approach to flood control and flood damage reduction, and as a co-chair of the Upper Mississippi River Task Force, I have consistently worked to develop bipartisan support for Corps plans and projects that take a comprehensive and basin-wide approach and that support the vision of the Mississippi River as a complex, multiple-use resource. The Comprehensive Plan calls for the Corps to investigate the fullest range of flood control and damage reduction measures, including nonstructural approaches to flood control, management plans to reduce runoff from farm fields and city streets, and habitat restoration programs.

These nontraditional approaches to flood control are particularly beneficial and cost effective. They protect farmers and city dwellers from floods at the same time that they improve water quality and restore the aquatic wetland and floodplain habitats that are so highly valued by fisherman, hunters, and recreationalists. The comprehensive plan embodies an approach to planning that I think should become the norm for the Corps of Engineers in future years.

I would also like to take this opportunity to express my appreciation to the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD) and to the ranking member, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VIS-CLOSKY), for the work in increasing the funding levels for the Upper Mississippi River Environmental Management Program. The EMP is a cooperative effort among the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the U.S. Geological Service and five Upper Mississippi River Basin

States to ensure the coordinated development and enhancement of the Upper Mississippi River system.

The program widely cited as a model for inner-agency and interstate cooperation is designed to evaluate, restore and enhance riverine and wetland habitat along a 1,200 mile stretch of the Upper Mississippi and Illinois Rivers.

In WRDA 1999, the EMP received permanent reauthorization at an increased funding level of \$33.2 million, and while the Upper Mississippi River Task Force had requested \$25 million for the EMP for this fiscal year, I recognize that the House's inadequate 302(b) allocations impose considerable restraints on the subcommittee and that the \$3 million increase over the administration's request represents a significant, if still insufficient, increase in funding.

Maintaining a proper balance between the economic growth and the environmental protection is essential to maintain the health of the Mississippi and Illinois Rivers and the communities within its watershed.

Achieving this balance requires the innovative and cooperative efforts of the Federal, State, local interests. The comprehensive plan and the EMP program are core programs that embody this spirit. It is important for this Congress to show our support for programs that will work proactively and cooperatively to reduce flood damage, maintain an appropriate navigation infrastructure, and enhance the environmental qualities of the Mississippi River system for generations to come.

Mr. Chairman, I for too long now have felt that the Mississippi River, America's river, has been the great natural resource cutting right through the heart of our country that has gone neglected as a national priority in this Congress. And working within the task force in a bipartisan fashion, we have been trying to coordinate our efforts between the north and south ends of the river to develop programs and to offer the support and resources we need to protect this very important natural resource.

Why is this important? It is important because it is North America's largest migratory route. It is also the primary drinking source for 22 million Americans, and for the Upper Mississippi region alone it has a \$1.6 billion recreation impact as well as a \$6.6 billion tourism impact for local communities. In fact, we have more visitors that come every year to visit the Upper Mississippi Wildlife Refuge than who visit the entire Yellowstone National Park system. So this is a very valuable resource that we need to do, as a body, a better job of providing resources.

The comprehensive plan that my friend, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HULSHOF), is trying to fund with this amendment is a step in the right direction, along with other efforts that we have taken on the task force to draw more attention to programs that affect the Mississippi River Basin.

So I would call upon my colleagues to look at this amendment and support it. I think the offset is something that is reasonable in working with the Corps of Engineers coming out of administrative expenses, and this is a step, a very important step, to developing the comprehensive plan on a basin-wide approach which is long overdue for the Mississippi River.

I thank the gentleman again for offering the amendment.

□ 1630

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, it is with great reluctance that I rise to oppose the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HULSHOF). I have no problem with the project. In fact, if we would have had the funds, we would have liked to have funded the request of the gentleman, but because of a lack of funds, we treated every person's project equally in the bill.

There were literally hundreds of projects that were authorized in WRDA 1999; and if we open up one project to funding, then we have to give equal treatment to all applicants for funding as a result of WRDA 1999 authorizations, and it is for that reason, and that reason only, that I oppose the amendment.

In fact, if the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HULSHOF) would withdraw his amendment, I will commit to do all I can to help find the funds as we go to conference. There is a hope that we might get additional funds before we go to conference, and if we do, we are hoping that we can fund some of the new starts.

We have not even funded all of the ongoing projects in the bill this year, those that are already under construction and to fund a new project and not have the funds to complete existing projects, I think would be irresponsible.

With that in mind, I would sincerely ask the gentleman to withdraw the amendment, with the assurance that I will do all I can to find the funds for him as we go to conference, otherwise I would have to oppose the amendment.

Mr. HULSHOF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACKARD. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HULSHOF. Again, with all the great respect for the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD), I consider him just that, a gentleman, in this body, were it not for the time limit on the authorization, and that is the clock is running on this authorized project and the fact that the Corps of Engineers is expected to report back in about a year and a half, I would accept the invitation of the gentleman, otherwise, I am afraid I am going to have to insist on my amendment.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, if I can reclaim my time, I would simply like to ask Members then under the circumstances to vote against the amendment. Certainly it is at the expense of all other WRDA 1999 author-

ized projects, if we fund one. It would not be fair to the rest of the Members of Congress that have asked for funding for authorized projects in WRDA 1999. I think it is imperative that we are fair to all Members.

Mr. BOSWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the Hulshof amendment. In fact, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) and I have worked very closely with him on a number of things, and my good friend from Missouri, my neighbor, my good friend from Illinois, just across the river, "kattywompus" as we say down our way, has a lot of concerns.

I would say to the gentleman from California (Chairman PACKARD), we respect the gentleman's work on this very, very much, but this is not really a project in the sense that we think of projects. This involves the Mississippi. This involves the Illinois. This involves a great expanse, involving much more than any of us would have in an individual project, and our joint interest in this is for a number of reasons.

We have worked very hard to get folks along the river to realize what a great resource it is in many, many ways. I think that the gentleman from California (Chairman PACKARD) recognizes and appreciates that. I have no doubt about that, but there is a lot of interest groups out there that have different opinions.

Part of our process with our Mississippi River Caucus that the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HULSHOF) and I have cosponsored is to bring those folks together to see if we cannot work out how to take care of the navigation needs, the commerce needs, the things to do with recreation, the environment and so on, and we feel like we are making some progress.

We feel good about it. Now, this plan is needed so we can proceed, so we can go forth. It has been authorized by WRDA, and we would like now to put the resource with it to make this happen. In fact, I say to the gentleman from California (Chairman PACKARD) this very respectfully, we had hoped that if this would pass today that the gentleman would carry forth with the enthusiasm to conference to maybe restore that offset to keep things going.

We would not want to put an idea in the gentleman's mind, but I will take that opportunity. So thanks so much for listening, but different things have been said about how people depend on that river for commerce. They depend on the river for recreation. They are concerned about preserving the environment and all these things, and we are, too.

We are going forward with the premise with this study and what would bring to bear that we can put those kinds of folks together in the same room, so to speak, and we can work these things out. That is really what we are trying to do. It is not a project for me. It is not a project for the gentleman from Missouri (Con-

gressman HULSHOF) or the gentleman from Illinois (Congressman SHIMKUS) or anybody else, it is for the entire resource of the Mississippi and the Illinois. I think actually it will go on to be even beyond that.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, did the rule provide for a rolling of the votes to a later date if a vote is called for on any amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has the authority to postpone requests for recorded votes.

Mr. PACKARD. I thank the Chair.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, with reluctance I come to the floor also making an appeal to the gentleman from California (Chairman PACKARD) to be supportive of this amendment, I do that with great respect to my friend, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BOSWELL), the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HULSHOF), myself, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND) who just spoke earlier.

In our short 4 years of being Members of Congress, we have tried to marry the interests of a great diverse group of people who want to preserve this great national asset that we have, which is the Mississippi River, and preserve it for a lot of activities, a lot of things, from the transportation needs of our agricultural sector to get our goods south to take advantage of the world markets, to environmental stewardship of some of the greatest hunting and fishing locations in the country.

In fact, in my district, Pike County, Illinois has the largest white tail deer population; and hunters come from all over which helps the farmers meet their ends in low commodity prices. We know of the problem in the Gulf of Mexico, and having a good plan to address the runoff issues is a good way to be environment stewards, increased recreational activities on the Mississippi.

A lot of these groups that we have been dealing with for 4 years would not like to see any other group exist, but if we work with a plan, if we go in a manner to bring people at the table and work on a plan for the stewardship of this great national resource, then we have something that we cannot only benefit from, but that we can pass down to our families and our grandchildren.

The Mississippi River Caucus' members stretch from Minnesota all the way down to Louisiana. We are concerned about the river. I think that the Hulshof amendment, which takes funds from just the core staffing to focus on the time-sensitive issue of getting this plan developed, is to be commended.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all of my colleagues who are concerned about our ability to compete in the world market, the agricultural sector of the world, environmental stewardship and creating recreational opportunities up and down the Mississippi to be in support of this amendment.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate what the gentleman is attempting to do with his amendment. I appreciate the need, and I also appreciate the comments of the Members who spoke before me. I would associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD) and rise in opposition to the Hulshof amendment for three key reasons.

