

Putnam	Schwarz (MI)	Thompson (MS)
Radanovich	Scott (GA)	Thornberry
Rahall	Scott (VA)	Tiahrt
Ramstad	Sensenbrenner	Tiberi
Rangel	Serrano	Tierney
Regula	Sessions	Towns
Rehberg	Shadegg	Udall (CO)
Reichert	Shaw	Udall (NM)
Renzi	Shays	Upton
Reyes	Sherman	Van Hollen
Reynolds	Sherwood	Velázquez
Rogers (AL)	Shimkus	Visclosky
Rogers (KY)	Shuster	Walden (OR)
Rogers (MI)	Simmons	Wamp
Rohrabacher	Simpson	Wasserman
Ros-Lehtinen	Skelton	Schultz
Ross	Slaughter	Waters
Rothman	Smith (NJ)	Watson
Roybal-Allard	Smith (TX)	Watt
Royce	Smith (WA)	Waxman
Ruppersberger	Snyder	Weiner
Rush	Sodrel	Weldon (FL)
Ryan (OH)	Souder	Weldon (PA)
Ryan (WI)	Spratt	Weller
Ryun (KS)	Stark	Westmoreland
Sabo	Stearns	Wexler
Salazar	Stupak	Whitfield
Sánchez, Linda	Sullivan	Wicker
T.	Tancredo	Wilson (NM)
Sanchez, Loretta	Tanner	Wilson (SC)
Sanders	Tauscher	Wolf
Saxton	Taylor (MS)	Woolsey
Schakowsky	Taylor (NC)	Wu
Schiff	Terry	Wynn
Schmidt	Thomas	Young (AK)
Schwartz (PA)	Thompson (CA)	

The message also announced that the Senate concurs in the amendments of the House to the text and title of the bill (S. 1713) "An Act to make amendments to the Iran Nonproliferation Act of 2000 related to International Space Station payments."

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include tabular and extraneous material on the conference report to accompany H.R. 2419.

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

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2419, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 539, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 2419) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 539, the conference report is considered read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of November 7, 2005, at page H9813.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HOBSON) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VIS-CLOSKY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HOBSON).

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

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

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present to the House today the conference report on H.R. 2419, the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2006.

The amount of funding included in the Energy and Water conference agreement is \$30.5 billion. This represents an increase of \$663 million over the enacted level for fiscal year 2005, including supplementals and approximately \$748 million over the budget requests. Much of this increase is dedicated to the Civil Works program of the Corps of Engineers with the Corps receiving approximately \$1 billion over the budget request.

The recent hurricanes have taught us a hard lesson about the dangers of neglecting the water resources infrastructure in this country. We have to make sure we provide sufficient funds to address the most pressing water resource needs in this country, and we have to make sure that the Corps follows the spending guides provided by Congress in executing those projects.

We have focused on funding on the most important flood control, navigation and dam safety projects and on completing projects that are already under way. That means that our conference report includes only a limited number of new starts and project authorizations.

Our conference agreement imposes stricter controls on the Corps over reprogrammings and continuing contracts. Within the Department of Energy, our conference agreement provides health funding levels for the major DOE programs. We advance initiatives on the recycling of spent nuclear fuel and on the Reliable Replacement Warhead, and we keep critical projects such as the Yucca Mountain Repository and the National Ignition Facility and the Mixed Oxide Fuel Fabrication Facility moving forward.

I really want to thank all my colleagues on the Energy and Water Subcommittee and in the Senate. I especially want to extend my appreciation to my ranking member and partner in this venture, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VIS-CLOSKY). He has been an exceptional partner in this effort, and I believe we are both proud of this very bipartisan bill. I also want to thank the staff on both sides of the aisle for their outstanding work this past year.

I urge the unanimous support of the House for the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present to the House today the conference report on H.R. 2419, the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2006.

The total amount of funding included in the Energy and Water conference agreement is \$30.5 billion. This represents an increase of \$663 million over the enacted level for fiscal year 2005, including supplementals, and approximately \$748 million over the budget request.

Title I of this conference report provides funding for the Civil Works program of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and for the Corps' Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program. The conference agreement provides the Corps with \$5.4 billion in fiscal year 2006, slightly below the current year when last year's emergency supplemental appropriations are considered, but approximately \$1 billion over the budget request.

The recent hurricanes in September and October should serve as a long-overdue wakeup call to both Congress and the Corps of Engineers about the importance of water resources infrastructure in this country. We have to make sure that we provide sufficient funds to address the most pressing water resource needs in this country, and we have to make sure that the Corps follows the spending guidance provided by Congress. We have to fund the right projects, we have to make sure the Corps completes those projects in a timely manner, and we have to make sure those projects perform as intended.

To that end, our top priority in this conference was to provide additional funding for essential water projects around the country. Of the additional \$749 million that was available to our conference over the amount requested by the Administration, we dedicated \$634 million of that increase to the Corps of Engineers.

NOT VOTING—21

Ackerman	Emanuel	Norwood
Berman	Fossella	Solis
Boswell	Gonzalez	Strickland
Brown-Waite,	Hastings (FL)	Sweeney
Ginny	Jones (OH)	Turner
Conaway	Kilpatrick (MI)	Walsh
Davis (FL)	Millender	Young (FL)
Davis, Jo Ann	McDonald	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised that 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1238

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 579 on H. Res. 540 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 2490. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 442 West Hamilton Street, Allentown, Pennsylvania, as the "Mayor Joseph S. Daddona Memorial Post Office".

H.R. 3339. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2061 South Park Avenue in Buffalo, New York, as the "James T. Molloy Post Office Building".

The message also announced that the Senate has passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 797. An act to amend the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996 and other Acts to improve housing programs for Indians.

As we have done in the last several fiscal years, we have attempted to focus those resources on the Nation's top water resources priorities. That means that we apply funds to projects that can be completed in fiscal year 2006. We asked the Corps to use its professional engineering judgment to provide us with a list of the top ten priority flood control needs around the country, and a list of the top ten navigation infrastructure needs as well. Unfortunately, the Corps was unable to provide us with anything other than the list of projects contained in the budget request, so we generally funded those critical flood control and navigation projects at the full amount of the request.

As in previous years, we also limit the number of new starts and the number of project authorizations contained in this conference agreement. However, the most significant change is not in the funding levels or the individual projects, but rather in the way the Corps manages those funds and executes those projects. The Corps has operated its Civil Works program with a large amount of flexibility in the past, with the freedom to move funding around from project to project. Unfortunately, that practice got out of hand, to where the Corps was executing 20,000 reprogrammings a year for a workload of only 2,000 projects. That is not sound financial management.

