

2016 at page 149 of the official records of the county of San Joaquin.”

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This concludes the call of the Private Calendar.

HONORING GUS CASTELLANOS, HOST OF “THIS WEEK IN GARDEN GROVE”

(Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Gus Castellanos, creator, executive producer, and host of “This Week in Garden Grove,” a TV news show that is in my district of Garden Grove, California.

In 1985, Gus began working at Channel 3, a local TV station, when city officials decided to start a local cable show. When no one volunteered for the project, Gus happily stepped up to the task. Learning the ins and outs of running a cable news show, Gus quickly crafted a program that would highlight the achievements of the people and city of Garden Grove. In the 10 years the show has been running, Gus has endeared himself to thousands in our community as nearly half the city tunes in each week to his show.

I want to congratulate everyone involved on the 10th anniversary of “This Week in Garden Grove.” But I especially want to thank Gus, who has always been a friend and who has shown that one person can take the initiative to create something that makes an incredibly positive contribution to a community.

HOUSE TO CONSIDER ENERGY BILL

(Mr. DEFAZIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DEFAZIO. Madam Speaker, here it is, the long-awaited, secretly negotiated energy bill, a bill carefully designed to perpetuate our dependence on foreign oil, brokered by national, international, multinational conglomerates which will be subsidized to the tune of \$25 billion by United States taxpayers; the Enron provision to repeal the Public Utility Holding Company Act, guaranteeing a new round of mergers, speculation and rip-offs of electric consumers.

I can see only one benefit in this bill. It is huge, it is heavy, it is made of paper. If we take and send a copy to every American taxpayer and consumer, they can throw it in the wood stove or the fireplace and get a little bit of warmth, but that will be the only benefit they get out of this legislation.

WELCOMING TRADE MINISTERS TO MEETING OF FREE TRADE AREA OF THE AMERICAS

(Mr. SHAW asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHAW. Madam Speaker, as chairman of the Florida congressional delegation, I welcome trade ministers from 34 democratic countries to Miami, Florida, for the latest ministerial meeting of the Free Trade Area of the Americas currently under way. Scheduled for completion in 2005, the FTAA would represent the largest free trade area in the world, encompassing these 34 nations with a combined population of 800 million people. The FTAA will be a linchpin to economic growth, spurring trade and investment to the benefit of United States businesses, labor and consumers alike.

In addition, I urge the selection of Miami as the permanent home of the FTAA secretariat. The Florida delegation remains committed to ensuring an FTAA secretariat in Miami because of the city’s rich cultural and business ties to Latin America. In fact, this House in April of 2000 voted unanimously in support of Miami’s designation. With three international airports and three seaports, Miami is truly the gateway to the Americas. In fact, Enterprise Florida has estimated the creation of 90,000 new jobs and an increase of \$13.6 billion annually to Florida’s gross State product.

Again, I welcome the international community to south Florida, and remain mindful that trade alone is only part of the FTAA equation. The principles underlying a commitment to free trade are the same principles that foster free societies.

International trade is more than just the exchange of goods and services. It is the economic fabric that ties together like-minded Democratic governments and societies.

WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2754, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2004

Mr. REYNOLDS. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 444 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 444

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2754) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gen-

tleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. Madam Speaker, House Resolution 444 is a standard rule that provides for consideration of the conference report to accompany H.R. 2754, the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004. The rule waives all points of order against the conference report and against its consideration. The rule also provides that the conference report will be considered as read.

Madam Speaker, the underlying conference report is the result of hard work and compromise by the energy and water appropriations conference committee. The conference report suggests a strong civil works program with the Army Corps of Engineers. By concentrating \$4.5 billion on the traditional tasks such as flood control, shoreline protection, and navigation, which yield the most economic benefit for the Nation, the bill ensures the highest possible return on taxpayer investment.

Within the agreement, the Department of Energy is provided with \$22 billion. Included in that funding is nearly \$350 million for renewable energy programs and \$393 million for nuclear energy programs. Specific programs funded within the Department are the nuclear energy research initiative of \$11.6 million, \$6.5 million for the nuclear hydrogen initiative, and \$68 million for the advanced fuel cycle initiative. Adequate and needed funding is provided for science programs within the Department, including high-energy physics, nuclear physics, biological and environmental research, fusion energy research, and advanced scientific computing research.

The nuclear waste program continues to be one of our highest environmental priorities and one that is of particular importance to my region. I am also pleased that the conference report provides a total of \$580 million for nuclear waste disposal. Additionally, \$7.6 billion is provided for environmental management cleanup activities, continuing the strong commitment to accelerate cleanup schedules at contaminated sites throughout the country.

□ 1115

This funding is vital in reducing public health and safety risks. The conference report also provides \$8.7 billion for the National Nuclear Security Administration, which includes the nuclear weapons program, defense nuclear nonproliferation, and Naval reactors.