One is we have worked very hard to wisely spend every penny of water money available in as fair a fashion as possible, and in making that money go as far as possible, we did not, in this bill, fund any new starts, any new reimbursements, any new studies. That is an arbitrary decision, but it is one that both sides have stuck to with a great deal of scrupulous care. I think at this late moment, understanding the need, coming from a Great Lakes State myself and the intercontinental United States, I would oppose, first of all, for that reason.

Secondly, I am concerned that because we are taking money from one Army Corps account and moving it to another, we are simply obligating the Corps with an additional responsibility that we are not paying for with new money. The fact is, the account that the gentleman is taking the money from is at current level, there is no increase. It is \$2½ million below the administration's request, and we would cut it by an additional \$2 million.

Finally, the obvious point, and that is that this would also then require a reduction in force at the very time when we are asking the Corps to assume greater responsibilities than ever before across the Nation.

Again, it is out of no disrespect for the Member or the need of the constituents he represents or the other speakers, but I am adamantly opposed to his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there further discussion on the amendment?

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HULSHOF).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 532, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HULSHOF) will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GILCHREST

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GILCHREST:  
Page 2, line 18, after the dollar amount insert "(decreased by \$100,000)".

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would reduce the Corps of Engineer's General Investigation Account by \$100,000, the amount provided to continue the study to deepen the C&D Canal in my district.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to inform the Members that this is a project that has been ongoing for most of the 1990s. And in 1996, in a meeting I had at the Corps of Engineers headquarters in Washington, with the Philadelphia Corps in my district in Chestertown, Maryland, we went over all of the numbers, the math and came to a very, very clear determination that the benefit-to-cost ration on this particular project in Maryland did not meet the threshold in order to be funded by the Federal Government because there was no benefit to the taxpayers.

It is 4 years later. Every year since 1996, the Philadelphia district has come up with a benefit-to-cost ratio. Under scrutiny from the headquarters in Washington, it has always failed muster. We are not going to close the C&D Canal, there will be no decrease in commerce, but there is two things that we have seen very clearly, that to continue studying this issue that the Corps of Engineers has not been able to justify for most of the 1990s is a waste of the taxpayers dollars, so therefore we would like to cut \$100,000 from any more study in this particular area.

It does not reduce commerce in the C&D Canal. I want to make that very clear, that is in the Corps' own document. The Corps says if we deepen it, there will be no increase in commerce to the Port of Baltimore. The Port of Baltimore has a 50-foot deep channel right now to the Port down the Bay out into the ocean. It is not a matter of not being able to accommodate the number of ships that are necessary.

In these studies, if we looked at it from an environmental perspective, deepening the canal will bring in more salty, polluted water from the Delaware River, into the sensitive spawning areas in the upper Chesapeake Bay.

□ 1645

But even more interesting than that, the environmental study has not been concluded. Even though the Washington Corps asked it to go along with the feasibility study, the Philadelphia district did not do that. But there is something that we found out just a few months ago, which was rather astounding, in the study to determine whether there was going to be a change of water flow from the Delaware River or from the Chesapeake Bay.

There is an organization in the Corps in Mississippi called the Water Environmental Studies, or WES. WES gave to the State of Delaware an environ-

mental water flow study that showed the water flowing from Delaware to Maryland, and then WES gave a study to Maryland showing that the water, as a result of the deepening, would go from the Chesapeake Bay to the Delaware River. When we confronted them with this rather minor conflict, they said, well, we have to redo the study.

Mr. Chairman, one other comment about the environmental aspect of this. The northern route, which is not necessary to increase commerce by deepening it, if it is deepened, will result in 18 million cubic yards of dredge material being dumped overboard into the Chesapeake Bay. Now, to use the Corps' own words, what does that mean as far as nutrients are concerned, and nutrients is really another word for pollution. By dumping 18 million cubic yards of dredge material directly into the Chesapeake Bay, a stone's throw north of the Chesapeake Bay Bridge, it means the equivalent of adding a sewage treatment plant the size of the City of Annapolis, dumping in an uncontrolled amount of 2 million pounds of ammonia, some people call that nitrogen, they are the same thing, and 700,000 pounds of phosphorous.

Now, the average farmer in my congressional district is taking great pains to reduce the amount of silt or nutrients that they let into the Chesapeake Bay or its tributaries. A homeowner, if he wants to build a driveway has to put up a silt fence. The whole State of Maryland is going to great lengths to try to figure out how they can reduce the number of nutrients going into the Chesapeake Bay. All we want to do with this amendment, Mr. Chairman, is because the Corps has not been able to, in the decade of the 1990s, financially justify to the taxpayers of the United States this project and time and time again, every time it came up for scrutiny, the project was not justified, we want to save the taxpayers' dollars and cut \$100,000 from this study.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I first heard about this amendment about 4 hours ago.

Let me first put this in context for the Members. I believe that five Members of the Maryland delegation will rise in strong opposition to this amendment. Furthermore, while I have great respect for my colleague, we all adjoint the Chesapeake Bay, as a number of other districts adjoint parts of other waterways. We are talking about the waterways of Maryland. No particular one of us owns the waterways; they are common to all of us.

The gentleman says this has been a controversy in the 1990s and that throughout the decade of the 1990s, the Corps has been unable to justify the costs of this project. Now, the gentleman has another amendment and we will be talking about it as well; but I want to call to the attention of the House of Representatives, my colleagues, a letter dated April 30, 1996. That letter was sent to the gentleman

from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. In it, the Maryland delegation, all eight Members, all 4 Republicans and all 4 Democrats, wrote to the committee stating: "We write to ask your committee's favorable consideration of 3 important channel dredging projects affecting the welfare of the Port of Baltimore and the State of Maryland."

We went on to say in the next paragraph, "We cannot stress enough the importance of these projects in maintaining the vitality of the port. In fact, the competitive position of the port could turn, in large measure, on their implementation."

That letter was signed by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT), the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. EHRLICH), the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS), the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. WYNN), myself, and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST). Why? Because we felt this was a vital project to our State and to the economic viability of our port on which thousands of persons rely. Now, my two colleagues from Baltimore will speak, I think, more pointedly to that.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST). The deepening of the C&D Canal is absolutely essential for the viability of Maryland's port. The Port of Baltimore operates in an increasingly competitive environment. Anybody who represents a port knows that to be the case. The C&D Canal is a major access route between the Port of Baltimore and the North Atlantic coast ports. Use of the canal saves shipping lines time and money, which means competitive positions. The size of ships entering North Atlantic coast ports, including Baltimore, are already outgrowing the depth of the C&D Canal.

That is why this study is being conducted, and this \$100,000 is absolutely essential to complete this study before this project can proceed. As container vessels outgrow their ability to safely use the C&D Canal because of sailing draft constraints, they will be forced to sail substantially greater distances, via Cape Henry between the Port of Baltimore and North Atlantic coast ports, or use another port. That is why we wrote this letter. All eight Members of the Maryland delegation signed this letter.

The transfer of cargo jobs and taxes to other States will have an absolutely deleterious effect on the citizens of the State of Maryland. Moreover, although vessel services and cargo may be lost due to a failure to maintain competitive access channel depth, the substantial fixed costs of the port do not change for the smaller volume of remaining cargo. This will result in reduced port efficiency, increased Corps' costs of port improvements for the re-

maining users and, therefore, put us in an increasingly uncompetitive status.

Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD) that I would hope that he and the ranking member would oppose this amendment. The gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD) and I have talked about this amendment; the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKEY) and I have talked about this amendment.

I understand the gentleman's concern. The gentleman's concern is the dredging and where we put the spoil. That is a very significant issue that all of us are engaged in trying to figure out so that we do that correctly. But I would urge this body to reject this amendment, which stops the study. This does not deal with the dredging. The gentleman is correct, if we go ahead with a project, at some point in time we have to figure out where to put the spoil. I understand the gentleman's concern. Perhaps he did not have that concern in 1996 when he signed this letter.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HOYER was allowed to proceed for 30 additional seconds.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, the argument as to where to dump the spoil will have to be debated at some point in time. I would suggest to my friend, for whom I have a great deal of respect, that now is not the time to join it. I know the gentleman wants to stop this project and other projects; the gentleman has had, presumably, a change of heart since the 1996 letter, but we have moved ahead as a united delegation on this. I cannot speak for our two colleagues in the Senate, but I know they support this project as well.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge my colleagues in the Congress to reject this amendment and not stop the study from being completed. We will argue the issue of dredging at some later time.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Gilchrest amendment. I hate to see time limited on a discussion of this very important amendment. I am supporting the amendment because I think the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST) has made a compelling case in support of his amendment. This is his congressional district. I do not think there is anyone in this Chamber that knows more about this project than the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to hear more from him about the amendment, so I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST) at this time.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

We do many things up here as Members of Congress that cause us to take

awhile to begin to investigate and look deeper into a particular process. I certainly would like to continue the work in harmony with the Maryland delegation on numerous other projects. However, having spent literally years looking into the details of this particular issue, I have come full circle in realizing that not only is this project bad environmentally, not only because of the dredge material and where it is going to be disposed of, but because of the ground water and the aquifers when we deepen this canal and the problems that that will cause.