The problem was compounded by the Corps' excessive reliance on continuing contracts, whereby the Corps can commit the Federal government to multi-year contracts in advance of having sufficient appropriations in hand. These two practices, reprogrammings and continuing contracts, meant that the Corps was playing a shell game with the funding we appropriated, moving money around from project to project to cover obligations they had made in excess of available appropriations.

Our conference agreement brings that practice to an end, by imposing stricter controls over reprogrammings and continuing contracts. We put a lot of effort into negotiating sound allocations for water projects, and we expect the Corps to abide by those allocations in the future.

Funding for Title II of the bill, which includes the Central Utah Project Completion Account and the programs of the Bureau of Reclamation, is \$1.065 billion, \$47 million above the amount appropriated last year and \$114 million above the budget request.

Total funding for Title III, the Department of Energy is \$24.29 billion, \$129 million above fiscal year 2005 and \$77 million below the budget request.

Our conference agreement provides healthy funding levels for the major Department of Energy programs. Energy Supply and Conservation is funded at \$1.83 billion, an increase of \$24 million over the current year and \$81 million over the request. This amount includes significant increases in weatherization assistance and research on nuclear energy and electricity transmission and distribution. Fossil Energy research and development programs are funded at \$598 million, an increase of \$107 million over the request. This amount includes \$18 million for FutureGen and \$50 million for the Clean Coal Power Initiative.

Non-defense environmental cleanup activities are funded at \$353 million, an increase of \$3.3 million over the request. The Uranium

Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund receives \$562.3 million, an increase of \$67 million over the current year and a decrease of \$29 million below the request. Defense Environmental Cleanup programs are funded at \$6.19 billion, an increase of \$177 million over the request. Of this amount, \$157.4 million represents the cleanup of facilities of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA), initially proposed in the budget request for transfer from Environmental Management to the NNSA. The conference report provides \$526 million for the Hanford Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant, a decrease of \$100 million from the request.

The conference agreement provides \$3.633 billion for the DOE Office of Science, an increase of \$33 million over the current year and \$170 million over the request. This amount includes an additional \$30 million for advanced scientific computing, to accelerate the development of a leadership-class supercomputer for scientific applications.

For nuclear waste disposal activities, the conference agreement provides a total of \$500 million, including \$450 million for work on the Yucca Mountain repository and \$50 million to initiate planning and a competitive site selection process for one or more integrated spent fuel recycling facilities. It is essential to continue development of the Yucca Mountain repository, but it is also essential to pursue alternative approaches to spent nuclear fuel so that we do not have to develop eight more repositories by the end of this century.

The conference agreement provides a total of \$9.2 billion for the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA), an increase of \$217 million over the current year but a decrease of \$201 million from the request. This decrease compared to the request results largely from the cleanup responsibilities for NNSA sites and facilities, which were proposed in the budget request for transfer to the NNSA but were retained in Environmental Management in the conference agreement.

The conference agreement does not include funding for the Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator but provides significant increases for the development of the Reliable Replacement Warhead. Additional resources are provided to accelerate the consolidation of special nuclear materials into a smaller number of secure sites, and to accelerate dismantlement of obsolete nuclear weapons. The conference agreement includes the requested amount of funding for construction of the National Ignition Facility.

Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation activities are funded at \$1.6 billion, an increase of \$138 million over the current year and \$6 million below the request. This amount includes sufficient funds for the Mixed Oxide Fuel Fabrication Facility at Savannah River to proceed into construction in fiscal year 2006.

Funding for Title IV, Independent Agencies, is \$271.1 million, a decrease of \$18.2 million from last year and an increase of \$36.9 million above the budget request. We have funded the Appalachian Regional Commission at \$65.5 million, the same as the request. The Delta Regional Authority is funded at \$12 million, an increase of \$6 million over the request and over the current year. The conference agreement provides \$50 million for the Denali Commission, a decrease of \$16 million below the current year and \$47 million over the

budget request. The conference agreement provides \$734 million for salaries and expenses of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC), an increase of \$77 million over the current year and \$41 million over the request. This additional budget authority is provided for NRC work on licensing new reactors and for increased security assessments.

I want to thank my Senate counterpart, Chairman PETE DOMENICI, and his ranking minority Member, Senator HARRY REID, for their hard work during this conference. I especially want to extend my appreciation to my ranking member, the Honorable PETE VISCLOSKEY of Indiana, who was at my side during this entire process. I truly value his support and advice, and that of all the Members of our Energy and Water Subcommittee. I believe we are all proud of this bipartisan product.

Mr. Speaker, before I conclude I would also like to thank the staff for their help in shepherding this bill through the House and through conference with the Senate. The Subcommittee staff includes Kevin Cook, John Blazey, Scott Burnison, Terry Tyborowski, Tracy LaTurner, and our detailee from the Corps of Engineers, Taunja Berquam. I also want to thank Kenny Kraft of my staff, and Dixon Butler of the minority staff, and Peder Maarbjerg and Felicia Kirksey of Mr. VISCLOSKEY's staff.

I urge the unanimous support of the House for adoption of this conference report.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I recommend that all Members join me in supporting this conference agreement. Its presentation has been bipartisan, and the chairman has been fair throughout his preparation. I would also join the chairman in adding my appreciation to the staff led on the majority side by Kevin Cook. He is joined by Terry Tyborowski, John Blazey, Scott Burnison and Tracy LaTurner. They are a very strong team.

On the minority staff, I would like to thank Dixon Butler. This year we have two of the finest detailees ever from the Army Corps, Taunja Berquam helping with the majority and Felicia Kirksey helping with the minority. I would also thank Kenny Kraft on Chairman HOBSON's staff as well as Peder Maarbjerg on mine.

Conference negotiations this year were protracted and their favorable resolution required both patience and firmness in pushing for positive reforms of the Corps of Engineers management practices.

I want to thank Chairman LEWIS as well as Ranking Member OBEY for their steadfast support in getting this done.

As I said in my remarks earlier this year, Chairman HOBSON has led our subcommittee to take a long-term perspective on a number of important issues, and this is resulting in some profound and positive changes, including saner and safer policies on nuclear weapons, insistence on 5-year planning from the Corps of Engineers, Bureau of Reclamation, and the Department of

Energy; a focus on completing projects in management reforms, particularly at the Corps. On this side of the aisle I am pleased to have had the opportunity to support my chairman on these issues.