In closing, Madam Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman HOBSON) and all of the distinguished conferees on both sides of the aisle for their hard work and dedication to our Nation’s energy and

water priorities. I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying conference report.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS) for yielding me the time.

Madam Speaker, as my colleague on the Committee on Rules already noted, this rule is typical for a conference report. It is closed and it allows for 1 hour of debate. I should note that I am pleased to rise today to debate the content of the energy and water appropriations bill and only the energy and water appropriations bill. Let us just hope that when Congress adjourns the first session of the 108th Congress, it will have considered 13 such appropriations conference reports.

To Republican leaders who say that considering 13 separate appropriations reports is not possible or just highly unlikely, I note that while the other body remained in session last week, the House took the week off. Where there is a will, Madam Speaker, there is always a way. The will of the majority is clear, and it is not on the side of the American people.

But I should not dwell on this body's work ethic nor shall I attempt to predict or foresee the prospects of this week, however dim they may be. Instead I rise in support of the underlying conference report.

As previously mentioned, the energy and water appropriations bill provides \$27.3 billion in funding for the United States Department of Energy and many of our country's most important water-related projects. The bill appropriates about \$4.5 billion for the Army Corps of Engineers, about \$1 billion for the Bureau of Reclamation, \$22 billion for the Department of Energy, and about \$140 million for independent agencies including the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board.

The report also includes more than \$15 million in funding for the restoration of Florida's Everglades, and I thank all of our colleagues in the House for continuing to support that vital project in the State of Florida. It further contains legislative language ensuring that the State of Florida fulfills its commitment to improve water quality in the Everglades, and I would urge the Florida legislature to undertake its responsibilities most immediately in that regard. Both of these are prime examples of Congress's continuing commitment to the largest environmental cleanup in the history of the world.

I am proud of the fact that several of our colleagues including the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART), and myself are the immediate Representatives for the lake and Everglades area. There are other

Congress persons, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTSCH), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK), the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROSLEHTINEN) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEXLER), all of whom have been directly involved in this historic undertaking. I am proud of the work that Florida's whole congressional delegation has done on a bipartisan basis, particularly the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking member who is not from Florida but has helped us with this to keep this project moving ahead. The subcommittee chairman and the ranking Democrat are to be thanked for their tireless work, and I look forward to working with each of them in the future.

In addition to funding Everglades restoration efforts, the underlying report provides more than \$4.5 million for south Florida beach renourishment and protection projects, \$500,000 for Florida Keys water quality improvements, and more than \$17 million for improving south Florida's ports and waterways.

I am well aware that some of my colleagues on this side of the aisle have severe reservations regarding the report, particularly funding for the Yucca Mountain site, a Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator study, and an anti-environmental rider that affects a fair process already underway in Alaska. Their concerns are real, and, frankly, I am disappointed that we have not better addressed them in the conference report.

Again, Madam Speaker, this is by and large a good report. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, I think one of the obligations of those of us in the minority is to raise objection when we believe that the majority has not handled legislation correctly and to indicate support when we think it has handled things correctly. I want to stipulate that, in this instance, I think the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman HOBSON) has done a wonderful job in seeing to it that the Congress addresses its institutional responsibilities in the areas under the energy and water bill jurisdiction, and I think he has done an excellent job in involving the minority in reaching those decisions. In the process, it has been very apparent that the primary consideration of the chairman of the subcommittee has been the substance of the legislation, and he has tried to take the conference in a direction which defends the public interest irrespective of what either some people in the Congress or some people in the executive branch of government have felt about these issues. So I simply

want to take this time to congratulate the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman HOBSON) and to congratulate the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKEY), the ranking minority member on the subcommittee, because they have handled this bill in a way which, in my view, all appropriations bills should be handled, for that matter. And in the process, while I certainly do not agree with every provision in the bill, I think the process has been reasonable enough and the substance is reasonable enough that this bill merits support on both sides of the aisle, and I am pleased to report that to the House.

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

I take with good note the ranking member of the full Committee on Appropriations on the compliments to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HOBSON) as chair of the subcommittee, and I know that he works hard in those endeavors to achieve that, but it is not easy to get such a fine accolade on behalf of the ranking member, and on behalf of the chair of the subcommittee I will pass along his kind remarks.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise to support the underlying legislation as it relates to energy and water development, and I thank the chair and the ranking member.

Coming from Houston, Texas, having just experienced enormous flooding over the last 48 hours and the tragedy of tornadoes, I recognize the importance of a system of both energy and water that needs to work. I particularly want to note the importance in this legislation of the \$3.45 billion for the Department of Energy science programs that will allow us to deal with climatic concerns that impact the quality of life of our constituents and \$8.7 billion for the National Nuclear Security Administration because I would like to see the responsibility of cleanup be enhanced; \$426 million for renewable energy programs, and as well \$580 million for the nuclear waste program, and most of all, the \$4.6 billion for the Army Corps of Engineers, drastically needed in a community like mine that is 50 feet under sea level. So I am publicly asking for assistance from the Army Corps of Engineers as I have to return to Houston today because of several of my community sites have been destroyed, and I am going to seek help for them.