Also, the reason the cost-benefit analysis, the reason we are here today, and the feasibility study did not go through in December of 1996 was because we are spending money, Federal taxpayers' dollars, and we are getting no benefit. The argument that the Port of Baltimore desperately needs this goes counter to the records of the Corps of Engineers' evaluation that there will be no increase in commerce as a result of the deepening. Not only will there be no increase in commerce, there has been a steady decline of container cargo moving through the canal over the past 4 or 5 or 6 years.

Mr. Chairman, most of the ships, 60 percent of the ships that can use the C&D Canal right now choose not to use it. Why do they choose not to use the C&D Canal if it is available to them right now? Well, number one, it saves them no time. Going through the canal saves no time as opposed to going around Cape Henry and up the Chesapeake Bay. Number two, it costs more to use the C&D Canal as opposed to going around through the Chesapeake Bay where there is a 50-foot deep channel. It costs more because of the pilotage fees. The third reason many captains on board these ships choose not to use the C&D Canal, whether it is deeper or not, is that it is a narrow channel and they simply prefer the wide expanse of the Chesapeake Bay than moving through the narrow channel.

Now, I want to urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment because the Port of Baltimore is not at risk. No one will lose any jobs as a result of this measure. We are not closing the C&D Canal; it will remain open. Marsk and Sealand, if that issue comes up with their huge ships, could never, under any circumstances, no matter how deep it is, use the C&D Canal.

The C&D Canal is a vital link for commerce. It is used by ships that have roll-on, roll-off trucks and tractors; it is used by bulk cargo; it is used by any one of a number of ships. The deepening of the C&D Canal is simply not necessary.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote for fiscal responsibility. Here is the interesting thing: this project, since it has been turned down by Corps' headquarters time after time because it does not meet the cost-benefit analysis, this project is probably never going to be approved by the Corps of

Engineers through their own process, so there is no need to spend \$100,000 again for a new study.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank my colleague for that explanation. As usual, he has done his homework, and he presents compelling evidence to support his position.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, my colleague from the Eastern Shore might represent the area around the C&D Canal, whereas I represent, along with the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. EHRLICH) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS), the Port of Baltimore. Although none of us can judge what the Army Corps will or will not do in their studies, we all acknowledge, those of us who represent the Port of Baltimore, how important it is to maintain and strengthen the entry into the Baltimore port.

□ 1700

The Baltimore port is unique. It is more inland than the East Coast ports, but because of that, it takes more time to get to the Port of Baltimore. The fact that we have two days to enter and exit the port is one of the key advantages to the Port of Baltimore.

The maintenance of the C&D Canal is absolutely essential to the health of the Port of Baltimore. The Port of Baltimore represents 18,000 direct jobs, 87,000 port-related jobs, 69,000 indirect jobs in our region, and \$1.3 billion annually to Maryland. Business revenues are affected by the Port of Baltimore, \$40 million in U.S. custom receipts.

So, Mr. Chairman, the majority of our delegation, the overwhelming majority of our delegation, is going to ask this body to reject the Gilchrest amendment because it could jeopardize very much the health of the Port of Baltimore.

As my friend, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) pointed out, we authorized this project several years ago by unanimous support within our delegation. Democrats, Republicans, support the maintenance of our channels.

My colleague, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST) mentioned the environmental issues, the Chesapeake Bay. We are all working very hard on the Chesapeake Bay, Mr. Chairman. I am proud of the work that my constituents are doing on the streams that lead into the Bay. We have worked very hard at the State level and the national level to deal with the Bay.

But to raise the issue of maintaining decent entry or exits to our ports as compromising the Bay is an insult to the Army Corps, an insult to those of us who worked very hard on this issue.

The Army Corps is going to release its report, the gentleman from Mary-

land (Mr. HOYER) is absolutely correct. My colleague is more concerned, I think, about where the dredge materials are being placed than the actual dredging within the C&D Canal. All of us in our delegation strongly support the independence of the Army Corps in reaching the right decision as to the environmental risks involved.

We also believe it is the Army Corps' responsibility to go through the economics of it and come out with the right conclusion. We set up the Army Corps as our agents in this matter, and now the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST) is saying we cannot trust the Army Corps. Let us at least let the process move forward.

This is not a local project that affects one congressional district in this country, this is a project that affects the health of our region. That is why we are going to find that the overwhelming majority, Democrats and Republicans, in our region, in our State, are going to oppose the Gilchrest amendment.

We ask Members to respect our delegation's point of view, respect the fact that we need to maintain a healthy and competitive and safe port. Safety is very much at issue here. We will do nothing to compromise our environment. We are all committed to it. I urge my colleagues to reject the amendment.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment, and I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST).

Mr. GILCHREST. I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, there are two other Republican Members in the Maryland delegation at this time that, as a result of new information, also now oppose this particular amendment.

I would like to say that this entire project is in my congressional district, which gives me plenty of time when I go home to look into the details of the process. I am not about to insult the Corps of Engineers, I am not about to insult anybody. But we as Members of Congress have the responsibility of oversight of all Federal agencies. When we see some peculiar numbers in Federal agencies that are not correct, we investigate. That is what we have done.

So the cost-benefit analysis in 1996, no; it was redone in 1997 and it was turned down; it was redone in 1998 and turned down by the Washington Corps; and it was redone in 1999 and also turned down. That is one of the oversight responsibilities that we have.

We are not stopping maintenance of these channels to the Port of Baltimore. None of the maintenance will be stopped. The Corps says, and other agencies, but the Corps, who we are talking about here now, their numbers show, and we have checked them out, that there will be no jobs lost in the

Port of Baltimore if we do not deepen the C&D Canal because there will be no commerce lost in the C&D Canal if it is not deepened because more than half, 60 to 70 percent of the ships that use that canal right now, with plenty of draft, choose not to use it.

Mr. Chairman, let us go back to the Corps of Engineers. Why should we have oversight of the Corps of Engineers? One of my colleagues mentioned that I was concerned about where the dredge material is dumped. Yes, I am concerned about where the dredge material is dumped, because there is a little community in Cecil County, in the northern part of my district. No one in that community, no one in that town, can drink their water now. They all have wells and they cannot drink the water because the Maryland Department of the Environment says the dredge disposal site is leaching acid into the groundwater so they cannot drink their water.

What does the Corps of Engineers say after the Maryland Department of the Environment says that any elementary school child that looked at the analysis of that dredge disposal site would say, yes, that is causing acidity in the ground water, so those people cannot drink their water?

What does the Corps say to that? "It is not our fault. We do not think that dredge disposal site is causing that problem." So what did the Maryland Department of the Environment say to the Corps of Engineers? You cannot dump that material here anymore. Should we have oversight of what the Corps does? Absolutely, yes.

Now, there is another dredge disposal site a little further up the C&D Canal that we investigated, and we have found that the Corps did not put enough lime in the layers of that disposal site, either, so that is leaching acidity into the water of the C&D Canal, which has an impact on the fish.

The other thing, the Corps, when they finally finished with that dredge disposal site, they put material on the top of that from sewage treatment plants. Well, there is some question about that. But if we deal with that correctly, and when we dump sludge from sewage treatment plants, there are a lot of heavy metals in that sludge.

We found out that after they dumped the sludge on that dredge disposal site, they did not do anything to it. Half of the heavy metals from that sludge dumping leached into the C&D Canal where my constituents catch and eat fish. If we look on the Delaware side, Delaware has said, do not eat any fish in the C&D Canal.

So is it our responsibility to have oversight over the Corps of Engineers and uncover some of these things. Whether they are innocent mistakes, whether it is incompetence, it is our responsibility as elected officials to conduct that oversight.

One other thing with the Corps of Engineers. We have great respect for the

Corps of Engineers because they do good work. But when there is a problem, I think we should deal with that problem. When they deepened the canal the last time more than 25 years ago, they cut the line, the sewer line.

If we look at the C&D Canal, there is a little town there called Chesapeake City. Chesapeake City is divided by the C&D Canal. When they deepened the project the last time, Chesapeake City had one sewage treatment plant and one drinking water plant. Well, they cut those lines. Now, almost 30 years later, the Corps has never compensated that little town. That little town had to build another sewage treatment system. The people in that little town pay high rent for that.

I urge support for the amendment.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as I sit here and I listen to the discussion, it just reminds me of why we need to study. My good friend, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST), who I have the utmost respect for, and I know that this is a major, major issue for him, has stated a number of things just now. I do respect what he has said.

He has talked quite extensively about the Corps of Engineers. But one of the things that he said just a moment ago is that the Corps does a good job. It is one of the last things he said. The fact is that the Corps should be allowed to continue its work with regard to this matter.

I think the gentlemen from Maryland, Mr. CARDIN and Mr. HOYER, laid it out quite succinctly. While this may be an issue, and the issue arises out of the district of the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST), it affects all of us in one way or another. That is why we all joined together not very long ago asking for the study, so we could move forward in a way that was very careful, in a way that we felt was prudent.

Of course, our good friend, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST), joined us on that occasion. We want to thank him for doing that. But there is something that is very important to all of us. That is, and we agree with the gentleman on the point that we want our tax dollars to be spent in a cost-efficient and effective manner, a cost-efficient and effective manner. We are talking about \$100,000 here. We are talking about a study. We are not talking about the end result, we are talking about a study.