□ 1245

The conferees were given an allocation of \$749 million larger than was available when the House developed its bill back in the spring. The tragic events that resulted from the hurricanes demonstrated that our Nation has crying needs in the areas served by the program of the corps, and we have devoted the increased funds to meet these needs along the Gulf of Mexico and across the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for my colleagues' support of this conference agreement.

Mr. Speaker, I recommend that all members join me in supporting this conference agreement. Its preparation has been bipartisan and the Chairman has been fair throughout its preparation. I would add my appreciation to the staff led on the majority side by Kevin Cook. He is joined by Terry Tyborowski, John Blazey, Scott Burnison, and Tracy LaTurner. They are a strong team. On the minority staff, I would thank Dixon Butler. This year we have two of the finest detailees ever from the Army Corps: Taunja Berquam helping the majority and Felicia Kirksey helping the minority. I would also thank Kenny Kraft on Chairman HOBSON's staff and Peder Maarbjerg on my staff.

Conference negotiations this year were protracted and their favorable resolution required both patience and firmness in pushing for positive reforms of the Corps of Engineers management practices. I want to thank Chairman LEWIS and Ranking Member OBEY for their steadfast support in getting this done.

As I said in remarks earlier in the year, Chairman HOBSON has led our subcommittee to take a long-term perspective on a number of important issues and this is resulting in some profound and positive changes, including saner and safer policies on nuclear weapons, insistence on 5-year planning from the Corps of Engineers, Bureau of Reclamation, and Department of Energy, a focus on completing projects, and management reforms, particularly at the Corps. On this side of the aisle, I am pleased to have had the opportunity to support him on these issues.

The conferees were given an allocation \$749 million larger than was available when the House developed its bill back in the Spring. The tragic events that resulted from hurricanes Katrina and Rita demonstrated that our Nation has crying needs in the areas served by the programs of the Corps of Engineers, and we have devoted the increased funds to meeting these needs both along the Gulf of Mexico and across the Nation.

The Energy and Water Development conference agreement had to work within the constraints that started with the President's budget request and its inadequate commitment of resources to the programs of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. The events of this year amply demonstrated the latent threats to our Nation from natural disasters and the failure of inadequate manmade structures. The Congress is doing the right thing in increasing spending on the Corps in FY 2006 by more

than \$1 billion over the request. Hopefully the Administration will now understand the level of investment needed and submit a budget for FY 2007 that sustains and extends this investment level for the water infrastructure of our Nation.

An additional top priority within the Energy and Water appropriations is nuclear non-proliferation. While the overall level included in the conference agreement is slightly below the request, considerable funds have been shifted from a construction project with major unspent balances to support of high priority programs to help Russia protect and control its nuclear weapons material. The Russian side has signaled strong willingness in this area, and bureaucratic obstacles in the U.S. have been removed. We must seize this opportunity for the increased safety of us all.

Alas, this conference agreement is limited by an overall constraint forced by allocation.

Four fifths of the Energy and Water funding goes to the Department of Energy, but energy research, development and demonstration is only 10% of the Department. The cost of gasoline, natural gas, and home heating oil have exploded over the past 18 months. Only the Federal Government can invest in the long-term R&D needed and stimulate demonstration and deployment of new technologies through partnerships with the private sector.

When our Nation faced high costs and uncertain supplies for energy in the mid-1970s, President Carter and Congress, made major investments in energy conservation and renewable energy along with unconventional sources of fossil fuels were funded. A comparable response today would require quadrupling our support for renewable energy and doubling our support for conservation R&D at DOE. As a start, Democrats advocated for creation of an energy independence fund of one-quarter billion dollars of new money at DOE at the time the House considered the Energy and Water appropriations bill.

The prosperity of our Nation is built in part on preeminence in almost all areas of fundamental science research. The Department of Energy is the primary supporter of physical science research and provides state-of-the-art user facilities available to investigators from government, academia, and industry.

The constraints on this conference agreement have allowed only one area of research and user support to be increased above the request—high performance computing. This is an area where the United States invented the field and long held undisputed leadership in the world. Several years ago, that leadership was challenged by Japan with their development of the Earth Simulator. For three years in a row, the Congress has had to increase support substantially in this area to sustain momentum in reachieving U.S. leadership.

The conference agreement provides no increased support for the operations of DOE user facilities. Construction of these facilities represents a major investment. Before the recent run-up in energy prices, it was estimated that an additional \$95 million was required to operate these facilities at full capacity. Operation of these facilities is energy intensive, and the FY 2006 operating levels are likely to be smaller than planned.

Within the constraints of the conference allocation, the Energy and Water conferees have made good choices for our Nation. I ask for support for this measure.

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

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield for the purpose of making a unanimous consent request to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT).

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

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report.

I rise in support of this bill, and I want to thank Chairman HOBSON for working on behalf of the civilian research and development programs of the Department of Energy. Needless to say, I wish the bill could have been even kinder to those programs, but I know that Chairman HOBSON pressed on their behalf.

I want, though, to bring attention to one concern I have about the conference report. The conferees dropped House language preventing an agreement on ITER, the international fusion project, from being finalized before March 1. This language, which I offered and the House approved by voice vote, was designed to prevent the U.S. from moving ahead with ITER until we had a consensus on how to finance the billion-dollar U.S. contribution.

You'd think that would just be common sense in this period of fiscal austerity when we are talking about cutting programs that Americans rely on. But the House language has been replaced by weak report language calling for a study by the Government Accountability Office.

I understand why, in the give and take of conference negotiations, my provision may have had to go away. But the issue is not going to go away.

I want to make clear to everyone concerned that I will do everything in my power to kill the ITER project if there is not an agreement by March that the domestic fusion program has to be scaled back to pay for ITER.

I am not going to allow the U.S. to enter into an international commitment that it cannot afford. I would rather kill the ITER project.

The fusion community will have to be realistic. It cannot have all its current projects and ITER. And it will not.

This year's appropriation already makes clear why this is so. Just about every area of activity under the DOE Office of Science sees a cut, especially if earmarks are excluded, except Fusion Energy Sciences. Fusion science is important and may be a key to our energy future, but it cannot consume the entire budget of the Office of Science. And that is what will happen if the domestic program is held harmless while ITER is constructed.