As I mentioned, this is an important question in Houston. In fact, the recent mayoral campaign was based upon who can deal with flooding. So this strikes at the heart of our community and its survival. I also want to note that we will be bringing up H.R. 6, the Energy Policy Act of 2003. Let me note that I

am grateful for the focus of doing energy research for both renewables, but also alternatives, and although it was a vigorous debate, I want to say to my energy friends, the deletion of ANWR does not mean that we cannot be domestically sufficient, that we cannot resources to invest in domestic energy resources, particularly in the Gulf where the gentleman from Texas (Mr. LAMPSON) and I offered an amendment to determine the amount of resources in the Gulf off the shores of Louisiana and Florida, in particular, and to do more reinvigorated drilling in that area where it is well assured that it can be done in a very scientific and environmentally safe area. Even though there are issues with the Energy Policy Act that I would be concerned about, as a Texan, I think it is vital that we become more independent as it relates to energy resources, that we begin to look at alternatives, begin to look at incentives for alternative motor vehicles and the \$1.8 billion for the electric power industry. My colleagues can be assured, to my friends in Texas, that we will never be totally independent of oil and natural gas of which we have much in this area. So this Energy Policy Act, that is, H.R. 6, should at least be considered a first step where we have come together, although sometimes in controversy, to put on the table a real energy agenda and policy for the 21st century and for this country. It is long overdue, and as someone who has practiced oil and gas law since about 1976, I can tell the Members that we will be better off having a road map that we can follow and that we can work with environmentalists and work with independents, small energy companies, who can be the backbone of an energy policy in this Nation.

So, Madam Speaker, I rise to support H.R. 2754 and the rule, as well as H.R. 6.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS).

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule, yet with some strong reservations also regarding final passage of the Energy and Water Appropriations Conference Report. But before I explain my reservation, I would like to recognize the many efforts of the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman HOBSON), the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKEY), ranking member, and other hardworking Members and their staffs who have made, over the past year, an effort to work with the Nevada delegation to address our serious concerns with the Yucca Mountain project.

For example, during initial House floor consideration of the energy and water bill this past July, the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman HOBSON) was gracious enough to grant the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. PORTER) and I a colloquy on the issue of early ac-

ceptance of spent nuclear fuel at Yucca Mountain. In response to our concern, the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman HOBSON) agreed not only to strip the early acceptance language from the bill, but also to dedicate \$4 million in additional Federal spending to bolster security at our Nation's nuclear power stations. I am heartened by the gentleman from Ohio's (Chairman HOBSON) willingness to ensure that the early acceptance of spent nuclear language did not remain through the conference on this measure.

However, the conference report still dedicates \$580 million in taxpayers' dollars to the Yucca Mountain project, in my opinion, a fatally flawed Federal boondoggle that a majority of Nevadans, millions of Americans, and the Nevada Congressional Delegation strongly opposes.

Madam Speaker, I will vote yes on this rule; however, I will remain opposed to frivolously spending taxpayers' dollars and will never give up the fight against wasteful Yucca Mountain project spending.

□ 1130

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

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

The previous question is ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam 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, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BONILLA. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the motion to go to conference on H.R. 2673, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2673, AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2004

Mr. BONILLA. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2673) making appropriations for Agriculture,

Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. OBEY moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill, H.R. 2673, be instructed to insist on the House position on prescription drug importation in Section 749 of the House-passed bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 8 minutes.

Madam Speaker, to the uninitiated, people might think that this is a motion that deals with the agriculture appropriations bill. But, in fact, what is happening today is that conferees are being appointed, ostensibly, to deal with the agriculture appropriations bill but, in fact, the agriculture appropriation will then become the vehicle into which all other appropriation bills that have not yet passed the Congress will be dumped, producing one of those glorious omnibus appropriation bills that the Congress deals with at the end of the session when it has not been able to get its work done. So Members can expect to see this conference come back containing not only the material that is appropriate to the agriculture bill, but if the majority has its way, they can expect that the conference report will also contain the State, Justice, and Commerce appropriation, the Labor, Health, and Human Services appropriation, perhaps the VA-HUD appropriation, the D.C. appropriation, and perhaps several others. On this side of the aisle, we do not believe that those bills should be considered together. We believe that each of them should stand on their own merits.

We have another complicating factor, because this legislation will be used by the majority to try and pave the way for passage of its ill-conceived and misbegotten Medicare, so-called Medicare Reform Act. Now, that bill started as an effort to provide a prescription drug benefit for our senior citizens under Medicare. Instead, what is being produced on that score is a very weak, badly-shredded, partial benefit that does not even begin until years down the road, and the enticement of that prescription drug bill or that prescription drug coverage, I should say, is