We have been going back and forth here about what the study may show. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST) just spent the majority of the time that he just spent talking about the end result as far as the sludge material, where it would go. We are not at that point right now. I just think, in fairness to all of us from the State of Maryland, that we should be allowed to proceed with the study that all of us asked for.

Some people may have changed their minds since then, Mr. Chairman, but the fact is that we have asked for this. I think we should proceed so that whatever we do, it is based upon some good, sound knowledge.

I do not think that one day the Corps of Engineers are some of the worst people in the world and the next day they do good work. The fact is that I think we have all depended on them throughout these United States, and we have relied on them extensively. I would hope that we would let this study proceed.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST), and in respect to my colleagues from Maryland, who will be the experts in dealing with the Maryland problem, but I rise in support of the principle that we all have an obligation and responsibility to defend the interests of our own district. I have great respect for my friend, the gentleman from Maryland, who is doing that I think very eloquently.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST).

Mr. GILCHREST. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding to me, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, my colleague, the gentleman from Baltimore, Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS), made some good comments about the importance of research and study. But I feel there is a point at which the study finally does come to an end, because it cannot be proven.

For example, the cost-benefit analysis which justifies the Corps continuing the project must show that there is a benefit to the taxpayers of the United States. It did not show that in 1996. The cost-benefit analysis failed the Corps' own scrutiny in 1996. It failed the Corps' scrutiny in 1997. It failed again in 1998. It failed again in the spring of 1999.

The Corps has spent hundreds and hundreds of thousands of dollars studying this issue. When do we say, there is no benefit to the taxpayers, no benefit to the Port of Baltimore, and the study comes to an end? I would say that that point of time is now.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, we do not have a dog in this fight. This is a squabble within the Maryland delegation. However, generally we as a committee like to finish projects that have been started.

The project does meet the cost-sharing responsibilities. That is economically favorable. It has been authorized. Under those conditions, we generally like to see the project funded. It is funded at the level that the administration has requested. I would hope that the debate can conclude and that we can move on and have a vote on this.

Mr. EHRLICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, real briefly, with great respect to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST), the author of the amendment, and our personal friendship, I am going to have a lot to say about the gentleman's next amendment, but for present purposes I will adopt the comments given by my colleagues, the gentlemen from Maryland, Mr. HOYER, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. CUMMINGS.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EHRLICH. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate his comments.

Mr. Chairman, I would remind my colleagues, in listening to the debate of my friend, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST), what he is particularly animated about and what we all share his concern about is pollution, not only in the Chesapeake Bay but in its tributaries as well, that obviously run to and from the Bay, irrespective of studies that tell me it is running both ways.

□ 1715

That is a little perverse, and I share the gentleman's skepticism at this finding. But he is very concerned. And he has talked about the pollution in Chesapeake City, the pollution in other areas, the results of dredging, the results of spoil. That is the gentleman's issue. The issue is he does not want dredging. I understand that.

Now, the gentleman has offered very frankly some comments about the studies: that the studies that he believes were done in 1997 and 1998 are not accurate; that the Corps has asked for new studies, and that they are trying to complete this study.

The gentleman wants to, in effect, preliminarily cut the head off of this item. And his staffer is shaking his head very vigorously, yes. That is what the gentleman wants to do. He wants to kill this project. I understand that.

He did not want to kill it in 1996, when he signed a MD delegation support letter. Now, why do we have a joint letter? We had a delegation letter because we thought it was a State issue and all eight of us signed the letter. All eight of us, including the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT) whose district does not touch the Chesapeake Bay, although his district does touch on the Potomac River, which does come into the Chesapeake Bay, the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA), whose district touches the Potomac River which connects to the Chesapeake Bay; myself and every other Member in the delegation signed the letter.

The gentleman's concern is well understood in the delegation. He is very well-schooled on this and works hard on it, and I have the utmost respect for

the work that he does and the work he expresses. But as the gentleman from Baltimore, Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), pointed out, we are all concerned about that. All of us are very concerned about this issue.

Mr. Chairman, I frankly will tell the gentleman that I have been involved in trying to clean up the Chesapeake Bay and support Chesapeake Bay cleanup programs since long before he was in office, when I was in the State Senate, as has the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN). The fact of the matter is that he is concerned about that.

Now, we should allow the Army Corps of Engineers to complete this study. Then we can have the debate, because it will take money to dredge. Then we can have the debate. At this point in time I would assure my colleagues that this is a State issue, not a local issue. This is a State issue.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Baltimore County, Maryland (Mr. EHRLICH), who represents parts around Baltimore City, County and Anne Arundel County as well and Hartford County that all border the Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries who himself has an interest in the Port of Baltimore, for yielding me this time.

Mr. EHRLICH. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I would state that we pay these folks to do a job. If we do not trust them, we should not hire them. We should let them finish their job.

However, I think the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) puts it very succinctly. Our respected colleague has a different view. In the interest of fairness, I will yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST).

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I am not only concerned about the Chesapeake Bay; I want to get involved in doing something about the Chesapeake Bay. Just speaking words does not have an impact on the ground.

And as far as that letter was concerned, once we evaluated the process after we supported it in the beginning, we saw some oversight problems.

I would rather be right than be consistent. And Abraham Lincoln said, "The foolish and the dead alone never change their mind."

Now, we all have disagreements on this, and I respect those disagreements. But not only is my issue dredging, and not only is my issue where to dispose of it and the environmental vulnerability of the Chesapeake Bay and its estuaries, but I am also concerned about jobs; and I would do nothing that would eliminate jobs in the City of Baltimore.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 532, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST) will be postponed.

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to enter into a colloquy with the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD), chairman of the Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development Appropriations.

Mr. Chairman, I have closely monitored the progress of the Alabama-Coosa-Tallapoosa, or ACT, and the Apalachicola-Chattahoochee-Flint, or ACF, Tri-State Water Compact negotiations over the last 3 years. I am most concerned with a proposal that has recently and repeatedly surfaced concerning a major interbasin transfer of water from Lake Allatoona in northwest Georgia in the ACT river basin to Lake Lanier, which is in a completely different river basin, the ACF. The proposal calls for an authorization of up to 200 million gallons per day transfer of water from Lake Allatoona to Lake Lanier.

Not only is this a strong point of contention in negotiations between Alabama and Georgia, but it is also causing a great deal of concern among Federal stakeholders and the many elected officials, local governments, water authorities, and other stakeholders within the ACT, and in particular the Coosa and Tallapoosa regions.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly oppose any consideration of an interbasin transfer. It would seem, though, at a minimum, before such a proposal would be even considered as an option, this proposal should be both reviewed and studied by the authorizing and appropriations committees and subcommittees in the Congress.

An interbasin transfer would have a major detrimental effect on the environment and the economic growth of Northwest Georgia.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARR of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and I want to thank the distinguished gentleman from Georgia for bringing this issue to the attention of the committee.

I understand the idea of an interbasin transfer has been discussed in Northwest Georgia, and I assure the gentleman from Georgia the subcommittee understands the serious nature of any interbasin transfer of this magnitude and would be very concerned should such proposals be considered precipitously or without full and exhaustive public study, consistent with all the Federal and State laws and regulations.

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I reclaim my time only to thank the gentleman from California.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. EHLERS

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. EHLERS:  
Page 2, line 18, after "\$153,327,000" insert "(increased by \$100,000)".  
Page 5, line 11, after "\$323,350,000" insert "(reduced by \$100,000)".

Mr. EHLERS (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, last year we passed the Water Resources Development Act of 1999, which included a provision directing the Corps of Engineers to inventory and report to Congress on the existing information base for the Great Lakes biohydrological system. The intent of this provision is that the Corps compile the information existing within the Federal Government, including other agencies, which is relevant to sustainable water use management.

This information will be needed to make decisions about the appropriate sustainable use of Great Lakes waters. Building a comprehensive database, and identifying gaps in our knowledge, is especially critical at this time when the binational community in the Great Lakes Basin is taking a close look at water diversions and other consumptive use.

And on that latter point, I also have legislation pending which would deal with the issue of diversions of water from the Great Lakes, not just within the 48 States, but also international diversions. I think everyone is aware that we had a situation last year where a ship was initially granted permission to load on water for transport to a far-away country to be used as fresh water supply there. In an effort to prevent those diversions, we need studies and the legislation I am preparing.

This particular amendment would allocate \$100,000, with an appropriate offset, to allow the Corps to begin what is authorized in the legislation we passed last year, that is, to provide an information base for the Great Lakes biohydrological system.

This has been brought to the fore by an announcement just made yesterday that the Great Lakes governors have allocated from the Great Lakes Protection Fund \$745,000 for the Great Lakes Commission to study and improve the amount and quality of information available to decision-makers and the general public regarding water resources of the Great Lakes. That program fits in directly with what we have asked the Corps to do.