So I look forward to working with my colleagues on Appropriations and all my colleagues to make sure that the U.S. handles its international commitments responsibly. No one should misread what happened in this conference. The ITER program is in grave danger, and I guarantee you that it will not be completed with U.S. participation unless there is a more realistic plan to fund it.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield for the purpose of making a unanimous consent request to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN).

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report.

First, let me commend Chairman DAVE HOBSON and Ranking Member PETE VISCLOSKY for their hard work on this Conference report.

In a year of fiscal constraint, extraordinary costs due to natural disasters, they have produced an excellent bill that addresses our national priorities and a wide range of Federal programs, including such diverse matters as flood control, navigation improvements, environmental restoration, nuclear waste disposal, advanced scientific research, maintenance of our nuclear stockpile, and nuclear non-proliferation.

KATRINA

No policy discussion about the Corps of Engineers can take place in this body without the looming shadow of Hurricane Katrina and its huge devastation.

This historic storm—encompassing 90,000 square miles in Louisiana, Mississippi and Alabama—raised issues that the Corps and the Congress must consider in the months ahead as we look to rebuild the Gulf Region and protect others susceptible to same kind of natural disaster.

Let's be blunt. A Katrina could—and will—happen again and we must heed its "lessons learned."

In the near term, we must be a careful steward of the taxpayers' dollars.

In the long—term, Congress needs to revisit how we prioritize ongoing Corps water infrastructure projects in a way that allows flood control, navigation, beach erosion to be completed once they are begun.

THE COAST

The Army Corps of Engineers keeps our waterways open for business, prevents our communities from flooding and our beaches from eroding.

In New Jersey alone, the Army Corps budget helps keep the 127 miles of New Jersey coastline open to visitors from across the country. Serving as one of New Jersey's greatest attractions, our beaches generate over 30 billion dollars for our State's economy each year, while providing over 800,000 people with jobs. This bill provides \$71 million dollars for beach preservation and restoration.

PORT

One of the most important Army Corps projects is the Port of New York and New Jersey Harbor Deepening. For the third year in a row, President Bush's budget message recognized the dredging of this port as a national priority and it called for it to be one of five national navigational projects.

It goes without saying that projects like the Port drive our national economy. The Port is a national asset. As the largest port in the northeast and a leading job center for the New Jersey/New York Metropolitan Region, we must continue to focus our efforts on deepening its major navigation channels so that the port is able to meet the 21st Century needs of our economy.

FLOODS

Of course, the importance of the Army Corps budget is not limited to just navigational projects. In an effort to protect New Jerseyans, their homes, and their businesses from the destruction and devastation of flooding, this bill also provides the framework and the funding to purchase wetlands for natural storage areas, and to work with the local governments across northern New Jersey to develop long-term solutions to re-occurring

floods. In New Jersey this means that important corps initiatives like the Jackson Brook Flood Control project in my own district and the ongoing acquisition of wetlands critical for the preservation of flood storage areas, among several other critical local projects have the funding to remain on track.

ENERGY

Mr. Speaker, our country continues to benefit from advances in science, technology and engineering. We've discovered the potential for fusion energy, advanced renewable energy, and improved energy efficiency. Through cutting edge research and the development of these programs at the U.S. Department of Energy, we are rapidly advancing our scientific knowledge.

Mr. Speaker, I have long supported funding for renewable energy sources. The Committee's investment of \$1.2 billion in renewable energy resources will be integral to creating alternative energy solutions for our nation. The Department of Energy is pursuing other new technologies to meet future energy and environmental needs. These technologies will change how we use and produce energy.

I am pleased that year after year this Committee continues to recognize the incredible potential of fusion energy by providing a \$30 million increase in funding for a total of \$296 million in funding for the program—which will advance the vital work of the domestic fusion community to prosper at sites such as New Jersey's Princeton Plasma Physics Laboratory.

The money in this bill for energy efficiency and renewable energy will fund continuing improvements in technology for programs I strongly support like hydro-electricity, wind and solar power. Since FY2000, the U.S. Congress, through this committee has invested over \$3 billion in renewable energy.

The Chairman and his staff have worked extremely hard to craft a good bill. Kevin Cook and his team deserve a lot of credit. For all of these reasons, I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield for the purpose of making a unanimous consent request to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GILLMOR).

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

Mr. GILLMOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank Chairman HOBSON and Ranking Member VISCLOSKY for their diligent efforts in bringing the Energy and Water Appropriations bill to the floor.

This legislation contains many important provisions for our Nation, including significant funding for dealing with spent nuclear fuel, including funding for the Yucca Mountain repository. I want to thank the chairman for being a leader in nuclear issues, and for moving forward aggressively to deal with the spent fuel issue. Regarding Yucca Mountain specifically, the funding level is lower than the \$651 million requested by the House Energy and Water Appropriations Subcommittee, but I understand this lower funding is a result of some challenges facing the project. With nuclear waste being stored at approximately 100 sites around the Nation, it is important to move to a central repository as soon as feasible.

I want to continue to see that this project moves forward and I look forward to when the

Energy and Commerce Committee holds oversight hearings to ascertain the project's recent progress as well as DOE's plan for moving ahead at Yucca Mountain. I urge all of my colleagues to vote for this very important legislation.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. REHBERG), a committee member.

Mr. REHBERG. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HOBSON) for his hard work and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) as well.

The current energy crisis has caused us to refocus on future energy needs, how we can become more efficient and produce more energy from the same resources with less pollution.

Funds have been correctly appropriated in this bill to research initiatives that will speed up the deployment of hydrogen fuel cells, coal gasification technologies, advanced turbine research, next generation fuels, and environmental controls.

In this bill, you will see Future Gen. Future Gen is a Department of Energy collaboration with private industry to develop a near-zero emissions power plant. Unlike traditional coal-fueled generation facilities, sulfur and mercury will be removed before combustion, and the carbon dioxide will be safely sequestered underground, making Future Gen the most environmentally friendly coal-fired generation facility in the world.

The success of this venture requires government support to cost-share substantial private investments. This conference report sends a powerful message that the United States is prepared to move forward and construct such a facility.

I support these efforts and would like to again thank Chairman HOBSON and Ranking Member VISCLOSKY, and I look forward to seeing these research initiatives becoming a reality.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, I was one of 416 Members of this body who voted back in May for a different and better energy and water appropriations bill.

But then a funny thing happened on the way to the conference committee. Although the House- and Senate-passed bills both funded one of this Nation's most important analytical research projects, the Relativistic Heavy Ion Collider, which is operated by the Department of Energy's world-class Brookhaven National Laboratory, which I am very proud to represent, somehow this breakthrough research was cut dramatically in conference.

