

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER). I would again stress what an extraordinary role he has played in this House on housing matters.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LINDER). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3834, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 3834, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

CHANDLER PUMPING PLANT WATER EXCHANGE FEASIBILITY STUDY

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3986) to provide for a study of the engineering feasibility of a water exchange in lieu of electrification of the Chandler Pumping Plant at Prosser Diversion Dam, Washington, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3986

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

SECTION 1. CHANDLER PUMPING PLANT AND POWERPLANT OPERATIONS AT PROSSER DIVERSION DAM, WASH- INGTON.

Section 1208 of Public Law 103-434 (108 Stat. 4562) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in the subsection heading, by inserting "OR WATER EXCHANGE" after "ELECTRIFICATION";

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) as subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C), respectively, and indenting appropriately;

(C) by striking "In order to" and inserting the following:

"(1) ELECTRIFICATION.—In order to"; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

"(2) WATER EXCHANGE ALTERNATIVE.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—As an alternative to the measures authorized under paragraph (1) for electrification, the Secretary is authorized to use not more than \$4,000,000 of sums appropriated under paragraph (1) to study the engineering feasibility of exchanging water from the Columbia River for water historically diverted from the Yakima River.

"(B) REQUIREMENTS.—In carrying out subparagraph (A), the Secretary, in coordination with the Kennewick Irrigation District and in

consultation with the Bonneville Power Administration, shall—

"(i) prepare a report that describes project benefits and contains feasibility level designs and cost estimates;

"(ii) secure the critical right-of-way areas for the pipeline alignment;

"(iii) prepare an environmental assessment; and

"(iv) conduct such other studies or investigations as are necessary to develop a water exchange.";

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by inserting "or water exchange" after "electrification"; and

(B) in the second sentence of paragraph (2)(A), by inserting "or the equivalent of the rate" before the period;

(3) in subsection (d), by striking "electrification," each place it appears and inserting "electrification or water exchange"; and

(4) in subsection (d), by striking "of the two" and inserting "thereof".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON) and the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 3986.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3986 authorizes a study of the feasibility of exchanging water diverted from the Yakima River for use by two irrigation districts for water from the Columbia River. The study would be conducted as part of the Yakima River Basin Water Enhancement Project. The legislation will promote salmon recovery in the Yakima River without reducing the amount of water available to irrigators.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS).

(Mr. HASTINGS of Washington asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3986. I thank the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, as Members know, the preservation of salmon in the Pacific Northwest is one of my top priorities in this Congress. I am convinced that we can save this national treasure while also preserving the jobs and quality of life of Pacific Northwest residents. My legislation is just one example of the benefits that could be attained for salmon by interested parties working together at the local level.

Very simply, Mr. Speaker, my legislation authorizes a study of the feasibility of exchanging water diverted

from the Yakima River for use by the Kennewick and Columbia Irrigation Districts for water from the Columbia River. The study would be conducted as part of the Bureau of Reclamation's Yakima River Basin Water Enhancement Project, a series of projects authorized by Congress to improve water quality and quantity in the Yakima River. These two systems currently take their water from the lower Yakima River where flows have already been decreased because of upriver diversions. By taking water from the much larger volume of the Columbia River, the impact on threatened and endangered species would be significantly reduced.

Specifically, this project provides the opportunity to increase Yakima River flows at Prosser Dam during critical low flow periods by up to 750 cubic feet per second. This approach will provide over twice as much flow augmentation as the previously approved electrification project and could completely eliminate the Yakima River diversion for the Kennewick Irrigation District. A new pump station and pressure pipeline from the Columbia River will be the cornerstone of a more salmon-friendly Kennewick Irrigation District.

This project is a winner for both fish and water users. It balances the need to improve habitat for threatened species while protecting water rights. Preliminary results from a lower reach habitat study indicate that these increased flows would greatly help salmon and bull trout. In addition, this proposal would provide substantial water quality improvements in the Yakima River.

It is important to note that a change in the diversion for the Kennewick Irrigation District from the Yakima River to the Columbia River will completely change the current operational philosophy for the district. It will evolve from a relatively simple gravity system to one of significant complexity involving a major pump station and pressure pipeline to the major feeder canals. This remodeling will have a significant impact on the existing system and its users during construction, start-up and transition. That is why it is essential for the Kennewick Irrigation District to be in a position to develop these facilities in the way that best fits its current and future operational goals and causes the least disruption to district water users. That is why this legislation requires the Bureau of Reclamation to give the Kennewick Irrigation District substantial control over the planning and design work in this study with the Bureau having the final approval. This approach will ensure continued involvement and support which is vital to the success of this project.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, that this bill has been going through the process on both the Republican and Democrat side. When you talk about water issues in the Pacific Northwest, you tend to polarize people in different approaches.

This bill and what it tries to do is unique in that it has broad support from virtually everybody involved in water issues in the Northwest. From the Bureau of Reclamation to the American Rivers, National Fisheries, U.S. Fish and Wildlife, the Yakima Nation, the Department of Ecology within Washington State, the Northwest Power Planning Council, the Washington State Water Resources Council, the Yakima Basin Joint Board of Irrigation. If we put all of these people together in a room on any other water issues, we would be bound to have polarization. But on this one because it does have the potential of augmenting flows in a river that needs more flows and saving salmon, to me it seems it is the right thing to do.