Now I do regret and apologize to the gentleman from California (Chairman PACKARD) for rushing to the floor at the last moment with this amendment, but it is because we have just received the information that the Great Lakes

governors have released this funding. I would like to pursue the amendment; but out of consideration for the gentleman, I am quite willing to withdraw it if he can give me assurances that he will seek to address this funding matter in conference.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EHLERS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, we certainly do wish and we hope that we could take care of the gentleman's problem in conference, and I assure him that we will make every effort to do so. The \$100,000 is not a great deal of money; and if we get additional funds, we may be able to take care of it.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for his reassurances.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

#### CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

For the prosecution of river and harbor, flood control, shore protection, and related projects authorized by laws; and detailed studies, and plans and specifications, of projects (including those for development with participation or under consideration for participation by States, local governments, or private groups) authorized or made eligible for selection by law (but such studies shall not constitute a commitment of the Government to construction), \$1,378,430,000, to remain available until expended, of which such sums as are necessary for the Federal share of construction costs for facilities under the Dredged Material Disposal Facilities program shall be derived from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund, as authorized by Public Law 104-303; and of which such sums as are necessary pursuant to Public Law 99-662 shall be derived from the Inland Waterways Trust Fund, for one-half of the costs of construction and rehabilitation of inland waterways projects, including rehabilitation costs for the Lock and Dam 12, Mississippi River, Iowa; Lock and Dam 24, Mississippi River, Illinois and Missouri; Lock and Dam 3, Mississippi River, Minnesota; and London Locks and Dam, and Kanawha River, West Virginia, projects; and of which funds are provided for the following projects in the amounts specified:

San Timoteo Creek (Santa Ana River Mainstem), California, \$5,000,000;

Indianapolis Central Waterfront, Indiana, \$7,000,000;

Southern and Eastern Kentucky, Kentucky, \$4,000,000;

Clover Fork, Middlesboro, Town of Martin, Pike County (including Levisa Fork and Tug Fork Tributaries), Bell County, Martin County, and Harlan County, Kentucky, elements of the Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River, Kentucky, \$19,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to proceed with planning, engineering, design and construction of the Town of Martin, Kentucky, element, in accordance with Plan A as set forth in the preliminary draft Detailed Project Report, Appendix T of the General Plan of the Huntington District Commander:

*Provided further*, That using \$900,000 of the funds appropriated herein, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to undertake the Bowie County Levee project, which is defined as Alternative B Local Sponsor Option, in the Corps of Engineers document entitled Bowie County Local Flood Protection, Red River, Texas, Project Design Memorandum No. 1, Bowie County Levee, dated April 1997.

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, ARKANSAS, ILLINOIS, KENTUCKY, LOUISIANA, MISSISSIPPI, MISSOURI, AND TENNESSEE

For expenses necessary for prosecuting work of flood control, and rescue work, repair, restoration, or maintenance of flood control projects threatened or destroyed by flood, as authorized by law (33 U.S.C. 702a and 702g-1), \$323,350,000, to remain available until expended.

#### OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

For expenses necessary for the preservation, operation, maintenance, and care of existing river and harbor, flood control, and related works, including such sums as may be necessary for the maintenance of harbor channels provided by a State, municipality or other public agency, outside of harbor lines, and serving essential needs of general commerce and navigation; surveys and charting of northern and northwestern lakes and connecting waters; clearing and straightening channels; and removal of obstructions to navigation, \$1,854,000,000, to remain available until expended, of which such sums as become available in the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund, pursuant to Public Law 99-662, may be derived from that Fund, and of which such sums as become available from the special account established by the Land and Water Conservation Act of 1965, as amended (16 U.S.C. 4601), may be derived from that account for construction, operation, and maintenance of outdoor recreation facilities.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GILCHREST

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GILCHREST:  
Page 5, line 22, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$6,801,000)".

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would decrease the Corps of Engineers' operations and maintenance account by \$6,801,000 for the Tolchester S-turn straightening project in my district.

Mr. Chairman, similar to the amendment that we debated just a few minutes ago, this particular project, this straightening of a natural channel, would cost the taxpayers \$13 million. Now, as the Corps has run through its process to analyze the cost benefit to the taxpayers in this country, this particular project in the First Congressional District of Maryland dealing with the Tolchester Channel does not meet the Corps' own justification to do. The Corps of Engineers has not met the threshold to benefit the taxpayers in the United States.

So my colleagues have come to Congress to get this project, I guess I would say, pushed through. This project, the Tolchester S-turn, does not meet the cost-benefit analysis to benefit the taxpayers anywhere, including Baltimore City. The project, therefore, is not necessary.

Let us take a look at the environmental impact of this particular project. The channel right now is a natural channel. It is the old Susquehanna Riverbed that flows from Pennsylvania out to the Chesapeake Bay. This is a natural-flowing channel. There is a natural scouring in this particular area, so very little dredging is necessary. If we straighten the Tolchester Channel, the likelihood of an increased cost for dredging is there.

Now, when the channel is straightened, it will change the direction of the flow of water. And when the direction of the flow of water is changed, great damage will be done to one of the largest oyster bars in the Chesapeake Bay. This oyster bar just off Tolchester is 300 acres, and it is a very active site.

□ 1730

When one changes the flow of the water, one will slow the water down over the oyster bed. That means it will silt up. Now, if one straightens the channel and ships can flow faster through this channel, which they will do, one will increase the wake. When one increases the wake, one will do several things.

One, it will cause more erosion on the shore. It has already caused significant damage to people's property, whether it is a garage, cars, docks, you name it. But the third thing, which is really a safety hazard, the wake will increase the danger of children playing on the beach that have already found it difficult to play on the beach. When one of the ships goes by, these young people could be washed into the Chesapeake Bay and potentially drown.

Now, the question will arise that we are dredging this new channel for safety purposes that has been asked for by the Coast Guard, the Corps of Engineers. When that issue comes up, let me say this, I had a direct face-to-face conversation with the Corps of Engineers, the District Engineer in the City of Baltimore. I asked them that question: Does this rise to the threshold of a safety hazard for shipping through the Tolchester Channel. The answer, Mr. Chairman, was no, it does not rise to a safety hazard through the Tolchester Channel.

The only reason we are dredging the Tolchester Channel is because we are dredging the whole northern route, the Brewerton Extension, the Tolchester Channel, the C&D Canal.

We have already talked about the C&D Canal, and we know that is not necessary to dredge. So if it is not necessary to dredge the northern route, if it is not a safety hazard, which the Corps of Engineers in Baltimore said it is not a safety hazard, and the Coast Guard if you ask them direct, the Coast Guard will say that the Tolchester S-turn, since over 6,000 ships have passed through there in the last 6 years with no incident, that the Tolchester S-turn does not rise to the level of a safety hazard with their office.

Now, can one make it safer? Sure. Can one dredge the Tolchester S-turn and make it a straight channel? Sure. Would it be safer if it were straight? Sure. But what damage will be done if one does that if it is not a safety hazard? The damage that will be done as a result of that S-turn is great.

I ask my colleagues to support my amendment.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, very quickly, this is about dredging. It is contrary to the letter that all of us signed receiving it as a State project in 1986. No doubt about it. This was not perceived by any of the delegation to be a local project. It was a Statewide project, which is why all eight Members of the delegation signed.

In the letter that I reference, we also strongly supported and urged the inclusion of the straightening of the S-turn, the Tolchester Channel. Why did we do that? July 14, 1998, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST) says he has talked to the Coast Guard. Now, with all due respect to the gentleman, until 4 hours ago, I did not know of any of this. My office was not talked to. I got no information. I did not know about his conversations with the Coast Guard. I do not think the committee knew about his conversations with the Coast Guard. Maybe they did.

But at any event, let me read a letter, 26 August 1994, signed by Rear Admiral Eckart of the United States Coast Guard, Commander of the Fifth Coast Guard District. I quote a part of that, Mr. Chairman. "The S-turn in Tolchester Channel presents one of the most difficult navigational challenges to a large ship within the Fifth Coast Guard District, not just within Maryland, not just within the Chesapeake Bay, but within the entire district." Yes safety is going to be raised.

Now, July 14, 1998, some 2 years later, this is a Vice Admiral, United States Coast Guard, then Commander, I am not sure whether he is still Commander of the Fifth Coast Guard District. A letter referring to the Tolchester Channel. "With increases to vessel size, the severity of the turns have caused difficulty with maneuvering. The Coast Guard would prefer to be proactive in preventing any potential serious mishaps. The removal of the S-curve in the Tolchester Channel would be a significant step."

Now, I do not have a subsequent letter from the Coast Guard saying, no, we did not mean that. Apparently they have had a personal conversation with the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST) who claims this is in his district. Technically I suppose, if one surrounds waterways, they are in one's district, but the fact of the matter is I would again reiterate this is perceived by the State legislature, by the governor, and by the majority of our delegation as an issue of our State and of our port.

Mr. Chairman, the 1996 water bill directs the Corps to expedite review of

potential straightening of the channel, Tolchester Channel S-turn. It came out of a committee of which the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST) was a member.

If determined to be feasible and necessary for safe and efficient navigation, and I have just read my colleagues two letters of the Coast Guard that indicated it was necessary for the safe and efficient movement of vessels through this channel, to implement such straightening as part of the project maintenance.

Now, earlier the gentleman said he was not opposed to maintenance dredging. Now, I am not sure what maintenance dredging he refers to, but the fact of the matter is he tried by saying that, if we had ships going through, then children were going to drown. I do not know that any children had drowned, and that would be a serious problem we would have to protect against, apparently in anticipation of the safety argument that somehow making the water flow faster could be dangerous. I have not heard the oyster problem before, but we ought to look at that problem as well.

But the fact of the matter is this is essential. In two letters from the Coast Guard, I do not have a more recent letter telling me they were wrong, the 1994 and 1998 letters say it is a safety issue. It is a problem. It is not only a problem, it is the worst problem in the Fifth Coast Guard District. That is why they believe this project is absolutely critical.

I know the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. EHRLICH) is going to speak on this. We have a bipartisan position on this issue, I think. In fact, the committee has included this money at the request of the administration, this is not an add-on project, this has been a planned project that is moving ahead to provide for safer navigation. It is essential.

We would ask our colleagues to reject this amendment which, again, is designed to stop dredging. I understand that that is the objective of the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST). I agree with him to stop dredging if it is entirely harmful. But until that finding is made, then we need to proceed to make sure, A, the economic viability of the port and, B, directly related to that the safety of the vessels using the channels that access and egresses the port of Baltimore.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST), and I would like to ask him a question, and then I would like to have him expound a little bit more on that.

I ask the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST), is there an environmental impact statement on this project, because that is something that should concern us all.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST) for a response to that question.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) for yielding to me.

There has been no environmental impact statement done on this particular project. I have talked to the Corps of Engineers from Baltimore City, along with the Coast Guard, along with numerous other people involved in this in Chestertown, Maryland once again, and the Corps cannot tell us how high the wake will be when it hits the shore except that it is going to be higher.

The Corps cannot tell us whether or not that slow down in the current will have an impact on those oysters because they have not done the study.

I would like to, if I may, just respond to some of my colleague's comments. This is not a maintenance project. We do maintain the Tolchester Channel. The Tolchester Channel is maintained on a regular basis. This amendment has no impact on normal maintenance of the Tolchester Channel. This is considered new work.

Now, the Corps of Engineers has stated that this is not appropriate nor proper when considering it as a safety project. Because since 1994, there has been 6,700 ships pass through the Tolchester S-turn without an incident. There has been some groundings north of the Tolchester S-turn and there has been some groundings south of the Tolchester S-turn, but there has been no groundings in the Tolchester S-turn.

Now, as far as the Coast Guard saying that this is the biggest navigation challenge in this particular Coast Guard district, well, that is correct. This is a challenge. But apparently the pilots and the captains have met that challenge, and they have not had an incident in the Tolchester S-turn.

So since they have not had an incident, a safety hazard incident in the Tolchester S-turn, what are we talking about here? We are talking about straightening the channel where there has been no incidents of safety problems reported.

Then we are creating a safety hazard for people on the banks that are less than 1,000 feet from these huge ships that pass by that cause major wakes and potential problems with young children on the shore. Plus the fact we are then going to increase the cost to homeowners' property. Remembering now there is no safety hazard in the S-turn, there is a challenge to the pilots, they pass through there all the time. But a safety hazard, has it risen to the legality of a safety hazard by the Coast Guard or Corps of Engineers? The answer is no in their documents.

So I would urge the Members of this House to think two ways, to think fiscally, conservative, as to why we do not want to throw good money down a sink hole when a project is not necessary; and when a project is not necessary, why do we do it to create another safety hazard and another environmental hazard?

So I would urge my colleagues in the House to vote for this amendment.

Mr. EHRlich. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, again, with great deference and respect to the gentleman from Maryland, Mr. Speaker, countries probably watching, tuning in today are saying "S-turn, what S-turn?"

This S-turn is important in Tolchester Channel because it is part of the approach to the Canal, the C&D Canal. Ships change course five times within 3 miles, often beginning a new turn sometimes in the opposite direction before completing the previous turn. With ships approaching 1,000 feet in length, it is becoming increasingly difficult to navigate the channel, especially in winter, especially in poor weather with the wind and tide conditions.

The gentleman from Maryland talked about pilots and the pilots association. Well, the pilots association is on record. It has urged for a number of years that this channel S-turn be modified as soon as possible to avoid potential ship groundings.

As my friend from southern Maryland has stated on numerous occasions in this year's Energy and Water Appropriations Bill, Congress appropriated \$6 million for the S-turn.

The project was also authorized in 1999 as part of the operations and maintenance program. In order to complete the job, we need \$6.8 million dollars. The project is totally 100 percent Federally funded.

Now, we have talked about safety, and that is the primary reason to get this job done. We can reduce the likelihood of an accident. But the project also produces economic benefits, many economic benefits.

The economic consequences of a serious accident, for instance, were one to occur, would be significant, something we certainly do not want to visit. Accordingly, the avoidance of such an accident, while not easily quantifiable, contains economic benefits.

Moreover, Mr. Chairman, since this project was approved by the Corps and authorized by this Congress, the Corps has reserved the environmental assessment. In fact, the Corps is finishing the environmental assessment for the project. It will be circulated in July and approved in settlement or October at or near the beginning of fiscal year 2001.

□ 1745

My friend and colleague from Maryland is someone for whom I have great respect on these issues. We disagree from time to time when it comes to dredging issues. But the majority of the Maryland delegation is letting this House know that this is an important project for the economic engine, which is the Port of Baltimore, the economic engine that drives the State of Maryland.

Congress recognized this fact by appropriating these funds last year, and all we are asking this House to do is to

complete the job. Accordingly, I urge all of my colleagues to oppose the Gilchrest amendment.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EHRlich. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I have a map here, and the gentleman represents, am I correct, Baltimore County?

Mr. EHRlich. That is correct.

Mr. HOYER. And the Tolchester Channel is essentially southeast of the gentleman's congressional district and northeast of the district of the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST)?

Mr. EHRlich. That is correct.

Mr. HOYER. Whose district is it in? It is in the middle of the water; is that correct?

Mr. EHRlich. That is correct.

Mr. HOYER. So because it borders the district of the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. EHRlich) and it borders his district, both gentleman can equally claim it; am I correct?

Mr. EHRlich. I certainly claim economic benefits to be derived from this project.

Mr. HOYER. I just wanted to make sure that we understood.

Mr. EHRlich. In fact, the map is up.

Mr. HOYER. Good. We have all got maps.

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUINN. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding. I just wanted to make a couple of points very quickly, if I can.

The last comment: Whose district is the Tolchester Channel in? I do not think it really makes a difference whose district the Tolchester Channel is in. It happens to be in my district, though, and I will show my colleagues on the map. Not the district of the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. EHRlich) and not the district of the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

If my colleagues will look at this map, it is a little busy, a little hard to see, but if we look at the map, the C&D Canal channel comes down the eastern side of the Chesapeake Bay along the Eastern Shore, and the area we are talking about is Kent County on the Eastern Shore. Following this line coming down here, we can see the C&D Canal approach the channel. Down in this area, what do we have right here, less than a thousand feet off the shores of Kent County, in a pretty little place called Tolchester? The Tolchester Channel.

Now, in the Tolchester Channel is the Tolchester S-turn, which we have already concluded is not classified as a hazard but a challenge. So just a quick clarification. The Tolchester Channel, the Tolchester S-turn is contained within the first congressional district.

Now, since we are reading letters, I want to read something from the report of the Corps of Engineers that was recently put out about the Tolchester S-turn. Here is what it says. "The benefit for straightening the Tolchester S-turn is based solely on transit time savings." It might be a challenge to get through the Tolchester S-turn, but well over 6,000 ships have done it since 1994 without one incident in the Tolchester S-turn.

What are the hazards for straightening the Tolchester S-turn? As we can see right along here, the shores of Kent County in the first congressional district, the hazards apply to the people on the shore. The hazards apply to those watermen who want to catch the few remaining oysters in the Chesapeake Bay that will be silted over, which is about the largest oyster bar in the Chesapeake Bay, well over 300 acres.

One last comment. The only reason they would straighten the Tolchester Channel, the Corps of Engineers, is if it was a benefit to the taxpayers; and they have concluded that it is not a benefit to the taxpayers. There is no financial justification for it. And the other one, is it really a safety hazard? And we have concluded that it is a challenge. The safety hazard lies with those residents on the shoreline.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARDIN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the debate time on this amendment and all amendments thereto be limited to 10 minutes, equally divided.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, is that 10 minutes per side, proponents and opponents? Mr. Chairman, there was 20 minutes total on this amendment.

Mr. PACKARD. I adjust the unanimous consent request to 10 minutes each side.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) each will control 10 minutes.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, who controls the time in support of the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST).

Mr. GILCHREST. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. Who seeks time in opposition?

Mr. CARDIN. I seek time in opposition, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, first let me say to my friend, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST), if we get a ship that is moving through the S-turn that happens to go aground and starts spilling oil, I think then all of us are going to say why did we let this happen.

I am thinking about what I can say to my colleagues who are listening to this debate to try to impress upon them why they should reject this amendment. Sure, I can go through the safety considerations, and we have gone through that. I can read to them a letter signed by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST) that says the Tolchester project involves safety-related modifications of the existing channel which makes five course changes within 3 miles. The Corps of Engineers is completing a safety-related study of the project. We request that the committee indicate support for the execution of the project as a safety improvement using operation and maintenance funding authority. This was signed by our entire delegation, including the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST).

I could tell my colleagues that this does meet the standards to be funded, otherwise the distinguished chairman and ranking member would not have included it in the bill they brought forward. The administration would not have included it in its funding. This is not an add-on. This is authorized funding and has met all of the standards.