As a result, the RHIC, as it is known, could lay dormant, unused, for 47 weeks out of the year. Why is this project so important? It is designed to recreate conditions of the Big Bang

from which the universe was born and life created.

The Federal Government has already invested more than \$1 billion, that is \$1 billion, in the construction of this facility; and it simply makes no sense to let such an investment go unused. I do not know about my colleagues, but this is like buying a Porsche and letting it sit in your driveway because you will not buy the gas.

I ask, is there a more important basic research project in progress anywhere else in the country? How did we justify disinvesting in this project, as well as BNL's research into translational neuroimaging and functional nanomaterials?

Could this be an example of the kind of cuts we are beginning to witness as a result of the misguided priority of the budget reconciliation legislation?

That said, I am deeply grateful for the support of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HOBSON), the chairman of the subcommittee, who visited the lab earlier this year, and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), the ranking member, who has consistently advocated this research.

I look forward to their continued support and working with them to restore this funding and protect the jobs at BNL, some 200 of which might be lost, ideally within these first few months of fiscal year 2006, and upon their approval of reprogramming existing funds within the Department of Energy.

Until that happens, Mr. Speaker, I, therefore, must reluctantly oppose this conference report.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield for the purpose of making a unanimous consent request to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON).

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this conference report.

Once again this year, the bill before us is the result of a bi-partisan atmosphere in the Energy and Water Subcommittee that is fostered by Chairman HOBSON and his ranking member—Mr. VISCLOSKY. I want to thank both of them for the manner in which they approach the many issues before the committee and for producing a bill that will pass today with little or no opposition.

First, the Energy and Water bill begins a new chapter in the history of the Army Corps of Engineers which will lead to better budgeting, more accountability, and the completion of high-priority projects in a quicker timeframe.

I want to commend Chairman HOBSON for his insistence on reforms to the Corps budgeting process and for demanding greater accountability from the Corps to Congress and the American people.

Second, the bill makes tremendous investments in our nation's science and energy-related programs. Our National Laboratories, under this bill, will continue and expand their cutting edge work on the many pressing scientific challenges facing our Nation. Perhaps even more important in a time of high energy

prices, this bill will expand our Nation's efforts to become less dependent on foreign sources of energy.

For my home state of Idaho, this bill will provide a boost to the Idaho National Laboratory's ongoing work to design and build a new generation of nuclear reactors, close the nuclear fuel cycle, protect our Nation's critical infrastructure from cyber-based attacks, and secure radioactive nuclear materials from those who would do us harm.

Finally, this bill continues our Nation's efforts to establish a long-term repository for spent nuclear fuel and high-level nuclear waste at Yucca Mountain. While the Yucca Mountain funding in the bill represents an overall decrease from last year, it still provides \$500 million to move the project forward toward a license application and construction.

I'm committed to seeing Yucca Mountain finalized and I know Chairman HOBSON is as well. I remain hopeful that the current challenges facing the program will soon be overcome and that an aggressive schedule for completion of the project can be adopted in the very near future.

In closing, I want to again recognize the bipartisan manner in which this bill was written and acknowledge the tremendous work of all of the staff on the Subcommittee.

I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield for the purpose of making a unanimous consent request to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM).

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

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman and I rise in support of the conference report.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS).

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the Department of Energy has been working for the past year on answering questions about challenges on construction of the waste treatment plant at the Hanford clean-up site, with only limited information being shared with Congress, the State of Washington, or the local community.

Just yesterday, the Department officially notified Congress that the costs of constructing the waste treatment plant have increased by more than 25 percent.

We were not told what caused the increase, what the Department's planned path forward is for the waste treatment plant, or what the ultimate cost and completion date will be. We know only that costs have increased by over 25 percent, and more information is promised in the summer of next year.

Waiting until next summer for answers is simply not acceptable to me. Is that also the view of the chairman?

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, it is my view. My visit to Hanford last year

gave me a real appreciation for the need to treat the tank wastes at Hanford and protect the Columbia River from the groundwater contamination.

The Department must be more forthcoming with information on its plans for the waste treatment plant, and this conference agreement requires a report on their actions to date by December 1 and quarterly reports beginning on January 1.

So the gentleman has my assurance that we are on this; and, frankly, had I not visited and seen the problem firsthand, I might not have been as active and as strong on this; but I want to assure the gentleman and his State that we are going to be on top of this.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, this reporting requirement, in my mind, is fully justified and delivers a strong message that the Department must be more direct, open, and prompt in sharing details on its path forward for the waste treatment plant. I want to thank the gentleman for his continued commitment to the environmental management program within the Department of Energy.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield for the purpose of making a unanimous consent request to the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE).

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

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my strong support for this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Energy and Water Development rule/conference report on the floor today and urge my colleagues support it.

The Energy and Water Development Appropriations bill for fiscal year 2006 total \$30.5 billion.

Title I of the bill provides \$5.4 billion for the programs of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, an increase of \$57 million above the fiscal year 2005 enacted level and \$1.2 billion over the budget request.

Title II provides \$1.07 billion for the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Reclamation, an increase of \$113.9 million above the budget request. The committee recommended \$1.03 billion for the Bureau of Reclamation.

Title III provides \$24.2 billion for the Department of Energy, DOE, a decrease of \$129 million from fiscal year 2005 and \$76 million less than the budget request. All Department of Energy programs are funded within this bill. The committee funds new initiatives on the consolidation of special nuclear materials, the interim storage and integrated recycling of spent nuclear fuel, and on creating a sustainable nuclear stockpile and the DOE complex necessary to support that stockpile.

CALIFORNIA SPECIFIC FUNDING

Over \$300 million for Corps projects in California. These include flood control, water supply and navigation.

Over \$200 million for Bureau of Reclamation projects in California. These include water supply, water reuse, and desalination.

\$37 million for CALFED projects. The committee has redirected the funding for higher

priority projects that will support the implementation of the CALFED program. The funded projects will produce increased sources of water for the State of California, otherwise known as “firm yield” projects, improve drinking water quality, and improve water delivery flexibility.

\$6 million for Sacramento Area water conservation projects.

\$1 million for an economic analysis update for Auburn Dam.

\$2 million for the American River Pump Station.

\$1 million for the El Dorado Irrigation District Temperature Control Device.

\$1 million for the Sacramento River diversion Study.

\$40 million for the American River flood control projects, including \$10 million for a permanent bridge below Folsom Dam.

The bill fully funded the President’s request for the National Ignition Facility, the premier U.S. facility for inertial confinement fusion, and the Stanford Linear Accelerator Center, a high energy physics lab. High energy physics is the cornerstone of our understanding of the physical universe. These two outstanding California facilities are on the cutting edge of research.

The bill also provides continued funding for Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory to continue basic science research and advanced scientific computing, which allows the U.S. to compete with the rest of the world in important scientific fields.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, the tragedy of Hurricane Katrina taught us again the importance of investing in our Nation’s water infrastructure. While I believe that significant changes need to be made in the operations and management of the Army Corps of Engineers, I support this legislation which acknowledges the lack of prioritization process for Corps projects. I support language in the bill that directs the National Academy of Public Administration to study and recommend factors to be used in determining the allocation of the Corps’ limited resources.

I also strongly support funding contained in the bill that will benefit my constituents and the Pacific Northwest environment. I appreciate the funding included for floodplain restoration on Johnson Creek, which will enable the Corps to undertake a cost-effective environmental improvement within an area slated for industrial development and will help leverage private development by proactively addressing important stream corridor needs. I am also pleased that the conferees chose to fund an energy conservation program at the Armory Theater in Portland and a Solar Photovoltaic Test Facility System at Portland State University. The conference report also contains important funding, although not nearly the amount necessary, for the St. Johns Landfill Dike Stabilization, which will help prevent municipal and industrial waste from contaminating sensitive wetlands. Finally, I appreciate the funding in the bill directed towards dredging, maintenance, and environmental restoration on the Willamette and Columbia Rivers.

However, I am strongly opposed to language in the conference report directing the Bonneville Power Administration, BPA, to cease funding of an important independent scientific research center based in Portland, OR, known as the Fish Passage Center, FPC. For over 20 years, the FPC has been vital in ensuring that State and tribal fishery man-

agers are armed with the best available scientific information about the status of salmon populations. In this role, the FPC fulfills a legal obligation under the Federal Northwest Power Act and under tribal treaties.

Without the Fish Passage Center, the myriad of Federal, State, and tribal agencies responsible for Pacific salmon recovery could lack valuable data and information on what works and what doesn’t to recover salmon. Federal efforts to recover Columbia and Snake River salmon are currently in flux after a recent Federal district judge overturned the most recent Salmon plan. With so much uncertainty surrounding future recovery efforts, now is not the time to reduce access to the best available scientific information.

Although the language in the conference report directs PBA and the Northwest Power and Conservation Council to transfer the functions of the FPC to “existing and capable entities,” I am concerned that it does not provide enough direction about how this should take place and does not ensure that State and tribal fish and wildlife agencies will have a say in how and where these functions will be transferred. I hope that BPA and the Council set up a process that actively engages and is fully responsive to the needs of the State fish and wildlife agencies and tribes for whom the FPC was originally created.

The Pacific Northwest is about to embark on a 1-year-long court-ordered process to correct the flaws in the Federal Columbia Basin Salmon Plan. It is my hope that the transfer of the FPC functions does occur seamlessly and in full collaboration with our State and tribal managers so they may fully participate in discussions and negotiations concerning the operations of the Federal Columbia River Power System.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to see that the conference report has deleted all funding for the nuclear bunker buster program. This action reflects the second time that the Congress has decided to reject the Bush administration’s request for this dangerous and unnecessary weapon, and I am hopeful that this action will end the debate on this issue once and for all.

The United States faces a serious national security threat from the proliferation of nuclear weapons materials and technologies, most notably in North Korea, Pakistan and Iran. The pursuit of new nuclear weapons such as the Bush administration’s proposed nuclear bunker buster sends a dangerously mixed signal to the rest of the world and erodes our non-proliferation credibility. Nations that see the U.S. expanding and diversifying our nuclear arsenal are encouraged to seek or maintain nuclear deterrents of their own and ignore nonproliferation obligations. Additionally, a U.S. move toward expanding and diversifying our nuclear stockpile is contrary to our legal obligations under Article VI of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, NPT, which clearly requires the United States to work toward reducing our nuclear arsenal.

In light of the adverse impact of the pursuit of the nuclear bunker buster and any other new nuclear weapon on international non-proliferation efforts, the fact that the bunker buster would inevitably spread high levels of radiation above ground, and existing U.S. earth-penetrating and other conventional weapons capabilities, the Bush administration’s proposed nuclear bunker buster study

and the development of any new nuclear weapons are a dangerous and wasteful use of taxpayer money.

While I am pleased at the outcome on the bunker buster, I am very concerned that this appropriations bill provides \$80 million for the Advanced Fuel Cycle Initiative—an increase of \$10 million over the amount requested for this program. In addition, the bill provides an additional \$50 million in nuclear waste disposal funding to support development of a spent nuclear fuel recycling plan. These proposals are aimed at reviving nuclear reprocessing—an idea that Congress has considered and rejected in the past.

The conference report contains language that directs the Department of Energy to use this money to

accelerate the development of a separations technology that can address the current inventories of commercial spent nuclear fuel and select the preferred technology no later than the end of fiscal year 2007.

Essentially, the Appropriations Committee is telling DOE that it doesn’t believe Yucca Mountain will ever be opened, so it now wants the Department to instead embark on a crash program to start reprocessing nuclear waste.

I warned back in 1987 that the decision to limit the search for a deep underground repository to the Yucca Mountain site and to bar examination of other alternative sites was a risky one. If Yucca Mountain proved unsuitable, or if it could not meet the NRC’s licensing requirements, then our country efforts to find a solution to the nuclear waste problem would be forced back to square one.

Now, it appears that my warnings are being borne out. The Yucca Mountain repository is falling apart in the face of serious scientific and technical problems. But rather than come back to Congress and ask for legislation that would reopen the search for a permanent repository, which the nuclear industry and its supporters in Congress know would be politically hazardous, the appropriators now appear to be effectively abandoning the notion of deep underground burial. Instead, they want to reprocess the waste and store it in above ground “interim” storage facilities.

Now, you would think that such a fundamental rewrite of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act would actually require action by the committee that actually has jurisdiction over the act in the first place. In the House, that would be the Energy and Commerce Committee. However, in this bill the directive to prioritize reprocessing is being made without any participation by the Energy and Commerce Committee. The committee doesn’t even get a copy of the report mandated by the Appropriations conferees.