I urge my colleagues to support this. I want to thank the Committee on Resources for their work and support in getting this bill out of committee in a unanimous, bipartisan way.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Washington I think has properly explained the legislation and the purposes of the legislation and the intent with which it is offered before the House. I do not disagree with that. I, however, will ask Members to vote against this legislation, especially Members of our caucus. I do so not because of the content of the bill but because of the manner in which Democratic Members of the committee and of our caucus have been treated in this committee in terms of the scheduling of legislation that has been offered by Democratic Members of the House. Much of that legislation is essentially noncontroversial but important in those particular districts, and we continue to have a gross disparity both in the treatment in the committee and on the floor of the House.

As I have noticed and the leadership has agreed to, we would ask Members to vote against this legislation until such time as we can get a fairer treatment of pending legislation as we come to the closing days of this session. We have asked continuously, we have sent numerous letters to the chairman asking for hearings on various pieces of legislation. Those hearings have not been granted. Again many of those bills are noncontroversial. Then we are told because they do not have hearings, they cannot come to the floor. Yet we constantly are considering bills from the other side, without hearings on the floor, many of which have not even been heard in the committee.

Last week, 18 Republican bills were scheduled and no House bills, one Senate Democratic bill was scheduled and dealt with. Tomorrow there are scheduled to be 15 Republican bills and six Democratic bills. It is very clear that if we continue this, there will be many members of the Democratic Caucus who have matters pending before the committee and the House that simply

will not be considered before the clock runs out. I think we can do better. We have done better in past sessions of the Congress. I would encourage at least the members of our caucus to vote against the consideration of this and the next bill on the suspension calendar later today when we have a recorded vote on this matter.

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I find it interesting that the gentleman from California urges his Members to vote against a bill which he considers to be a good bill simply because he disagrees with the procedure and the proportion of bills that have been presented on the floor from each party. He calls that a gross disparity. Yesterday, there were five bills considered on this floor that were Republican bills out of the Committee on Resources and four bills that were Democratic bills that were considered on this floor out of the Committee on Resources.

I would point out to the gentleman from California that in this Congress, we have had more than twice as many Democratic bills on this floor under the suspension rule as there were the last time his party controlled this body. More than twice as many. I think that we have been more than fair with the minority party under the suspension rule and the number of bills that come out. In fact, the gentleman recognizes that tomorrow over a third of the bills on the agenda in the Committee on Resources are from the minority party. So while the gentleman raises an issue which is always of concern to the minority party, and rightfully of concern to the minority party, I think he makes a fallacy in his argument that we have not been fair to the minority party. I wish he would reconsider and look at the merits of the bills rather than the procedures by which they get here.

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Just in quick response, I would say that obviously the number of suspension bills is greater because this committee really only does business by suspension and that is obviously their prerogative. I would also say that I appreciate yesterday's schedule. That was negotiated. That was negotiated with notice. However, amendments were offered without notice. Last week it was 16-zip. Obviously we continue to fall further and further behind. I appreciate it is a third of the bills and the gentleman is contending that is fair. We represent half of the Congress, half of the people in the Nation, and we are put in the position now as this session comes to a close as I said before that many members of this caucus had bills that were important to them and their district, not of great controversy, not of great ideological battle and to date

we have not been able to get those matters put before the House.

I would again urge the members of our caucus to oppose the two bills offered by the Committee on Resources. This does not go to other matters on the suspension calendar, because that is the purview of those committees. But with respect to these two matters from the Committee on Resources, I would urge a no vote so that we can get consideration of the members of the caucus's bills that are still pending.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Again I would point out, the gentleman raises an issue which ought to always be of concern from the minority side of the aisle, whoever is in the minority. But again I would point out that bills under consideration by this Congress, 23.4 percent have been Democratic bills. The last time his party controlled this body, 11.8 percent of the bills were Republican bills. I think that we have been more than fair. He said that last week there were 16 bills and none of them were Democratic. I would remind the Member that one of them was from the minority leader in the Senate, Senator DASCHLE. I believe that that is a member of his party.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. If the gentleman will yield, I said that that bill had been dealt with, a Senate bill, a Democratic bill. That does not solve the problem for Members of the House.

□ 1100

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I would just point out that these bills ought to be based on their merits. This is a good bill. The gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) has recognized that this is a good bill, and we ought to consider it and not vote against it simply because he does not like the procedure by which the bills have come to the floor.

Last week we have, as I understand it, in the Committee on Resources asked the minority party for bills they would like to have put on the agenda, no bills were proposed from the minority party to put on the agenda, and, consequently, none were.

As I said earlier, we have five Republican bills tomorrow. A third of the bills that are on the agenda are Democratic bills, and I am glad that the gentleman forwarded those to us so we could consider them tomorrow, and they will be considered in a fair and appropriate manner.