I could talk about the need, about the pilots, the bay pilots that have been in my office that tell us of the safety hazards and the time delays that are caused because of the S-turn and how this change should be made from the point of view of the efficiency and safety of our port.

I could tell my colleagues about the environmental issues; that all of us are very concerned about the environment and we have worked very hard. Our entire delegation will stand by the Army Corps' findings. And if this is not consistent with the environmental standards, that we are not going to support any type of activity that jeopardizes the progress that we have made in the last 25 years for the Port of Baltimore.

I could tell my colleagues all these things, but let me just maybe make one point. This has followed the orderly process. And if my colleagues believe there should be a process in approving these projects, reject the gentleman's amendment. We have four Members of our delegation on the floor that represent this area, two Democrats, one Republican, opposing the gentleman's amendment.

We all are concerned about the area; but we recognize that in order to make progress, in order for safety, in order for the efficiency of this port and in order for the environment of our area,

we must reject the gentleman's amendment. As well intended as it is, the gentleman is opposed to dredging. He is opposed to any new dump sites. I understand his position, but it is not the orderly process that we followed.

We have complied with all of the requests that have been asked of us. Allow the study to go forward. Let the Army Corps reach its judgment. We are all satisfied to be controlled by how the Army Corps reaches that decision.

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

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

Let me just make some comments. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) said we stand by the Corps' findings. The Corps found that the benefit for the straightening is based solely upon time saving. It is not economically justified. And the Corps' findings go on to say, "Based on our information, general funding for this purpose," straightening the Tolchester S-turn, "is not considered feasible or appropriate." That is what the Corps of Engineers said.

Now, the gentleman is saying that we did not follow an orderly process. Well, we did follow an orderly process. The orderly process rejected the widening and the straightening of the Tolchester S-turn by the Corps of Engineers. What we are doing here is interrupting, we are bypassing, we are leapfrogging the orderly process with this appropriation of \$6 million for what the Corps of Engineers said was not a necessary project.

Now, at this point I would like to wax a little bit philosophical with Justice Felix Frankfurter's statement, which goes and I quote, and this has to do with the letter that I signed approving this project some years ago. And after some investigation and a closer look at the project, I would like to quote Justice Felix Frankfurter. Here is what he said: "Wisdom so often never comes. When it does, we ought not to reject it merely because it's late." And in this particular situation, I think that is appropriate.

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

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS), my colleague from Baltimore.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise to strongly oppose the gentleman's amendment to strike the funding to straighten the S-turn in the Tolchester Channel leading to the Port of Baltimore.

The straightening of the Tolchester S-turn is critical to maintaining navigational safety and economic viability of the Port of Baltimore. Nearly 8,000 Baltimore City residents are directly employed by port businesses and as many as 30,000 additional city residents have jobs related to port activities.

The S-turn poses a serious problem with regard to safety risks, as my col-

leagues on this side stated a little bit earlier. Ships often have to change course five times within 3 miles to navigate the turn. With vessels nearly a thousand feet in length, it is difficult to safely navigate the channel, particularly in poor weather conditions.

The straightening of the turn has been recommended and supported by the State of Maryland, the Maryland Port Administration, the Fifth U.S. Coast Guard District, and the Maryland Pilots Association.

And speaking of the Maryland Pilots Association, in a letter dated April 26, 2000, written by Captain Michael Watson to Colonel Berwick of the Army Corps of Engineers, and I quote this because this is a very interesting statement and it goes to that whole issue of safety, and we are talking about the pilots who are out there every day, it says: "Tolchester Channel was originally designed to utilize deep water in order to minimize dredging costs and allow for increases in vessel loads. This resulted in the creation of the S-turn at the northern end of the channel. As vessel size has increased, the S-turn has become more difficult and groundings have resulted. Subsequent modifications and additional buoys have addressed the problem, but only in part. Pilots," and I emphasize pilots, "continue to report close calls and near misses, especially during periods of reduced visibility during winter ice. A straightened channel will have many advantages, increasing navigational safety, reducing the protection for maritime accidents, and thereby helping to protect the Chesapeake Bay environment."

With that, Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment.

□ 1800

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, could the Chair tell me how much time I have remaining.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST) has 8 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) has 4½ minutes remaining.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, who has the right to close?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST) has the right to close.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a comment about the S-turn and the pilots. The S-turn was not made to accommodate ship traffic. The S-turn is a natural channel, as the old Susquehanna River bed that is a natural channel. It is naturally deep.

Now, when we straighten out that S-turn, we are going to do a number of things, one of which is to increase the cost of dredging because many of those areas will be filled in.

Now, we are talking about \$6 million, \$13 million dollars, to complete a project that we asked the Corps to look

into. When the Corps looked into this project, their answer to do this project was no. It is written down no. I have talked to Colonel Berwick that the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) has referred to, and Colonel Berwick, from the Baltimore district, said, number one, it does not rise to a safety hazard, it is a challenge to get through there, but it is not a safety hazard for ships to pass through and this particular channel is an environmental problem if we dredge this channel.

So the Corps of Engineers said no. So what does Congress say if this amendment fails? The Corps of Engineers, through their study that we say we ought to trust, we hold on to their study, the Corps says no, for sound fundamental reasons. Congress says yes.

I strongly urge my colleagues in the House to be fiscally responsible, environmentally smart, and consider the safety hazard of the people on the shore because of the increasing wake that will result from these bigger ships that will go faster through this straightened Tolchester channel.

One other quick comment. There is at this point in time no Environmental Impact Statement that has been concluded by the Corps of Engineers on this project.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, will my friend, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST), yield on that issue?

Mr. GILCHREST. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I know he has mentioned that a couple of times.

As I think he knows, that is not a unique situation of this project, but that statement is applicable to a number of the safety-related projects in this bill as well as previous bills.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, and I will close with this comment, the other problem with this, it is a much broader issue than the Sandy Canal or a safety concern for the Tolchester area.

The whole northern route that would be dredged by my colleagues would involve 18 million cubic yards of dredge material being dumped overboard in the middle of the Chesapeake Bay just north of the Chesapeake Bay Bridge.

I guess we could get into a dispute whether or not that is actually in my district or in the district of the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) or anybody else's district. It does not matter. That 18 million cubic yards is 2 million pounds of ammonia, 700,000 pounds of phosphorus. It is the equivalent of putting a sewage treatment plant the size of the city of Annapolis right there in the middle of the Chesapeake Bay, and I do not think that is what we want to do.

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

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD), the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, the Gilchrest amendment seeks to zero out funding for the Baltimore Channel and Channels navigation channel maintenance and straightening project. This is an ongoing project which was funded in the current fiscal year, and the proposed funding is to complete the project in fiscal year 2001.

The committee included report language to address the apparent concerns of the gentleman which involves environmental analysis and effects of proposed dredged-material disposal sites.

On this point, we have stated in our report our expectation that the Corps of Engineers will comprehensively consider alternative disposal sites in its ongoing Environmental Impact Statement which is to be released as a revised document later this year.

It is inappropriate to pre-judge the outcome of that analysis as being unsatisfactory; and, therefore, I reluctantly oppose the amendment of the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST).

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. WYNN).

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from Maryland for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to join most of my Maryland colleagues certainly in strongly opposing this amendment. We have looked at this issue thoroughly and, as has been indicated through today's testimony, we are near unanimous agreement that this amendment is inappropriate.

We have here fundamental safety issues with respect to Tolchester, and we ought to acknowledge that fact and then act upon it and not implement this amendment, which would, in effect, overturn a lot of the work that has already been done.

This is a channel that has many shifts and turns in order to accommodate the traffic and, also, to accommodate safety concerns. Straightening the channel is a desirable objective. That is an objective that we are pursuing through, I say, the majority of the Maryland delegation. We have studied this issue thoroughly. As was indicated, Environmental Impact Studies are underway and we certainly cannot pre-judge them to be in the negative.

Under the circumstances, I think it is both prudent and sound that we proceed with the position that the delegation has taken and reject this amendment. I would urge the membership to do so.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this project was approved by Congress even though the Corps said in their analysis it did not rise to the cost benefit analysis that was necessary to do a project like this. But, nevertheless, this has been approved by Congress. But we have not started this project. We continue the maintenance of the Tolchester Channel, but we have not started this new

work project which I am so adamantly opposed to.

Now, I do want to sincerely thank the chairman of this committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD), for working with me on this issue and many other dredging issues in the past dealing with the Chesapeake Bay.

I wish the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD) a long, successful, joyous retirement. And at this particular point, I am thinking about that myself. So if I am ever out in San Diego, Mr. Chairman, I would like to do a little kayaking in the Pacific Ocean out there. But I do want to thank the chairman for being a gentleman with all these various issues.

Now, as far as the delegation is concerned, the delegation is not united on this. There is no unanimous agreement on this particular issue. The gentleman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA), the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT), and myself are all opposed to this particular project. We are going forward with the maintenance of the Tolchester Channel, but we do not want to deal at this point, because all the evidence points against it, with the widening of the Tolchester S-turn; and we do not want to do that because there is no need to dredge the northern route at this point because it is not a safety hazard, it is not necessary for increasing commerce, it has nothing to do with jobs in the city of Baltimore.