Yes, there was language in the Energy Policy Act which authorized R&D on reprocessing. I opposed that language, and sought unsuccessfully to remove it from the bill. But R&D is far different from moving to full-scale engineering of reprocessing technologies with a short-term deployment objective. That is what is being proposed in the bill before us today. This conference report is actually talking about setting a target for site selection in fiscal year 2007, and a target for initiation of construction of one or more integrated spent fuel recycling facilities in fiscal year 2010.

This has enormous implications for the future of efforts to permanently dispose of the Nation’s nuclear waste in a deep underground repository. It effectively means that there will

be no deep underground repository. It effectively means that there will be no deep underground burial of waste in our lifetimes. So, all of the billions paid into the Nuclear Waste Fund over the years will soon see those funds be diverted over to supporting this new unproven and risky scheme of reprocessing.

This is a huge policy shift. Since the 1970's we have had a policy in this country against reprocessing spent fuel, both because of the risk of nonproliferation and because reprocessing is not economical. In recent years, Republican leaders in Washington have decided they want to undo that policy, however.

I am fundamentally opposed to reprocessing, because I believe that a revival of domestic reprocessing would undermine America's nuclear nonproliferation efforts, cost us enormous amounts of money, will not solve the nuclear waste problem, and won't increase nuclear safety.

With respect to the proliferation risks—just look at North Korea. It has been reprocessing spent fuel from its reactors to use in nuclear bombs. In response, President Bush has asked the Nuclear Suppliers Group to limit access to reprocessing technology, arguing that:

This step will prevent new states from developing the means to produce fissile material for nuclear bombs.

At the same time, the U.S. is confronting Iran over its plan to develop a full uranium enrichment program. How are we going to credibly ask the rest of the world to support us when we tell Iran or any other nation that they cannot have the full fuel cycle or reprocessing when we have one here at home? It just won't fly.

America cannot preach nuclear temperance from a barstool. We cannot credibly tell other nations that they should refrain from reprocessing or other nuclear fuel cycle activities abroad when we are engaging in these same exact activities here at home. That is why President Gerald Ford called for an end to commercial reprocessing back in 1976, and why no President since then has successfully revived reprocessing.

In addition to the serious adverse nonproliferation consequences, reprocessing also is not economical. A MIT study put the cost of reprocessing at four times that of as once-through nuclear power. The current price of concentrated uranium "yellowcake" in the spot market is about \$53.00/kg. For reprocessing to be economical, there must be a sustained 8-fold increase in the long-term price of uranium. That is not likely to occur anytime soon.

On top of that is the cost of building a plant. As a benchmark, Japan's nearly completed Rokkasho reprocessing plant—20 years in the making—costs on the order of \$20 billion. I have seen some cost estimates for a U.S. reprocessing program that run as high as \$65 billion. That is not something that is economically viable at a time of huge Federal budget deficits.

Moreover, reprocessing will not really alleviate the nuclear waste problem. Talk to the folks at Savannah River where over 30 million gallons of high-level waste were left behind from reprocessing. Under this bill, Savannah River may be targeted again for interim storage for spent fuel, awaiting reprocessing. So might Hanford and Idaho or other Federal sites.

The conference report states that funding in the Nuclear Waste Disposal Account will be used:

to prepare the overall program plan and to initiate a competition to select one or more sites suitable for development of integrated recycling facilities (i.e., separation of spent fuel, fabrication of mixed oxide fuel, vitrification of waste products, and process storage) and initiate work on an Environmental Impact Statement. The site competition should not be limited to DOE sites, but should be open to a wide range of other possible federal and non-federal sites on a strictly voluntary basis.

These reprocessing sites will become de facto nuclear waste dumps. Which State is going to "volunteer" to become a nuclear waste dump? Under the Nuclear Waste Policy Act, such a site cannot legally be located at the Yucca Mountain site. So, where is it going to go?

How long will the waste be stored there? The spent nuclear fuel cannot even be handled to be reprocessed for 5 to 15 years—it is so radioactive. So we know already that "interim storage" could last for a very long time.

And if we construct these "interim" waste dumps, what happens next? What will happen to all this waste when the hard reality of the disastrous economics combined with the fact that our government is already too deep in deficit that it will be unable to subsidize such a program forever? There are simply too many unanswered questions.

It is also not accurate to suggest, as some do, that reprocessing is safe. Twenty tons of highly radioactive material leaked from a broken pipe at the Sellafield nuclear reprocessing plant in the United Kingdom in April of this year. Senior officials at the UK's Nuclear Decommissioning Authority, which owns the Sellafield reprocessing have pushed to close THORP altogether, arguing that it is more cost-effective to close the plant now rather than repair the problems only to decommission the plant as planned in 2012. Is that the kind of mess we want happening over here?

When the House version of this bill was being debated on the House floor last summer, I offered an amendment which would have transferred the \$15.5 million appropriated for reprocessing and interim storage to several energy efficiency priority programs that were underfunded in the bill. Unfortunately, my amendment was defeated.

I continue to be opposed to the reprocessing language in the bill. I intend to continue raising questions about this proposal, both in the Energy and Commerce Committee and on this floor.

Finally, on another matter, I am very concerned about the cuts that have been made in energy efficiency programs in this bill. We are in the middle of an energy emergency. We had a hearing before the Energy and Commerce Committee last week that showed the impact that these high prices are having across the board, in every sector of the economy. The Senate will be holding a hearing today on price gouging by big oil companies and the \$100 billion in oil company profits projected for 2005. There are things that we can do in this area. What we are seeing is missed opportunities.

The House Bill for the fiscal year 2006 Energy and Water Appropriations provided \$41 million for the State Energy Program. The Senate bill provided \$41 million for the State Energy Program. Now we go to conference and the conference report provides \$36 million, which is \$8 million below fiscal year 2005

levels—almost a 20 percent cut. We are in the midst of an energy crisis. This program implements energy efficiency programs and energy emergency preparedness activities in every State in our country. A recent National Laboratory study concluded that for every \$1 invested, we get \$7.22 in return in energy savings. This makes no sense. We should be increasing these programs, not cutting them.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the House Energy and Water Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2006.

This legislation provides essential funding for the Houston Ship Channel, \$26 million to finish the deepening and widening project and conduct environmental restoration work.

Also, I want to particularly express my appreciation for the Subcommittee's increase for Operations and Maintenance funding to \$11 million for Houston-Galveston.

It is penny-wise and pound foolish to underfund maintenance, because that reduces the benefits that we get from all of our construction dollars.

If we are going to dredge a channel to 45 feet to allow for modern ships to reach a port, we obviously have to keep that channel at 45 feet and remove silting and other blockages.

This bill also provides important funding for flood control projects in the Houston area—\$375,000 for construction of the Hunting Bayou Federal flood control project and \$75,000 to finish up the General Reevaluation Review study for Greens Bayou.

Hurricane Katrina showed the Nation the value of flood control projects. Both the Hunting Bayou and the Greens Bayou projects will save Federal money. By protecting homes from flooding, we reduce the amount of future disaster assistance and flood insurance claims.

My constituents who would benefit from these projects do not own expensive beach houses close to the shoreline, they own homes in a densely populated urban area over 50 miles from Galveston Bay.

However, Houston does not have a lot of elevated areas and we are at risk from hurricanes and tropical storms, and as a result flood control projects make good economic sense.

Unfortunately the Bush Administration repeatedly zeroes out funding in their budgets for flood control projects in Houston, for reasons I still cannot understand.

Our projects are authorized by Congress, have strong cost-benefit ratios, are supported by the community, and are managed by the professional experts at the Harris County Flood Control District. Hunting Bayou had over 8,000 residences flood in 2001 from Tropical Storm Allison and Greens Bayou had over 28,000 homes flood in the same storm.

As a result, I want to thank the Subcommittee Chairman, DAVID HOBSON, the Ranking Member, PETE VISLOSKEY, and especially my Texas colleague CHET EDWARDS for salvaging funding for all our projects—the Houston Ship Channel, Hunting Bayou, and Greens Bayou.

As final note, I want to add that the Houston Ship Channel has received serious damage from Hurricane Rita, roughly \$30 million. Parts of the channel have silted up with material to 35 feet, which is a serious safety and economic problem.

If the large oil tankers cannot get to the refineries on the Houston Ship Channel, that will

not help gasoline prices to go down in this country.

Our refinery capacity has got a lot of notice lately in Congress, and this is something we can do in the short term to help that—repair hurricane damage at oil importing ports like the Port of Houston.

The Houston delegation—myself, JOHN CULBERSON, TOM DELAY, AL GREEN, SHEILA JACKSON-LEE, KEVIN BRADY, MICHAEL MCCAUL, TED POE, and our Texas colleague on the Appropriations Committee CHET EDWARDS all recently sent a letter to the Committee and Subcommittee requesting this \$30 million in emergency damage repair funding for the next Supplemental.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the FY06 Energy and Water Appropriations Bill.

Chairman HOBSON, Ranking Member VISCLOSKY, and their staffs have worked tirelessly to produce a good bill and they deserve much praise for their efforts.

This bill goes a long way in strengthening our Nation's water infrastructure. If this past hurricane season has taught us anything, it is that we must ensure an adequate level of protection for our coastal cities and those areas prone to flooding.

The modest investments included in this bill can save billions in disaster recovery needs.

Our Nation's water infrastructure is also critical to building the economy. Our waterways provide a low cost way to move agriculture commodities and manufactured goods to the world market. This bill will help maintain and strengthen these arteries, ensuring access for American producers.

This legislation also includes critical funding for Nuclear power and our ability to store nuclear waste, namely the Yucca Mountain repository. The funding level is lower than what the House agreed to earlier this year, but the lower funding is justified by the Energy Department's recent changes to the project. What is important is that the Yucca Mountain project and Federal spent fuel management moves forward.

The legislation's funding for the Corps of Engineers, nuclear energy R&D and the Yucca Mountain program helps ensure a vibrant future for American water ways, flood control and nuclear energy.

I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Chairman HOBSON and Ranking Member VISCLOSKY for their hard work and encourage all of them to support this bill.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISSA). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

Pursuant to clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO IRAN—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 109-68)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. Consistent with this provision, I have sent the enclosed notice to the *Federal Register* for publication, stating that the Iran emergency declared by Executive Order 12170 on November 14, 1979, is to continue in effect beyond November 14, 2005. The most recent notice continuing this emergency was published in the *Federal Register* on November 12, 2004 (69 FR 65513).

Our relations with Iran have not yet returned to normal, and the process of implementing the January 19, 1981, agreements with Iran is still underway. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared on November 14, 1979, with respect to Iran, beyond November 14, 2005.

GEORGE W. BUSH.
THE WHITE HOUSE, November 9, 2005.

□ 1300

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WOLF. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include tabular and extraneous material on the conference report to accompany H.R. 2862.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2862, SCIENCE, STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006

Mr. WOLF. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 538, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 2862) making appropriations for Science, the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 538, the conference report is considered read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of November 7, 2005, at page H9713.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I am pleased to bring to the floor today the conference report on H.R. 2862, the fiscal year 2006 Science, State, Justice, Commerce, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN), for his support throughout the process. Together, we were able to get a strong bill passed by the House with a vote of 418 to 7. Also, I want to thank our Senate counterparts, Chairman SHELBY and Senator MIKULSKI, as well as Chairman MCCONNELL and Senator LEAHY.

I also want to thank the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) for his help and cooperation with this, and also the ranking member, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Within a very tight allocation, we were able to provide funding for a variety of critical national priorities. The conference report provides \$21.4 billion for the Department of Justice, \$784 million above fiscal year 2005 and \$1.1 billion over the budget request.

The conference agreement includes \$5.8 billion for the FBI, which is \$15 million above the budget request. The bill will provide for additional agents, analysts, and support staff to address terrorism and espionage threats. And keep in mind that last week the stories broke about how the Chinese, that, unfortunately, this body gave the Most Favored Nation trading status to, has been spying aggressively against our country, and the latest spying episode dealt with the B-1 bomber.

In addition, the bill provides funding to address deficiencies identified through external reviews, including a \$20 million increase for the FBI Academy, a \$20 million increase for additional secure space, and a \$14 million increase to improve information technology program management, \$5 million for retention and recruitment, a \$26 million increase for translators, and a \$70 million increase for the Terrorist Screening Center.

The conference agreement includes \$12 million above the request for the Marshals Service to enhance the protection of the Judiciary and fugitive apprehension programs.

For DEA, Madam Speaker, the bill restores proposed cuts for Mobile Enforcement Teams and the Demand Reduction program, and directs these efforts to focus on meth enforcement. The conference report does not include the Combat Meth Act that was attached to the Senate bill. While I