

other provisions in the area of base closure and realignment.

Section 8142, which would give the Secretary of the Army the authority to retain military family housing at Fort Buchanan, Puerto Rico, in support of the relocation of U.S. Army South, is a direct contravention of a decision made in the 1995 BRAC round to dispose of those units.

Many in this House have criticized the President for his circumvention of the BRAC process for political reasons at McClellan Air Force Base and Kelly Air Force Base. While section 8142 is intended to help the Army and is not purely political, its effect is the same. We should not begin to engage in a case-by-case undoing of prior BRAC decisions for any reason in the absence of an authorized realignment process. I hope we are not opening Pandora's box should this legislation receive the approval of the House today.

Finally, I question the wisdom of requiring the Secretary of the Air Force to expend \$7.6 million from the base closure and realignment accounts for demolition and other base conversion activities at Norton Air Force Base. The expenditures required by section 8145 are not related to any military mission and they are not required to comply with routine environmental remediation requirements. It is extremely unwise to tap the BRAC accounts to subsidize local reuse efforts. In that context, I find it equally unwise to continue the practice of permitting the use of other DOD resources for conversion activities at other BRAC locations.

For these reasons, and despite the fact that this is otherwise a very good bill, I regret that I must vote "no."

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support for the conference report to H.R. 4103, the Department of Defense Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 1999. I would also like to take this opportunity to recognize the distinguished Chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on National Security for his role in crafting a conference report that truly reflects our nation's priorities and ensures the continued preeminence of our military. He is to be commended for acknowledging the effect quality of life issues has on our military's performance.

I am especially pleased with the provisions that express our concern for the welfare of the men and women in the armed services and their families. H.R. 4103 includes \$35 million for Impact Aid, a program which provides funds to schools that experience a reduced property tax base as a result of their location near a military installation. Military personnel should not be forced to choose between their career and their children's education. This conference report also includes a much needed 3.6 percent military pay raise, a half percent above what was requested. Mr. Chairman, quality of life issues in our military have been neglected for too long. It is time that we address them and I believe that this conference report begins to do that. I urge my colleagues to give this conference report their strongest support.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I urge enactment and passage of this conference report, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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 7 of rule XV, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 4060, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

Mr. MCDADE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the order of the House of Friday, September 25, 1998, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 4060), making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Friday, September 25, 1998, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of September 25, 1998, at page H8842).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MCDADE) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKEY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MCDADE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCDADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the pending legislation.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. MCDADE. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to be able to present today the energy and water bill to the Members of the House and to strongly urge and recommend that it be passed. It was perhaps the most difficult energy and water bill that we have ever had, principally because the budget that was submitted to us was inadequate from the beginning.

In terms of real dollars, it is the lowest budget ever presented for construction programs of the Corps of Engineers.

□ 1545

Obviously, that required us to do a great deal of putting and taking to try to put together a bill that would develop the infrastructure of this country, protect health and safety, and keep our economy going by keeping our ports open and efficient.

Given that background, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I have been extraordinarily privileged, as the chairman of this subcommittee, to have an extraordinary group of people to work with.

Jim Ogsbury has been my chief of staff, and one would not find a more faithful and bright person; Jeanne Wilson is an absolute encyclopedia and an intellectual dynamo; Don McKinnon is a gentleman that I have known for some time, and he has been extraordinarily helpful; Bruce Heide handled the entire Corps of Engineers budget, and obviously, from what I have said, he did a superb job.

My friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. FAZIO), is not currently on the floor because of other business, but I want to offer him a tribute, as well, because without his cooperation and assistance the bill would not be here today.

Mr. Speaker, this is a \$20.9 billion bill, in gross terms. About \$4 billion goes to the Corps of Engineers to promote public health and safety, et cetera. About \$823 million goes to the Bureau of Reclamation for water projects in the west. Although there is a cut in the Bureau's budget, Mr. Speaker, we fully fund operation and maintenance of Bureau projects, to make sure that those projects are run efficiently and serve the public.

\$16.4 billion is appropriated to the Department of Energy. About \$12 billion is provided for defense activities and \$4 billion is for nondefense activities. As Members of the House know, defense activities include the maintenance of the nuclear stockpile, using science-based intelligence in lieu of nuclear weapons testing, which has been forewarned by this country. The Department has an awesome responsibility, and every year must certify to the President that the stockpile is indeed efficient and reliable.

On the nondefense side of bill, there is a host of energy supply activities, scientific research, et cetera, all of which are very interesting and important. The genome mapping project, the nuclear physics program, the high energy physics program, and other related programs are also funded in this bill.

Finally, there is \$126 million in for independent agencies, such as the Appalachian Regional Commission, which has been diligently serving the people of this Nation for approximately 25 years.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to file a more lengthy statement with my remarks for the benefit of Members, or anyone else, who might want to take a look.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the conference report accompanying H.R. 4060, the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Bill for Fiscal Year 1999. Total spending in this \$21 billion measure is \$388 million below the Administration's request for energy and water programs. The bill is within its 302(b) allocation for both outlays and budget authority.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Energy and Water Bill represents legislation of which the entire membership of this body may be proud. It continues, at responsible levels, investments in public infrastructure, scientific research, and economic development. At the same time, it is a fiscally austere bill, which reduces funding for less productive Federal spending programs. I am pleased that the conferees from the House and Senate, as stewards of the taxpayers' hard-earned dollars, were able to strike such a responsible balance.

The irresponsible budget request of the Administration, which slashed funding for the civil works program of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, presented a considerable challenge to the committee on conference. If the committee on conference had accepted the Administration's proposal—which represented the lowest budget in the history of the civil works program—then scores of ongoing construction projects would be terminated; dozens more would be placed on fragile life support; project completion schedules would be extended; costs would rise; and contractor shutdowns would be legion. Far from adopting this reckless budget, however, the conference agreement appropriates nearly \$4 billion for the Corps—an increase of \$716 million above the budget request.

For the construction program of the Corps, the conference agreement provides \$1.43 billion for fiscal year 1999. While this is a modest \$27 million reduction from the House-passed level, it is an increase of \$190 million over the Senate-passed level and an increase of \$624 million—or 77%—over the Administration's inane budget. It will ensure the continued effectiveness of the civil works program, which has had such success in protecting our communities from the devastating consequences of flooding and which has been so instrumental in the vitality of America's waterborne commerce.

Furthermore, the conference agreement includes \$1.65 billion for operation and maintenance of Corps of Engineers projects. This sum, along with the \$105 million in emergency appropriations enacted earlier this year, will help protect our investment in critical water infrastructure. The agreement also provides \$161 million for studies and investigations of Corps projects and \$140 million to continue the Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program (FUSRAP). The FUSRAP program was transferred from the Department of Energy to the Army Corps of Engineers last year amidst some controversy. I am pleased to report that, from all accounts, the transfer has been successful. Cleanups are proceeding on schedule, and we expect that the transfer will save the taxpayers substantial sums of money over the remaining life of the program.

Mr. Speaker, the conference agreement takes a significant step in the downsizing of the Bureau of Reclamation. In recognition that the Bureau's historical mission—reclamation of the West through the construction of large water storage and distribution facilities—has

largely been accomplished, the Bureau has undertaken a variety of new and expanded activities in recent years. These activities include: extensive "partnering" with other water resource interests, provision of technical assistance, water conservation and management planning, strategic analyses, development of integrated management programs and system integration alternatives, resource inventories, and environmental enhancements.

The conference agreement helps control Bureau of Reclamation mission creep by restricting the amount of resources available for new activities within the capabilities of other Federal and local resource agencies. The agreement, however, fully funds operation, maintenance and rehabilitation requirements for projects throughout the country. Furthermore, it provides funding to continue cost-shared studies and investigations that have been initiated in prior years. The agreement reflects the Committee's intention to protect the substantial Federal investment in water resource infrastructure while downsizing the Bureau and reducing unnecessary Federal involvement in local resource management.

Title III of the final conference agreement provides \$16.4 billion for the Department of Energy (DOE). \$11.86 billion—or 57% of the total provided in the bill—is dedicated to the atomic energy defense activities of DOE. Of this amount, \$4.4 billion is included for weapons activities. Although the tensions of nuclear brinkmanship are less today than at any time during the Cold War, our responsibilities for the stewardship and maintenance of the nuclear stockpile are not. Few responsibilities of the Federal government are of more moment than the continued safety and reliability of our nuclear weapons. The Committee has provided generously for the execution of these responsibilities and has invested enormous amounts in the science-based stockpile stewardship program of DOE. By focusing on the simulation of nuclear weapons through advanced computational and laboratory capabilities, the program is expected to serve as a surrogate for nuclear weapons testing.

The bill also provides substantial resources for the domestic energy supply and scientific research activities of DOE. The \$2.68 billion provided for the Science account includes \$130 million to initiate construction of the Spallation Neutron Source at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory in Tennessee. This state-of-the-art neutron facility will help keep the United States at the forefront of biological and materials sciences. In addition, funds provided for the Science account will help realize returns on our investment in scientific facilities by increasing user time at such facilities and maximizing their utilization.

The agreement also includes \$223 million—an increase of \$1.6 million over the budget request—for fusion energy sciences. To better reflect the program's transformation from one that is largely focused on technology development into one focused principally on basic research, the program has been moved out of

the Energy Supply account and into the Science account.

The agreement provides \$727 million for Energy Supply activities of DOE. This includes \$365.9 million for solar and renewable programs, an increase of \$19.6 million over fiscal year 1998. In addition, nuclear energy programs are funded at \$284 million, a reduction of \$41.8 million below the President's budget request. The conference agreement does provide \$19 million for the nuclear energy research initiative, a new research program devoted to enhancing the viability of nuclear power through improvements in safety, efficiency, and reliability.

The total amount appropriated for independent agencies is \$125.7 million, a decrease of \$151.9 million from fiscal year 1998, and \$373 million below the President's request. Consistent with the legislation passed by Congress last year, no appropriations have been provided for the Tennessee Valley Authority. For fiscal year 1999 and thereafter, TVA is empowered and directed to fund stewardship activities with internally generated savings and revenues. Absorbing the modest costs of stewardship activities will have no appreciable effect on an agency projected to receive \$6.5 billion in revenues in fiscal year 1999, and whose customers have enjoyed below-market rates for Federally-produced power for decades.

The conference agreement also includes \$66.4 million for the Appalachian Regional Commission, \$16.5 million for the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board, and \$465 million for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. The conference agreement does include \$20 million, as recommended by the Senate, for the Denali Commission. The agreement, however, makes this particular appropriation subject to authorization.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to my colleagues on the Subcommittee for their dedicated work on behalf of this conference agreement. Although there were a number of contentious issues to be resolved with the other body, the conferees worked in a bipartisan spirit of cooperation and comity to get the job done. It has been an honor and a pleasure to work with my talented and committed colleagues, and I thank them for their devoted efforts.

I would like to pay special tribute to the Ranking Minority Member of the Subcommittee, the Honorable Vic Fazio. In tribute to his many years of service on this Subcommittee, the committee on conference has renamed the Yolo Basin Wetlands in California as the Vic Fazio Yolo Wildlife Area. Given his enormous efforts to preserve and protect this critical natural resource, I believe this action to be a fitting tribute indeed.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support the conference agreement accompanying the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Bill for Fiscal Year 1999.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1999 (H.R. 4060)

	FY 1998 Enacted	FY 1999 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - CIVIL						
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY						
Corps of Engineers - Civil						
General investigations.....	156,804,000	150,000,000	162,823,000	165,390,000	161,747,000	+4,943,000
Construction, general.....	1,468,373,000	806,000,000	1,456,529,000	1,240,088,000	1,429,885,000	-38,488,000
Contingent emergency appropriation.....	5,000,000			8,000,000		-5,000,000
Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, and Tennessee.....	296,212,000	280,000,000	312,077,000	313,234,000	321,149,000	+24,937,000
Operation and maintenance, general.....	1,740,025,000	1,603,000,000	1,637,719,000	1,667,572,000	1,653,252,000	-88,773,000
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 105-174).....	105,185,000					-105,185,000
Regulatory program.....	106,000,000	117,000,000	110,000,000	106,000,000	106,000,000	
Flood control and coastal emergencies.....	4,000,000					-4,000,000
Formerly utilized sites remedial action program.....	140,000,000					-140,000,000
Defense function.....		140,000,000	140,000,000	140,000,000	140,000,000	+140,000,000
General expenses.....	148,000,000	148,000,000	148,000,000	148,000,000	148,000,000	
Total, title I, Department of Defense - Civil.....	4,169,599,000	3,244,000,000	3,967,148,000	3,788,284,000	3,960,033,000	-209,566,000
TITLE II - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR						
Central Utah Project Completion Account						
Central Utah project construction.....	23,743,000	22,189,000	24,189,000	28,189,000	25,741,000	+1,998,000
Fish, wildlife, and recreation mitigation and conservation.....	11,610,000	12,476,000	10,476,000	10,476,000	10,476,000	-1,134,000
Utah reclamation mitigation and conservation account.....	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	
Program oversight and administration.....	800,000	1,283,000	1,283,000	1,283,000	1,283,000	+483,000
Total, Central Utah project completion account.....	41,153,000	40,948,000	40,948,000	44,948,000	42,500,000	+1,347,000
Bureau of Reclamation						
Water and related resources.....	694,348,000	640,124,000	596,254,000	671,889,000	617,045,000	-77,303,000
(By transfer).....		(25,800,000)	(25,800,000)	(25,800,000)	(25,800,000)	(+25,800,000)
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 105-174).....	4,520,000					-4,520,000
Colorado River Dam fund (by transfer, permanent authority).....	(-5,592,000)					(+5,592,000)
Loan program.....	10,425,000	12,425,000	12,425,000	12,425,000	8,421,000	-2,004,000
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(31,000,000)	(38,000,000)	(38,000,000)	(38,000,000)	(38,000,000)	(+7,000,000)
Central Valley project restoration fund.....	33,130,000	49,500,000	33,130,000	39,500,000	33,130,000	
California Bay-Delta ecosystem restoration.....	85,000,000	143,300,000	75,000,000	65,000,000	75,000,000	-10,000,000
Policy and administration.....	47,558,000	48,000,000	46,000,000	48,000,000	47,000,000	-558,000
Total, Bureau of Reclamation.....	874,961,000	893,349,000	762,809,000	836,794,000	780,596,000	-94,385,000
Total, title II, Department of the Interior.....	916,134,000	934,297,000	803,757,000	881,742,000	823,096,000	-93,038,000
(By transfer).....	(-5,592,000)	(25,800,000)	(25,800,000)	(25,800,000)	(25,800,000)	(+31,392,000)
TITLE III - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY						
Energy supply.....	906,807,000	1,129,042,000	882,834,000	786,854,000	727,091,000	-179,716,000
Non-defense environmental management.....	497,058,000	452,000,000	466,700,000	418,254,000	431,200,000	-65,856,000
Uranium enrichment decontamination and decommissioning fund.....	220,200,000	272,000,000	225,000,000	196,827,000	220,200,000	
Science.....	2,235,708,000	2,470,460,000	2,399,500,000	2,634,207,000	2,682,860,000	+447,152,000
Nuclear Waste Disposal.....	160,000,000	190,000,000	160,000,000	190,000,000	169,000,000	+9,000,000
Departmental administration.....	224,155,000	245,788,000	175,365,000	234,755,000	200,475,000	-23,680,000
Miscellaneous revenues.....	-136,736,000	-136,530,000	-136,530,000	-136,530,000	-136,530,000	+208,000
Net appropriation.....	87,417,000	109,258,000	38,835,000	98,225,000	63,945,000	-23,472,000
Office of the Inspector General.....	27,500,000	29,500,000	14,500,000	27,500,000	29,000,000	+1,500,000
Environmental restoration and waste management:						
Defense function.....	(5,520,238,000)	(5,783,000,000)	(5,683,651,000)	(5,583,500,000)	(5,576,824,000)	(+56,586,000)
Non-defense function.....	(717,259,000)	(739,000,000)	(691,700,000)	(615,081,000)	(651,400,000)	(-65,856,000)
Total.....	(6,237,497,000)	(6,522,000,000)	(6,375,351,000)	(6,196,581,000)	(6,228,224,000)	(-9,273,000)
Atomic Energy Defense Activities						
Weapons activities.....	4,146,692,000	4,500,000,000	4,142,100,000	4,445,700,000	4,400,000,000	+253,308,000
Defense environmental restoration and waste management.....	4,429,438,000	4,259,903,000	4,358,554,000	4,293,403,000	4,310,227,000	-119,211,000
Defense facilities closure projects.....	890,800,000	1,006,240,000	1,038,240,000	1,048,240,000	1,038,240,000	+147,440,000
Defense environmental management privatization.....	200,000,000	516,857,000	286,857,000	241,857,000	228,357,000	+28,357,000
Subtotal, Defense environmental management.....	5,520,238,000	5,783,000,000	5,683,651,000	5,583,500,000	5,576,824,000	+56,586,000
Other defense activities.....	1,666,008,000	1,667,160,000	1,761,260,000	1,658,160,000	1,696,676,000	+30,688,000
Defense nuclear waste disposal.....	190,000,000	190,000,000	190,000,000	185,000,000	189,000,000	-1,000,000
Total, Atomic Energy Defense Activities.....	11,522,938,000	12,140,160,000	11,777,011,000	11,872,360,000	11,862,500,000	+339,562,000

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1999 (H.R. 4060)— continued

	FY 1998 Enacted	FY 1999 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
Power Marketing Administrations						
Operation and maintenance, Alaska Power Administration	3,500,000	-3,500,000
Capital assets acquisition.....	10,000,000	5,000,000	-10,000,000
Operation and maintenance, Southeastern Power Administration	12,222,000	8,500,000	8,500,000	8,500,000	7,500,000	-4,722,000
Operation and maintenance, Southwestern Power Administration	25,210,000	26,000,000	24,710,000	26,000,000	26,000,000	+ 790,000
Construction, rehabilitation, operation and maintenance, Western Area Power Administration.....	189,043,000	215,435,000	205,000,000	212,018,000	203,000,000	+ 13,957,000
(By transfer, permanent authority)	(5,592,000)	(-5,592,000)
Falcon and Amistad operating and maintenance fund.....	970,000	1,010,000	970,000	1,010,000	1,010,000	+ 40,000
Total, Power Marketing Administrations.....	240,945,000	250,945,000	239,180,000	252,528,000	237,510,000	-3,435,000
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission						
Salaries and expenses	182,141,000	188,898,000	186,500,000	188,898,000	187,500,000	+ 5,359,000
Revenues applied.....	-182,141,000	-188,898,000	-186,500,000	-188,898,000	-187,500,000	-5,359,000
Total, title III, Department of Energy.....	15,898,574,000	17,043,365,000	16,203,560,000	16,476,755,000	16,423,306,000	+ 524,732,000
(By transfer)	(5,592,000)	(-5,592,000)
TITLE IV - INDEPENDENT AGENCIES						
Appalachian Regional Commission	170,000,000	67,000,000	65,900,000	67,000,000	66,400,000	-103,800,000
Denali Commission	20,000,000	20,000,000	+ 20,000,000
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board.....	17,000,000	17,500,000	16,500,000	17,500,000	16,500,000	-500,000
Nuclear Regulatory Commission:						
Salaries and expenses	468,000,000	483,340,000	462,700,000	466,000,000	465,000,000	-3,000,000
Revenues.....	-450,000,000	-152,341,000	-444,700,000	-416,000,000	-444,800,000	+ 5,200,000
Subtotal	18,000,000	330,999,000	18,000,000	50,000,000	20,200,000	+ 2,200,000
Office of Inspector General	4,800,000	5,300,000	4,800,000	4,800,000	4,800,000
Revenues.....	-4,800,000	-1,749,000	-4,800,000	-4,800,000	-4,800,000
Subtotal	3,551,000
Total	18,000,000	334,550,000	18,000,000	50,000,000	20,200,000	+ 2,200,000
Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board	2,600,000	2,950,000	2,600,000	2,600,000	2,600,000
Tennessee Valley Authority: Tennessee Valley Authority Fund...	70,000,000	76,800,000	70,000,000	-70,000,000
Total, title IV, Independent agencies.....	277,600,000	498,800,000	103,000,000	227,100,000	125,700,000	-151,900,000
Scorekeeping adjustments.....	-529,705,000	-424,000,000	-424,000,000	-432,000,000	-424,000,000	+ 105,705,000
Grand total:						
New budget (obligational) authority.....	20,732,202,000	21,296,462,000	20,653,465,000	20,941,861,000	20,908,135,000	+ 175,933,000
Appropriations.....	(20,617,497,000)	(21,296,462,000)	(20,653,465,000)	(20,933,861,000)	(20,908,135,000)	(+ 290,638,000)
Emergency appropriations.....	(109,705,000)	(-109,705,000)
Contingent emergency appropriation.....	(5,000,000)	(8,000,000)	(-5,000,000)
(By transfer)	(25,800,000)	(25,800,000)	(25,800,000)	(25,800,000)	(+ 25,800,000)

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I would begin by saying that I support passage of H.R. 4060, the appropriation measure funding the energy and water projects for the United States of America for the next fiscal year.

I particularly want to point out at this moment my particular regard for three of the members of the subcommittee who will not be with us next year because of retirements. First of all, the yeoman's service the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. PARKER) has provided to the subcommittee over years. I appreciate all of his efforts and the contributions that he has made.

Secondly, I want to also thank the gentleman from California (Mr. FAZIO) for all that he has done for his country, for this institution, for the committee on which we serve. The reason I am here today is the gentleman from California (Mr. FAZIO) is about the business of this government doing the agriculture appropriation conference for the committee.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I think it is a tremendous coincidence for me personally that the first bill that I will manage for the Democratic side will, as I would understand it, be the last bill that the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MCDADE) will be managing on the Republican side.

Having met the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MCDADE) in 1977 as a member of a congressional staff, I must say that I am honored by the pure coincidence and great privilege that this is the gentleman's last bill and my first. It is a moment that I will remember forever, and also the gentleman's friendship.

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

Mr. MCDADE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG), a valued member of our subcommittee.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this conference report, and first I want to pay tribute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman JOE MCDADE) for his outstanding leadership, work, and cooperation. All of that is commendable, but we are very, very sorry to see him go. Believe me, we have appreciated having the gentleman's leadership here.

I also want to thank the subcommittee staff of the Subcommittee on Energy and Water, who have been working on a number of important provisions that are in this bill.

I just want to focus on a couple of areas where we have made, I think, great progress this year to clean up the former defense nuclear facilities. Specifically, in addition to the \$4.2 billion we provided for defense environmental management, we provided over \$1 bil-

lion for defense facilities closure projects, which provides funding for sites which have established a credible goal of completing cleanup by the end of fiscal year 2006.

The major environmental management sites, both Rocky Flats in Colorado and Fernald, Ohio, should be closed within the criteria of this program. It was just 2 years ago that DOE estimated that the total cost of the remaining clean-up of the environmental management sites at between, get this, between \$189 and \$265 billion over a 75-year period, almost as large in dollar amount as the S&L bailout.

That plan to us was unacceptable. Certainly, given the long-term funding outlook of all of the discretionary programs we had currently, entitlements and interest on the national debt constitutes, as I think everyone knows, about two-thirds of the budget, and in 10 to 12 years they are projected to consume 100 percent of the Federal revenues.

An accelerated clean-up schedule like the defense facilities closure projects will enable us to close some of the sites and free up funds to bring about closure to the entire environmental management program.

I also look forward to working with the new Secretary of Energy, Bill Richardson, and want to express the importance of closing out the remaining environmental management sites to him. I urge my colleagues to support this conference report.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN).

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

Mr. BENTSEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in support of the conference report on H.R. 4060, the fiscal year 1999 energy and water appropriations bill. First, I would like to thank the chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MCDADE) for his work on this bill, particularly as it relates to projects in and around my district in southeast Texas, and to the ranking member, the gentleman from California (Mr. FAZIO) for the work he did, as well as to my colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) a member of the subcommittee, who has done yeoman's service in looking out for the interests of our State.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out a couple of things. This bill carries forward with the funding necessary for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to meet the projects that were authorized, particularly the flood control and navigational improvements that were authorized for the 1996 Water Resources Development Act.

In particular, it is important to my area just earlier this month, after having gone through a long drought, the greater Houston area was hit with tropical storm Frances, flooding many

neighborhoods along the Brays and Sims bayous in my district.

H.R. 4060 includes vital funding for several flood control projects, including those for the Brays and Sims as well as Hunting and White Oak bayous. I appreciate that the committee had the wisdom and foresight to see that the Corps got the funding that it needed for these projects.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, let me say that the bill includes \$49 million for the deepening and widening of the Houston Ship Channel, the Nation's second largest port in terms of tonnage. This is a major part of the greater Houston area economy, having an indirect and direct effect on about 200,000 jobs, and this deepening and widening will allow the port to remain competitive, as we have more and more trade going on out of the Texas area.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank all the Members of the committee, but particularly the chairman, who is departing, and the ranking member, the gentleman from California (Mr. FAZIO), who is departing, and ask my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Conference report on H.R. 4060, the FY 1999 Energy and Water Appropriations bill. I would first like to thank Chairman MCDADE and Ranking Member FAZIO for their hard work on this important legislation. I would also like to thank my good friend from Texas, Mr. EDWARDS, for all the help he and his office have provided to projects in our state.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the decision of the Conference to ensure the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers receives adequate funding to continue their vital work in the areas of flood control and navigational improvements as authorized by the 1996 Water Resources Development Act.

I am very pleased by the support this legislation provides for addressing the chronic flooding problems of Harris County, Texas. Just this month, southeast Texas suffered significant flooding from Tropical Storm Frances including neighborhoods along the Brays and Sims Bayous in my district. H.R. 4060, includes vital funding for several flood control projects in the Houston area, including Brays, Sims, and Hunting and White Oak Bayous, which will provide much-needed protection for our communities.

I am most grateful for the subcommittee's decision to fund the Brays Bayou project at \$4.5 million for FY '99. The Administration's FY '99 budget did not request any funding to continue work on this critical flood control project. However, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers had initially requested \$6 million to meet FY '99 construction needs. I am most appreciative that the Conference was able to fund this project while remaining within their budgetary spending caps as specified by the 1997 Balanced Budget Agreement.

This project is necessary to improve flood protection for an extensively developed urban area along Brays Bayou in southwest Harris County. The project consists of 3 miles of channel improvements, three flood detention basins, and seven miles of stream diversion and will provide a 25-year level of flood protection. The project was originally authorized in the Water Resources Development Act of

1990, as part of a \$400 million federal/local flood control project. Through Fiscal Year 1998, over \$6 million has already been appropriated. The Harris County Flood Control District has expended over \$21 million for preconstruction preparation in terms of land acquisition, easements, and relocations, plus an additional \$2.5 million in engineering and construction. As part of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996, the project was authorized as a demonstration project for a new federal reimbursement program. This program is an effort to strengthen and enhance the Corps/Local Sponsor role by giving the local sponsor a lead role and providing for reimbursement by the Federal Government to the local sponsor for the traditional Federal portion of work accomplished.

I am also most grateful for the committee's decision to fund the Sims Bayou project at \$12 million for FY '99, which is much improved over the Administration's request for this project. This project is necessary to improve flood protection for an extensively developed urban area along Sims Bayou in southern Harris County. This project, authorized as part of the 1988 WRDA bill, consists of 19.3 miles of channel enlargement, rectification, and erosion control beginning at the mouth of the bayou at the Houston Ship Channel and will provide a 25-year level of flood protection. This continuing project has received over \$100 million to date in state and federal funding and is scheduled to be completed two years ahead of schedule in 2004.

Mr. Speaker, I am also pleased that this legislation provides \$49 million to fund continuing construction on the Houston Ship Channel expansion project. This project offers tremendous economic and environmental benefits and once completed, will enhance one of our region's most important trade and economic centers. The Houston Ship Channel desperately needs expansion to meet the challenges of expanding global trade and to maintain its competitive edge as a major international port. Currently, the Port of Houston is the second largest port in the United States in total tonnage, and is a catalyst for the southeast Texas economy, contributing more than \$5 billion annually and providing 200,000 jobs.

However, the Port's capacity to increase tonnage and create jobs is limited by the size of the channel. Hence the need for the Houston Ship Channel expansion project, which calls for deepening the channel from 40 to 45 feet and widening it from 400 to 530 feet. The ship channel modernization, considered the largest dredging project since the Panama Canal, will preserve the Port of Houston's status as one of the premier deep-channel Gulf ports and one of the top transit points for cargo in the world.

Again, I thank the Chairman and Ranking Member for their support, and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker. I rise today in strong support of the Energy and Water Appropriations Conference report and to commend my colleagues on the Conference Committee for their diligent work in bringing this Conference Report to the floor.

I would like to take a moment to highlight two items in this bill that are important to the citizens of western Wisconsin: The Upper Mississippi River System Environmental Management Program and the LaFarge Dam, located in the Kickapoo River Valley.

The Mighty Mississippi River runs through the heartland of our nation, and has been the focal point of our country's development throughout history. Today, Americans from 33 states live, work and play in its basin, and so it is only right that we recognize the Mississippi River as a nationally significant resource by funding programs such as the EMP, that serve the multi-purpose nature of this great river.

The Mississippi River is a working river with diverse uses. It carries the agricultural products of our nation's midsection to foreign markets while providing habitat for fish, wildlife and migrating waterfowl. Boaters and anglers use the rivers backwaters and side channels for a wide variety of recreational activities.

During this congress, I have worked with Rep. OBERSTAR, Rep. LEACH and Rep. GUTKNECHT to form the bipartisan Upper Mississippi River Task Force. Sixteen members of Congress—eight members from each side of the aisle—have joined together, to recognize the national importance of the navigational, recreational, and environmental benefits this nation enjoys because of a healthy, vibrant Mississippi River. The Upper Mississippi River Task Force has repeatedly voiced its unwavering support for fully funding the EMP. I thank the members of the Task Force for their bipartisanship, diligence and perseverance in supporting our nation's interest in the Mississippi River.

The EMP is unique in its multi-agency and multi-state cooperation in addressing the diverse needs of the resource. This Appropriations bill provides \$18.9 million for the long-term resources monitoring and habitat restoration and enhancement efforts of the EMP. I commend the Army Corps of Engineers, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the U.S. Geological Survey, and the states of Wisconsin, Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota and Missouri for their participation in such a successful program.

This appropriations bill also provides \$2.8 million in much needed funding for the LaFarge Dam project in my district in Western Wisconsin. The Water Resources Development Act of 1996 provisionally deauthorized the Army Corps of Engineers' La Farge Dam Project, located on the Kickapoo River in western Wisconsin. It also called for the transfer of ownership 8700 acres to the State of Wisconsin and Ho-Chunk Indian Nation.

This funding will provide the Army Corps of Engineers the resources it needs to continue the relocation of a state highway, conduct an environmental clean-up of reserve land, make safety modifications to the site, and address cultural resources issues in compliance with federal law. This funding will finally make the Kickapoo Reserve accessible to hikers, canoeists and outdoor enthusiasts for generations to come.

I applaud the Appropriations Committee for its diligence in protecting these priorities and providing the financial resources we need to preserve and protect the integrity of our nation's most treasured natural resources, our nation's rivers.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, with the adoption today of the conference report on H.R. 4060, the Fiscal Year 1999 Energy and Water Development Appropriations, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to the House and Senate conferees for the inclusion of \$14 million for the West Columbus Floodwall Project. Each year, as the appro-

priations process unfolds in Congress, I have made budget requests for the Floodwall Project, and have closely monitored the process to ensure that it receives the funding it needs. I remain committed toward achieving this goal. The \$14 million included in this conference report will allow this project to proceed on-schedule and on-budget.

The threat of a major flood disaster continues to loom Columbus and Central Ohio. In 1913, 1937, and 1959, melting snow and heavy rains caused the Scioto River to overflow its banks. The resulting catastrophic floods caused the loss of many lives, destroyed homes and businesses, and damaged millions of dollars worth of residential and commercial property. Until the Floodwall Project is completed, the potential for a major flood disaster will continue to threaten citizens, homes, and businesses located in the very heart of downtown Columbus that borders the Scioto River. Currently, approximately 17,000 residents continue to be placed at risk of life, injury, and hardship. Should a 100-year frequency flood occur prior to completion of the project, the damages are estimated at \$365 million and should a 500-year flood occur, the damages are estimated to exceed \$455 million.

While risk to human life and safety is of paramount concern, completion of the Floodwall will also permit important new development along the Columbus riverfront. Columbus is now the largest city in Ohio and the sixteenth largest city in the United States. Its economy is strong and the city is experiencing rapid growth. New construction in the downtown riverfront area, however, will not be able to proceed until the Floodwall construction is completed. Without the important protection of the Floodwall, this looming risk will deter future business and housing development, economic growth, infrastructure improvements, and recreational opportunities in the city. Currently, flood plain zoning restrictions continue to remain in place for 5,520 residences and 650 non-residential structures, as well as the future development of 2,800 acres. It is, therefore, imperative to the city's growth and economic health that the Floodwall Project continue on schedule. Therefore, it is not only the safety of Columbus residents and businesses, but also the future growth of the city's downtown which depends on the timely completion of this important project.

On behalf of those that continue to live with the threat of a major disaster in Columbus and Central Ohio, let me again thank all the Members for their assistance on this very important project.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I rise with specific concerns regards the Energy and Water Appropriation measure. When conference with the Senate was sought the full House accepted my instruction which put the House on record in opposition to the Senate provision regards the Denali Commission which provided the authorization of an economic development commission with such sums as necessary and then topped it off with a \$20 million appropriation. Little was understood, surely no hearings and no clear concept of what the purpose and cost would be were understood with the Senate language. The House on a voice vote said no to this policy path and process by accepting the veto instruction.

In conference I understand that the Senate advocate insisted upon this provision and that

the best the House conferees could do was to fence, to subject to authorization the \$20 million that was included in the final conference that we are being asked to agree to today.

I must say I'm disappointed with this result and hope that the House can forestall and quick action to free up this \$20 million solely for Alaska. This state has a significant oil reserve and billions in revenue that flows exclusively to the residents that have no income tax and little in other state-wide taxes that prevail in the other forty nine states. Alaska should look first to its own resources for the purposes anticipated by this commission provision and Congress should not short cut the normal process of open hearing and a good understanding of the topic. Nevertheless, we should and I'm hopeful that given the chance to review and limit this policy that the Congress would act responsibly. Therefore, I intend to vote for this measure with the hope that the intent of a true authorization, a complete evaluation, approved by the Congress is going to be implemented.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Conference Report on H.R. 4060, the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act for FY 1999. Included in this important conference report is an appropriation for the continued dredging project for the Houston Ship Channel. This has been a long time coming and we have all worked very hard to get to this point.

The expansion of the Houston Ship Channel is important on many levels. The Port of Houston, connected to the Gulf of Mexico by the 53-mile ship channel, is the busiest U.S. port in foreign tonnage, second in domestic tonnage and the world's eighth busiest U.S. port overall. With more than 6,435 vessels navigating the channel annually and an anticipated increase over the next few years, the widening of the channel from 400 to 520 feet and its deepening from 40 to 45 feet is a necessary step in safeguarding the economic viability of the port and the City of Houston.

The port provides \$5.5 billion in annual business revenues and creates 196,000 direct and indirect jobs in our communities. By generating \$300 million annually to the federal government from customs fees generated by port activities and \$213 million annually in state and local taxes, this Ship Channel dredging project will more than pay for itself.

We have made a good first step. For Fiscal Year 1998, the Congress approved \$20 million to begin construction. With the leadership and dedication of my colleagues, Chairman JOSEPH MCDADE and ranking Member VIC FAZIO, as well as Congressman CHET EDWARDS, we have secured \$49 million for fiscal year 1999.

We still have a lot of work to ensure that the deepening and widening project remains on schedule. Working together, I know we will be successful.

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of H.R. 4017, the Energy Conservation Reauthorization Act of 1998. The bill supports the continued funding of worthy programs that stemmed from the Energy Policy and Conservation Act and the Energy Conservation and Production Act. During the mark-up of H.R. 4017 in the Commerce Committee, the bill was amended to include a provision that would make our Nation less dependent on foreign oil supplies by promoting the use of biodiesel fuel in the Federal Government.

I am proud to rise as a cosponsor of a provision that will provide credit for those who consume the biodiesel blend, B-20, an alternative fuel. Currently, Federal, local, and municipal agencies must add alternatively fueled vehicles to their fleets. B-20 is an easily-accessible alternative fuel that is a combination of many of the farm products produced in southern Ohio. The bill authorizes fleet managers using biodiesel in their motor vehicles to receive credit toward the requirements for alternatively fueled vehicles established under current law.

Of equal importance is the positive effect this bill will have on farming communities across the country including those in the Sixth Congressional District of Ohio. This bill supports farm incomes by increasing demand for soybeans, natural fats, and other farm products. This measure is critical, given the current economic woes of farmers in Ohio and the rest of this country. H.R. 4017 does not create any new mandates on covered fleets, and actually provides fleet operators greater flexibility in compliance with existing law. The Energy Conservation Reauthorization Act modified the purchase requirement program to reward the use of alternative fuel sources. In sum, the bill promotes U.S. energy security and regulatory flexibility while assisting America's farmers.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). 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 7 of rule XV, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 3150, BANKRUPTCY REFORM ACT OF 1998

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 3150) to amend Title 11 of the United States Code, 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 (Mr. SHIMKUS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NADLER moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two houses on the Senate amendment to the House bill (H.R. 3150) be instructed to agree to section 405 of the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr.

GEKAS) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

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

Mr. Speaker, I am offering this motion in response to a disturbing practice that unfortunately has become all too common. Credit card companies have told the Congress that they need this bill to provide protection from irresponsible borrowers who abuse the bankruptcy system to evade debts that they can repay.

I do not agree with the bill and I do not agree with that contention, but even if that were true, the practice that some credit card companies have now engaged in is unconscionable. Some credit card companies now discriminate against the most responsible borrowers by cutting off their credit card or charging other fees to borrowers who commit the terrible sin of paying their bills in full and on time each month.

This form of discrimination against the most responsible borrowers is intolerable and outrageous. On the one hand they are telling us that borrowers are irresponsible and we should do something about that. On the other hand, they want the right to discriminate against borrowers who act responsibly.

Mr. Speaker, in response to this phenomenon, the other body adopted an amendment offered by the junior Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. REED, which would prohibit this practice. It is an amendment to the Truth in Lending Act. It makes sense, it is fair, and it reinforces the theme that the sponsors of this bill have been stressing, the theme of shared responsibility in lending between borrower and creditor.

□ 1600

The House bill tightens the noose around the necks of bankrupt Americans, but does nothing to ensure that banks are also required to act responsibly. This amendment and the others adopted by the Senate will help bring some balance to an unbalanced bill.

Mr. Speaker, this is a real problem. Around the country, credit card customers who are most responsible with their borrowing practices have received letters from issuers which say, and I am now going to quote,

Our records indicate this account has had no finance charges assessed in the last 12 months. Unfortunately, the expense incurred by our company to maintain and service your account has become prohibitive; and, as a result, in accordance with the terms of your card holder agreement, we are not re-issuing your credit card.

The message is clear. Be responsible but not too responsible. It reveals the true agenda of the supporters of this bill, which is not to encourage responsible borrowing but to allow banks to squeeze borrowers even further.

The banks were able to kill an amendment to prohibit the outrageous double fees at ATMs, a little balance