This has everything to do with spending the taxpayers' dollars unwisely. This has everything to do with an environmental project that is not wise to do and all the environmental groups are opposed to it.

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

Mr. Chairman, let me say that I ask my colleagues to support the chairman of the subcommittee, to support the majority of the Maryland delegation, and to support common sense and fair play and allow this project to move forward and reject the Gilchrest amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the dean of the Maryland delegation.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, this is an issue on which Maryland is not divided. The Governor of Maryland opposes this amendment. The State Legislature opposes this amendment, not because they voted on this particular amendment, but because they support the Tolchester Channel straightening.

Why? Because it is a safety issue.

The pilots have been lobbying this very heavily. The Coast Guard, in two letters I read to my colleagues, said this is a significant safety issue, it needs to be resolved.

The gentleman says we have not had any accidents. Well, the Exxon Valdez

had an accident where there had been no accident. Very frankly, we have a pipeline down on the Patuxent River which for 40 years carried oil without an accident. But there is going to be an accident here, and the consequences may be very significant.

The chairman of the committee and the ranking member of the committee have heard this issue, they have gone the regular process, and they have approved this project. The majority of the Maryland delegation opposes the amendment of the gentleman.

One of our former colleagues has worked very hard on this issue, Helen Bentley, a Republican; and I, as a Democrat, have worked hard on this issue. I share absolutely the concern of the gentleman about the environmental impact of dredging. We ought not to dredge if we cannot do so environmentally safely, period. That is a given.

But we ought not to by this amendment with, and I reiterate, 4 hours' notice to the Maryland delegation that this amendment was going to be offered, defeat this project, which has been worked on since 1996, actually before that, with the participation of the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST).

Now he has changed his mind. Let us not change our minds. Oppose the Gilchrest amendment. Support the Maryland delegation, the bipartisan Maryland delegation.

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

Mr. Chairman, in our closing comments, when we look at each issue of dredging or straightening or deepening one at a time, it is not an environmental problem. When we take the cumulative impact of all of these projects throughout the Chesapeake Bay, it is an environmental problem.

And, no, there are many people throughout the State of Maryland that oppose this particular issue. Every environmental group in the State of Maryland opposes this widening. My constituents, especially those that have property on the shoreline, oppose this widening and straightening of the Tolchester S-turn. And, believe it or not, my colleagues, the Corps of Engineers opposes this straightening with their cost benefit analysis because it

does not rise to the threshold necessary to benefit taxpayers.

The Environmental Impact Statement is not complete and there are many environmental hazards that we are considering.

The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) mentioned the problem with the oil tanker, the *Exxon Valdez*. 6,700 ships have passed through here in the last 6 years without one incident. And there are no rocks here. One of the reasons the Corps of Engineers said it was not necessary and one of the reasons the Coast Guard says it is a challenge but it is not a safety hazard is because there is nothing but sand here, nothing but sand and mud.

If anything runs aground, and they have not, they will slowly move into the sand bar and it is probably because the tide is down and when the tide comes up, they will move along.

This is not about safety, my colleagues. This is about convenience. This is about convenience.

The Corps of Engineers, in their statement, said this is about time saving. And so, we have not paid enough attention as Members of Congress, as our oversight responsibility, to some of these issues.

So I urge my colleagues to vote for fiscal responsibility, to vote for an environmentally sound amendment, and to vote for the average constituent that needs a voice in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1815

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 532, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST) will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

REGULATORY PROGRAM

For expenses necessary for administration of laws pertaining to regulation of navigable

waters and wetlands, \$125,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to use funds appropriated herein to: (1) by March 1, 2001, revise the report, Cost Analysis For the 1999 Proposal to Issue and Modify Nationwide Permits, to reflect the Nationwide Permits actually issued on March 9, 2000, including changes in the acreage limits, preconstruction notification requirements and general conditions between the proposed rule and the rule promulgated and published in the Federal Register; (2) by September 30, 2001, prepare, submit to Congress and publish in the Federal Register a Permit Processing Management Plan by which the Corps of Engineers will handle the additional work associated with all projected increases in the number of individual permit applications and preconstruction notifications related to the new and replacement permits and general conditions so that within two years the number of pending individual permits shall not be greater than the number of said permits pending at the end of fiscal year 1999. The Permit Processing Management Plan shall include specific objective criteria by which the Corps of Engineers progress towards reducing any permit backlog can be measured; (3) beginning on December 31, 2001, and at the end of each quarter thereafter, report to Congress and publish in the Federal Register, an analysis of the performance of its program as measured against the criteria set out in the Permit Processing Management Plan; (4) implement a one-year pilot program to publish quarterly on the U.S. Army Corps of Engineer's Regulatory Program website all Regulatory Analysis and Management Systems (RAMS) data for the South Pacific Division beginning within 30 days of enactment of this Act; and (5) publish in Division Office websites all findings, rulings, and decisions rendered under the administrative appeals process for the Corps of Engineers Regulatory Program as established in Public Law 106-60: *Provided further*, That Corps shall allow any appellant to keep a verbatim record of the proceedings of the appeals conference under the aforementioned administrative appeals process: *Provided further*, That within 30 days of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, shall require all U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Divisions and Districts to record the date on which a Section 404 individual permit application or nationwide permit notification is filed with the Corps of Engineers: *Provided further*, That "filed" shall mean the date an applicant first submits its application or notification to the Corps and not the date the application or notification is deemed complete.

**NOTICE**

***Incomplete record of House proceedings. Except for concluding business which follows, today's House proceedings will be continued in the next issue of the Record.***

## RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 31 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 0329

## AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DREIER) at 3 o'clock and 29 minutes a.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4461, AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-704) on the resolution (H. Res. 538) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4461) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4680, MEDICARE RX 2000 ACT

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-705) on the resolution (H. Res. 539) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4680) to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for a voluntary program for prescription drug coverage under the Medicare Program, to modernize the Medicare Program, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MARKEY (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of family illness.

## SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. McNULTY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. STABENOW, for 5 minutes, today.

## SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1309. An act to amend title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to provide for the preemption of State law in certain cases relating to certain church plans.

## BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

The Committee on House Administration reports that on June 27, 2000 they presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H.R. 642. To redesignate the Federal building located at 701 South Santa Fe Avenue in Compton, California, and known as the Compton Main Post Office, as the "Mervyn Malcolm Dymally Post Office Building".

H.R. 643. To redesignate the Federal building located at 10301 South Compton Avenue, in Los Angeles, California, and known as the Watts Finance Office, as the "Augustus F. Hawkins Post Office Building".

H.R. 2460. To designate the United States Post Office located at 125 Border Avenue West in Wiggins, Mississippi, as the "Jay Hanna 'Dizzy' Dean Post Office".

H.R. 2357. To designate the United States Post Office located at 3675 Warrensville Center Road in Shaker Heights, Ohio, as the "Louise Stokes Post Office".

H.R. 2307. To designate the building of the United States Postal Service located at 5 Cedar Street in Hopkinton, Massachusetts, as the "Thomas J. Brown Post Office Building".

H.R. 1666. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service at 200 East Pinckney Street in Madison, Florida, as the "Captain Colin P. Kelly, Jr. Post Office".

H.R. 2591. To designate the United States Post Office located at 713 Elm Street in Wakefield, Kansas, as the "William H. Avery Post Office".

H.R. 2952. To redesignate the facility of the United States Post Office located at 100 Orchard Park Drive in Greenville, South Carolina, as the "Keith D. Oglesby Station".

H.R. 3018. To designate certain facilities of the United States Postal Service in South Carolina.

H.R. 3699. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 8409 Lee Highway in Merrifield, Virginia, as the "Joel T. Broyhill Postal Building".

H.R. 3701. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3118 Washington Boulevard in Arlington, Virginia, as the "Joseph L. Fisher Post Office Building".

H.R. 3903. To deem the vessel M/V MIST COVE to be less than 100 gross tons, as measured under chapter 145 of title 46, United States Code.

H.R. 4241. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1818 Milton Avenue in Janesville, Wisconsin, as the "Les Aspin Post Office Building".

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 30 minutes a.m.), the House adjourned until today, Wednesday, June 28, 2000, at 10 a.m.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

8373. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Mancozeb; Reestablishment of Tolerance for Emergency Exemptions [OPP-301001; FRL-6556-9] (RIN: 2070-AB78) received May 16, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8374. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting notification of munitions disposal, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1512(4); to the Committee on Armed Services.

8375. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Health Affairs, Department of Defense, transmitting the TRICARE Program Effectiveness Interim Evaluation Report for March 2000; to the Committee on Armed Services.

8376. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule—National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research—received May 17, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

8377. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District [CA 240-0237a; FRL-6602-2] received May 9, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8378. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; California State Implementation Plan Revision, Antelope Valley Air Pollution Control District [CA 226-0186a; FRL-6606-3] received May 9, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8379. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Acquisition Regulation: To amend the EPA Acquisition Regulation Clause 1552.216-70, Award fee [FRL-6606-6] (RIN: 2030-AA74) received May 9, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8380. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Clean Air Act Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plan; South Dakota; New Source Performance Standards [SD-001-0010 & SD-001-0011; FRL-6603-1] received May 16, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8381. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Iowa; Correction [IA 104-1104; FRL-6702-9] received May 16, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.