Mr. Speaker, we will not reject them simply because they come from the minority party. We will look at them on the merits of the bill itself, so I would urge the Members not to get into this debate of killing bills simply because they are from one party or the other, but look at the bills on the merits of the bills.

I do not think the people of this country expect us to get into these types of partisan debates about whose bill it is. I expect that they expect us

to look at the merits of the legislation and pass them if they are good bills, and this is a good bill, as admitted by the gentleman from California.

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes to continue this dialogue.

Mr. Speaker, I would say that the speech that the gentleman just gave with respect to this bill and other bills about being considered on the merit is the reason we are asking Members to vote against these bills so that the Democratic Members can have their bills heard on the merits, marked up on the merits and voted up or down on the merits in the full House, that has not happened.

The gentleman can go on and on about 23 percent of the bills. The fact of the matter is we are half of the Congress, and there is a good number of Democratic bills that are languishing for no other reason than I guess that they are Democratic bills. I do not know how that determination is made, but obviously they have not been allowed to be considered on the merits.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope the Members would understand that there is very little else we can do other than to refuse to pass these bills until we get that kind of consideration to protect the rights of the minority Members of the House of Representatives, and I think it is important that we do that.

I think those Members were elected by the same number of people that others were elected by and their bills ought to be considered on the merit. Again, these are not great controversial bills. These are bills that are important to local districts, just as the ones before us today are, but they have not been accorded the same rights and privileges and, therefore, I would ask the members of the caucus and others, if they would like, to join us to vote against these two bills from the Committee on Resources.

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that I am pleased to listen to the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) and his change of heart from being 6 years in the minority, because it did not appear this way when he was in the majority, as I mentioned earlier, and I will continue to mention, that more than twice as many bills of the minority have come up under this Congress than came up the last time his body controlled the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS).

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON) for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I find this argument rather interesting, and I understand in-

side-the-Beltway politics, as far as getting your time on the floor, but on this bill particularly, I just want to make a point to my friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), because I know that he worked very hard on the original bill when it passed back in 1993 and 1994, and in my time in this Congress, I have heard the gentleman from California say it once and I probably dare to say I heard him say it a million times that we need to save the salmon, we cannot wait, we have to do it, time is of the essence on all of these issues.

Mr. Speaker, here we have a situation where we clearly have a potential answer, and the remark I would say is that I do not think the salmon really care about inside-the-Beltway politics, but I do know that this issue has to be dealt with, and this is a proper way to deal with it.

So notwithstanding the request on the other side, I would urge my colleagues to support this bill, because on its merits, from the standpoint of the environment, from the standpoint of saving fish, from the standpoint of expanding water quality, this meets to the "T" with strong bipartisan support.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that this is a good piece of legislation, and I think both sides recognize that this is a good piece of legislation. We can wrap all the rhetoric around this that we would like, we need to pass this bill and do what we can to help save the salmon. I hope the Members will support this.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LINDER). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3986, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING NEED FOR CATALOGING AND MAINTAINING PUBLIC MEMORIALS COMMEMORATING MILITARY CONFLICTS AND SERVICE OF INDIVIDUALS IN ARMED FORCES

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 345) ex-

pressing the sense of the Congress regarding the need for cataloging and maintaining public memorials commemorating military conflicts of the United States and the service of individuals in the Armed Forces.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 345

Whereas there are many thousands of public memorials scattered throughout the United States and abroad that commemorate military conflicts of the United States and the service of individuals in the Armed Forces;

Whereas these memorials have never been comprehensively cataloged;

Whereas many of these memorials suffer from neglect and disrepair, and many have been relocated or stored in facilities where they are unavailable to the public and subject to further neglect and damage;

Whereas there exists a need to collect and centralize information regarding the location, status, and description of these memorials;

Whereas the Federal Government maintains information on memorials only if they are Federally funded; and

Whereas Remembering Veterans Who Earned Their Stripes (a nonprofit corporation established as RVETS, Inc. under the laws of the State of Nevada) has undertaken a self-funded program to catalogue the memorials located in the United States that commemorate military conflicts of the United States and the service of individuals in the Armed Forces, and has already obtained information on more than 7,000 memorials in 50 States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the people of the United States owe a debt of gratitude to veterans for their sacrifices in defending the Nation during times of war and peace;

(2) public memorials that commemorate military conflicts of the United States and the service of individuals in the Armed Forces should be maintained in good condition, so that future generations may know of the burdens borne by these individuals;

(3) Federal, State, and local agencies responsible for the construction and maintenance of these memorials should cooperate in cataloging these memorials and providing the resulting information to the Department of the Interior; and

(4) the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of the National Park Service, should—

(A) collect and maintain information on public memorials that commemorate military conflicts of the United States and the service of individuals in the Armed Forces;

(B) coordinate efforts at collecting and maintaining this information with similar efforts by other entities, such as Remembering Veterans Who Earned Their Stripes (a nonprofit corporation established as RVETS, Inc. under the laws of the State of Nevada); and

(C) make this information available to the public.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN).

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H. Con. Res. 345 introduced by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROGAN)