

that DOE can reprogram those leftover funds as the need arises, sometimes on projects completely unrelated to the original intent of Congress.

In the current budget climate at present, it seems to me this accounting procedure may be flawed, and as we work toward balancing our books and exercise congressional prerogatives in terms of directing how these leftover funds are used, these unneeded carry-over funds should be used for deficit reduction or at least to ease shortfalls that can occur in the otherwise austere budget climate.

I would ask the chairman if we could work together to resolve this matter. As a member of both the Committee on National Security and the Committee on Science, I would welcome the opportunity to work with my colleagues on the Committee on Appropriation on this issue.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TANNER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for bringing this to our attention. The committee is quite concerned about this problem. We have been concerned for quite some time, have tried to identify just how much there are in some of these unobligated funds. Most appropriations are good for just 1 year. Sometimes in defense they go a little longer, but we are deeply concerned about the same problems and share your concern. We get a different figure from DOE when we ask for it, but we share your concern and would be pleased to work with you and the other authorizing committee members in making certain we try to tie up this loose end.

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I appreciate that because I am concerned about the funding levels in the decontamination and decommissioning account, which funds environmental cleanup and decontamination and decommissioning activities at the Portsmouth, OH, Paducah, KY, and Oak Ridge, TN gaseous diffusion plants, plants, and the non-defense environmental restoration and waste management account.

GAO, I would note, identifies more than \$40 million in leftover unneeded funds to cancel construction projects funded in the environmental and waste management account.

May I ask if the chairman believes that at least a portion of these carry-over funds could be used to fund needed projects in the decontamination and decommissioning account and the non-defense energy restoration and waste management account?

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would continue to yield, again we share his concern about this and we are trying to monitor this as closely as we can because this is one of the most rapidly growing accounts that we have and it will continue to be a problem for us. So we have to make sure every dollar is used

effectively. We share the gentleman's concern and will be glad to work with him.

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the service that both the gentlemen have rendered, and I thank the chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise informally.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. TORKILDSEN) assumed the chair.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 3734. An act to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 201(a)(1) of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1997.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 3734) "An Act to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 201(a)(1) of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1997," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints from the Committee on the Budget: Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. EXON, and Mr. HOLLINGS; from the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry: Mr. LUGAR, Mr. HELMS, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. HEFLIN, and Mr. HARKIN; from the Committee on Finance: Mr. ROTH, Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HATCH, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. BRADLEY, Mr. PRYOR, and Mr. ROCKEFELLER; and from the Committee on Labor and Human Resources: Mrs. KASSEBAUM and Mr. DODD, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

#### ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1997

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KNOLLENBERG].

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Indiana for yielding me this time, and I appreciate all the work he has done, particularly on this bill, but also the staff, my staff and the committee's staff. They worked hard and have done an outstanding job.

There are several things I want to talk about, but to be very brief about this, I want to focus on the fact that in this appropriations bill, like any other appropriations bill, we did not simply spread the pain evenly among the programs in our jurisdiction. Instead, we prioritized spending program by program based on their efficiency and national importance.

I would just tell my colleagues that I am encouraged by the committee's foresight to fund the basic research and development programs at the budget request level. Furthermore, the committee has reduced funding for those programs that simply give subsidies to corporations for product development. We have all heard of corporate welfare, and it seems to be in defiance of a free and open market. The market is the best indicator, of course, of the value of a product.

Programs such as the international solar energy program and the renewable energy production incentive program are an example, I believe, of the Federal Government defying the market by holding otherwise noncompetitive corporations afloat with Federal subsidies.

I want to talk about important item which, frankly, is a concern I think of everybody. It is the environmental waste end of things where we spend something over \$6 billion. If we look at the BEMR report, which was produced to give us an example of when this would come to an end, they are talking about the end of the next century. That is simply not acceptable.

I am glad to see we have report language now that will give us a program to get on track and it expresses the committee's strong views, and also, I believe, DOE's, in terms of bringing to closure these sites around the country.

In the report language for fiscal year 1998, the bill, and I certainly want to thank the gentleman from Indiana, Chairman MYERS, and the ranking member, the gentleman from Alabama, Mr. BEVILL, and all the committee for their work on this, we have in place a project closure fund.

It means simply this. The committee then directs the Department of Energy to include in its budget request to Congress an account designated as the project closure fund. As the report indicates, the purpose of a closure project is within a fixed period of time to clean up and decommission a former defense nuclear facility, or portion thereof, and to make the facility safe by stabilizing, consolidating, and removing special nuclear materials from the facility.

The site contractor must demonstrate and validate several criteria, including a project completion date, within 10 years of application. That is a lot shorter than the end of the next century. The amount of funding to be set aside for the project closure fund is 10 percent of the total defense EM Program. This funding would be available to site contractors who meet the criteria on a competitive basis.

The project closure fund is the type of program that can save the EM from becoming a century long spending fiasco. What we need and what the project closure fund provides is a responsible, manageable cleanup program to bring closure to the EM Program and free up the Department of Energy's largest fiscal expenditure for budget deficit reduction.

Closure of these former defense nuclear cleanup sites is mandatory if we are to achieve our highest goal, which is ensuring safety for the communities and the workers in close proximity to the sites.

It also sends a message, I believe, to the Department of Energy and the site contractors that the time is now to close down the EM Program. We owe it to our Nation to come up with a better plan.

Again, I sincerely want to thank Chairman MYERS, Ranking Member BEVILL, and all the crew, all the gang here that worked so hard to include the project closure fund in the report language. I am encouraged by this language, and I am glad to see we are turning the corner.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished ranking member for yielding me this time, and I will make a rather short statement with regard to the bill.

Mr. Chairman, it should not take a hike in the price of gasoline, such as we have experienced over the last year, for the Congress to remember its responsibilities to the energy supply and security of this Nation. However, because the last few years of relative calm in the energy markets have lulled us into complacency, perhaps this sharp jab resulting from these gasoline price increases may have been just what we needed.

It is a fact that our only insurance policy against future energy security problems, against further pollution and degradation of the environment and jolts to the economy from gasoline price hikes is energy research and development, and yet the bill before us today cuts energy research and development rather drastically.

I think that there may be some in this body who believe that the American public somehow will not notice that the Congress is cutting energy and renewables R&D even at this time of increased gasoline prices. Perhaps they think it is just too technical for the American public to grasp. However, poll after poll shows that the American public not only knows about these energy R&D programs but overwhelmingly supports them.

□ 1645

The American public expects the Federal Government to promote solar and renewable energy technologies and energy R&D, so that advances occur in the energy market sooner rather than later and so that current energy sources supply as much useful energy as they can. I am referring here, of course, to fossil.

The public understands that we have too much at stake in energy security, in curbing pollution, and in creating and capturing high technology markets for us to curtail Federal efforts in energy R&D now.

The bill before us risks just such a lack of attention to solar and renewables research, to nuclear energy strategy, to biological and environmental research and to fusion energy R&D.

I understand very clearly that this is because of the current budgetary crisis that faces us, but it is time for us to look to the long-term future of our country, and I think that we should begin with the kind of bills that we have before us. For a country as dependent on energy as the United States, investment in R&D is the only prudent course of action. A strong energy R&D program allows us and our children to develop cheap and pollution-free energy sources. More importantly, if we do not make this investment, our children will continue to be plagued by the geopolitical and economic problems that concern us today.

Mr. Chairman, I want to recognize the important contribution to the House and to this bill of the gentleman from Indiana, JOHN MYERS, and the gentleman from Alabama, TOM BEVILL, who will soon retire. They have been leaders. They have been gentlemen. They have treated me with courtesy even though I was a pain in the neck most of the time, and I am very grateful to them for this. I want to wish them the very best in terms of a happy, well-earned retirement. I hope that I will not see the last of them after they retire, and I look forward to continuing our good relationship.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California for his very kind and generous remarks.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN], a very hard working new member of this committee. He has made a great contribution in helping us ease the fusion problem.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 3816 making appropriations for energy and water development for fiscal year 1997. I would first like to thank Chairman JOHN MYERS and Ranking Member TOM BEVILL for their leadership and direction. Although I have not had the pleasure of working with them as long as some of my colleagues, I am grateful that I have had 2 years to learn from them. I will miss both of them in the next Congress as they are retiring.

I would also like to thank the dedicated staff of the subcommittee, without them our jobs would be tremendously more difficult. Their knowledge and professionalism is to be commended.

The bill before the House today stresses national priorities while keeping our commitment to downsize the Federal Government, maintain funding for critical flood safety projects, coastal protection, and dredging harbors and waterways throughout our Nation. We have made some tough choices about

where to reduce spending but I believe the \$19.8 billion that we have provided is targeted toward the areas that are the most important.

I am particularly pleased with the subcommittee decision to flatly reject the President's proposal to end coastal protection and smaller navigation projects. These projects are very important to local economies all over the United States and especially New Jersey. The President's policy was shortsighted and would have resulted in hurting many communities that rely on promises the Federal Government has made to provide flood protection. And more often than not, they are projects that have been undertaken in partnerships with local and State governments. I am hopeful that the administration will abandon future efforts such as these and concentrate on providing the protection that our citizens deserve.

In addition, this bill provides \$225 million for magnetic fusion energy research. While this number is reduced from last year level, I am hopeful that as the bill moves through the legislative process the committee will be able to increase the number. I am also optimistic that the committee will be able to reach a compromise on language giving the Department the greatest flexibility in meeting the FEAC recommendations contained in this year's report. Scientists who work in this special area of fusion research tell me that the prospects for achieving practical fusion energy have never been greater. The progress over the past several years has been truly impressive. Fusion energy research needs to be continued if we have any hopes of finding future energy sources that do not harm our environment.

Mr. Chairman, this bill represents real progress toward setting national priorities. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], our ranking Democrat on the House Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, let me simply make a few brief observations. I have some concerns about a number of items in this bill, including the international nuclear issues, the squeeze which is created on fusion research by earmarking, which means that you have left only \$16 million to fund \$51 million worth of demand from research universities around the country. I am concerned about the reduction in solar and renewable energy and about a number of other items, one of which I will be dealing with in an amendment which I will be offering later in the game on the advanced light water reactor.

My purpose in rising at this point, however, is to simply note with considerable regret the decision to retire that has been reached by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL]. We

have seen a number of stories written lately about why this institution seems to be so much more partisan and why it has become a much less pleasant place to work. It certainly has.

I think if you want to know why that is happening, I think two reasons are simply that Members like Mr. MYERS and Mr. BEVILL are retiring. I think that will be a great loss to this institution because they both bring to this institution not only their considerable expertise in the programs with which they deal, but they also bring considerable grace to the way in which they perform their jobs.

I have admired JOHN MYERS' ability to get along with everybody for as long as I have known him in this body. I do not think there is a mean bone in his body and I do not think there is a partisan bone in his body. He has, I think, genuinely shown that good guys can finish first, despite the admonition to the contrary by Leo Durocher a good many years ago.

I think the same is true for TOM BEVILL. Every one who knows TOM BEVILL understands that he is a consummate gentleman. They understand that he is first and foremost interested in getting the job done and does not much cotton to partisan arguments one way or another. He has helped many a Member and many a community in this country to deal with problems that otherwise would have been beyond their reach.

I will very much regret next year seeing that neither of them will be here, but they have done honor to this House. They have done honor to this country and they have done honor to their respective parties by the manner in which they have served their constituents in this body. I think we all owe them a standing round of applause.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] for those very kind remarks. I hope we deserve them.

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

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN].

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

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 3816, the fiscal year 1997 energy and water appropriations bill.

First, I would like to thank Chairman MYERS and Ranking Member BEVILL for their hard work on this important legislation and the consideration that they have given to my region of the country. As a former staff member of this body, it is an honor to have had the opportunity to work with them for just the short time that I have been here. But I do appreciate it and we will miss their leadership.

Devastating damage from floods is a clear reminder that our lives and our infrastructure and our economy depend on proper watershed management. I am pleased that H.R. 3816 includes vital

funding for several flood control and navigational projects in the Houston area. These projects include Brays, Sims, and Breens Bayous and will provide much-needed protection for communities that have been plagued by severe flooding for decades.

Funding is also included for the Port of Houston and Houston ship channel which are of great economic importance to our region and to the Nation.

I would remind my colleagues that in 1994, the Clinton administration proposed a phaseout of Federal funding for local flood control projects. I and other Members of the Texas delegation worked with the chairman and ranking member and members of the subcommittee to reject this proposal, and I am pleased that once again they have chosen to do so. However, as Congress seeks to balance the budget, the scarcity of Federal dollars for flood control could threaten hundreds of projects in southeast Texas and the entire country.

Although this committee has achieved what some would consider impossible in funding these projects, it is clear that Federal flood control policy must adapt to meet budgetary constraints without sacrificing public safety and environmental protection. That is why I have been working with the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure which oversees the authorization of water projects to restructure Federal watershed management and flood control policy and allow local entities to have more planning and construction involvement.

I believe local agencies, such as the Harris County Flood Control District in my district can construct these projects more quickly and more cost-effectively if they are free from Federal regulation and given more responsibility in return for less Federal dollars. This should benefit both the families who live in the flood-prone areas as well as taxpayers.

The Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure recently authorized the Water Resources Development Act reauthorization which includes language designating Harris County as a national test site for allowing local control over flood control. Under this plan, the Federal Government remains as partner in flood control but local governments will gain authority to respond more quickly and positively.

It is my hope that the Committee on Appropriations will look favorably on these flood control reforms. The time has come for Congress to give local governments more opportunity to plan and construct Federal flood control projects and to make safer communities and good for the American taxpayers.

I appreciate the work that the committee has done for the southeast Texas region. I ask my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HINCHEY].

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to raise a very serious consideration about one aspect of this particular bill; that is, the fact that this bill cuts 36 percent from fiscal year 1995 appropriations, the amount that it will spend in the next fiscal year on renewable energy research and development. This is a critical failure of the legislation. Keep in mind, a few years ago, we fought a war in the gulf. We fought that war for one purpose, because the gulf provides the world with the oil that it needs to run.

Just a few weeks ago, we lost 19 American servicemen in Saudi Arabia. The reason those servicemen were stationed in Saudi Arabia is only one, and that is because so much of our energy in this country is imported. We are now importing more than 50 percent of our annual energy needs, the annual oil needs, from outside of the country. We are becoming critically dependent upon foreign oil once again.

This is a very serious matter indeed. There is only one way for us to unhook ourselves from our dependence on gulf oil, one way to ensure that we do not fight more wars and lose more lives in Saudi Arabia and elsewhere in the gulf region. That is to remove ourselves from this dependence on gulf oil, Saudi Arabian oil particularly. We need to do that through research and development.

The research and development industry, the industry for research and development in solar is about to explode. It is expected that this industry will grow by 70 percent over the next 5 years. Let us look at where we stand with regard to other countries in this area of research and development.

Denmark spends more for wind research and development than does the United States. Japan spends twice as much on photovoltaic research and development than the United States, and Japan spends \$150 million more on photovoltaic procurement.

We need to reinvest in alternative energy. If we fail to do that, we are going to lose more American lives in the future.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA].

(Mrs. MORELLA asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

□ 1700

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, my congratulations to us and to the American people for having had the professional service of these two gentlemen who are leading this bill, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL], who both have served 30 years each. Three decades they have given to our country in a very professional committed manner, demonstrating that civility is here and does have a place in the legislative process.

Now commenting on the bill, Mr. Chairman: Within the energy and

water development appropriations bill, the Congress must ensure that we equip the Department of Energy to effectively meet our present and future energy needs. While the bill before us funds many critical programs, it would restrict the Department of Energy's ability to perform its mission by including a 30 percent reduction in the Department of Energy's departmental administration overall funding.

DOE's departmental administration salary and expenses budget is reduced by more than 20 percent, a reduction of over \$50 million in fiscal year 1997, and instead of allowing DOE to reallocate their reduced resources as they deem appropriate, it reduces DOE's departmental administration staff of 1,500 FTE's as full-time equivalents by another 500 FTE's, a cut of over one-third of their staff, and sets specific FTE targets for each office. So there is no flexibility for the right decisionmaking.

Last year in the fiscal year 1996 appropriations bill, Congress asked DOE headquarters personnel in certain programs to make significant cuts and changes. The departmental administration budget was cut by 15 percent, which translates into a reduction of approximately 400 FTE's. Managers worked hard to administer this staff reduction without resorting to reductions in force. To save jobs, performance awards were eliminated, overtime was reduced by a half, furloughs were used to address further funding shortfalls. And despite substantial reductions in operating cost at headquarters, a two-thirds reduction since 1993, this legislation sets a general management and program support function at DOE at 47 percent less than last year and 20 percent less than the administration's request.

Mr. Chairman, it has been a difficult year for Federal employees. They have endured shutdowns, downsizing, RIF's, uncertainty and reduced benefits. They are among the most resilient people that we know. We really should not hit them any harder.

The negative ramifications of this unprecedented and punitive cut will affect the many important projects funded by this year's Energy and Water Development Appropriations bill. The bill targets cuts in the Environmental Management Program, Nonproliferation, and Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy. In addition, the 90-percent cut imposed on DOE's Policy Office will leave only 20 employees to perform critical technical and economic analysis. This cut will jeopardize strategic planning and implementation of management reforms, economic policy development, gasoline market impact analyses.

Mr. Chairman, what I want to say is that I think we can ill-afford to have these cuts of the Federal employees, and I think it affects adversely the mission of the Department of Energy. I hope the conference committee will do something to ameliorate it. I feel that

this important piece of legislation does have that damaging aspect of it.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. VISLOSKEY].

Mr. VISLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I regret that I was not present 19 years ago when the Tom Bevill-John Myers story began; the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL] at that time being chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] being the ranking minority member. I am very pleased that I was present, however, as a member of the subcommittee on the very last markup held by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS], and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL]. These two gentlemen are gentlemen in the truest sense of the word, and with the national public debate that has been overtaken by cynicism, they are the two who we can point to in the House of Representatives and hold out as examples of people who can hold strongly held views and yet work 24 hours a day to find that responsible bipartisan middle ground.

I say to the gentleman from Indiana and the gentleman from Alabama, I respect you, I have a deep affection for you. You have been friends of mine. You have been more than generous, much more generous than I deserved, with me, and you will be sorely missed. You have my every best wish for good health, joy, and happiness for every day of your life, and it was a tremendous privilege to be able to serve, however shortly, on the subcommittee with both of you in leadership positions.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER].

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

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to begin my remarks where my distinguished friend from Indiana left off. That is, attempting to recognize and thank the gentleman from the great State of Indiana, a fellow Hoosier, and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL], a friend on the Democratic side, for all they have contributed to this institution over their long years and their valuable years of service.

Certainly we have many, many debates in this Chamber where oftentimes it is overtaken and overwhelmed by partisanship and by cynicism and by lack of respect for one another. These two gentlemen always would bring bills to this House floor where there was a comity, a respect and an institutional knowledge that lent credibility to this institution, and I thank them for that contribution in making this a better place to serve.

Along those lines, Mr. Chairman, I would like to encourage my colleagues to vote for an amendment that I will be

offering later on in this debate on the energy and water bill where I will cut about \$9.6 million from the field laboratories. Now, certainly the Senate has done this already. They have said, we do not just cut things from Washington, DC, and the bureaucracy here, we have to cut from our own backyards as well too, and that means going out into the field where we have some of the money going for congressional pork. Let us make sure that as we cut and balance the budget in outyears, that we cut not just Washington, DC, bureaucracy but we cut some of the field offices, and I will be offering a bipartisan amendment to cut to where the Senate has cut.

I would also encourage my colleagues to not overly micromanage in the area of fusion R&D, and there is report language in this bill that I think can be as harmful as some of the cuts that have taken place over the years in fusion. I would say let us not micromanage to our universities, big or small, exactly where each and every one of these dollars should go in fusion research.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would say let us continue to put many of our resources in solar and renewable research. I am somewhat concerned with some of the cuts in this bill on solar and renewable. I know an amendment is going to be offered, a bipartisan amendment that I will strongly support, that will include restoring some moneys back into that very, very valuable account.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I conclude my remarks, thank the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] for his service to the great State of Indiana once again, and thank the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL] for his bipartisanship.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to comment on several provisions in the House version of the energy and water appropriations bill for fiscal year 1997 that I hope will be fixed by House floor action or in conference.

First, the energy and water bill continues the assault on civilian applied energy R&D initiated last year. From fiscal year 1995 levels, without factoring inflation, this bill cuts solar and renewables research by 44 percent, nuclear energy R&D by almost 60 percent, biological and environmental research by 6 percent, and fusion R&D by 37 percent. This is unacceptable.

These cuts devastate activities such as those that created solar cell modules that allow the United States to lead the world in sales of this technology with over one-third of the \$300 million per year photovoltaics market; developed wind turbines that save the energy equivalent of 4.4 million barrels of oil each year in California alone; achieved a 50-percent increase in efficiency at nuclear powerplants, saving several million dollars per year per reactor; and made significant progress toward developing a fusion reactor that could help to create a worldwide supply of cheap energy for the 21st century.

In addition to reducing energy costs, these same technologies also reduce pollution and help to preserve the environment. If technology development can invent a way out of

our pollution problems, it is surely a better approach than imposing Federal mandates and regulations.

Another bonus of such technology development may be that the United States can become more self-sufficient and cease to depend on foreign energy sources. I, for one, don't want to fight another Persian Gulf war if we can avoid it. And I think that spending a little on energy R&D to avoid such a war in the future—even in the distant future—is well worth the price.

Amendments will be offered later to add funds to the solar and renewables research efforts of the Department—I strongly support such amendments. In addition, I will be offering (an) amendment(s) to recoup savings from streamlining in the Department and its laboratories—and I strongly urge Members to listen closely to that debate and support returning those savings, not those from cuts to R&D, to the taxpayer.

At the same time, some Members will offer amendments to eliminate further research and development of Advanced Light Water Reactors. I strongly oppose such a move. We need to complete the final year of the ongoing innovative public-private partnership to develop the next-generation nuclear powerplants of the future. Otherwise we will concede the market to other countries with less stringent safeguards for environmental and health protection.

Each of these issues will be the subject of further floor action. However, there are two issues that I'd also like to discuss now that I respectfully ask the eventual conferees to this bill to consider in conference.

First, the report accompanying the Energy and Water appropriations bill details specific funding allocations within the fusion R&D account. These earmarks severely disadvantage the universities and small laboratories that participate in the program and threaten the balance between small and large experiments so important to its advancement. I appeal to the eventual conferees on this bill to negate this report language in conference. Such earmarking does not reflect well on the Congress and may do more harm to the Fusion R&D program than even the 40-percent cut it has received these past 2 years.

Also within the bill's report language are detailed FTE allocations for the Department's headquarters staff. Not only do these levels severely hamper the ability of the Department to carry out its mission, but such directive language intrudes on the prerogative of the executive branch to organize and staff its offices as circumstances require. This language also does not reflect well on the Congress and I encourage the conferees for this bill to strike it in its entirety.

Before I close, I would like to recognize the excellent work of Chairman MYERS and Ranking Member BEVILL. While there are several aspects of the bill with which I do not agree, I thank them heartily for their fine effort in the face of such a daunting task. Both JOHN MYERS and TOM BEVILL will be sorely missed in this Congress after they retire and their institutional knowledge will be impossible to recover. While this is not yet the time for good-byes, I want to express my heartfelt appreciation for their important contributions to the Congress and to this bill, and not let my disagreement with certain actions taken in the bill reflect on the tremendous contribution that both Members bring to this House.

Finally, I would like to close with an appeal to Members of the House to consider the long-term implications of reductions to applied R&D contained in this bill. Such R&D has proven time and again its worth to American society through environmental protection and economic gains. Furthermore, energy and environmental technologies will only grow to a greater economic engine in the global economy, as environmental problems and oil import concerns increase. We must not hamper the ability of the United States to compete and benefit from these developments. Otherwise, when we have balanced the budget, we will find that we are left with a knowledge deficit that places the American economy behind its competitors.

I urge Members to vote on upcoming amendments to restore U.S. energy and environment R&D capabilities, while supporting bipartisan efforts to cut in the appropriate places—namely, administrative overhead at the Department and its laboratories.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, we thank everyone who said nice words about the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL] and me, but this is about to conclude here.

So at this time I yield the remaining time that we have on our side to the very distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS]. He is a very hard-working, valuable member of the subcommittee.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I just want to join with all of our colleagues in the accolades that have preceded me in thanking the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] and the distinguished former chairman and now ranking member, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL], not just for their tremendous work on this bill, but for their many years of extraordinary service to the House and to our country. I think I speak for all our colleagues in saying that their collective wisdom and experience will be sorely missed in this House and am wishing them well in all their future endeavors.

Later tonight during the appropriate titles of the bill, I want to talk on a couple of other subjects: Small harbor safety and fusion energy. But right now I want to focus on one action that I wish we had taken in committee but did not, and that is dealing with the growing problem of radioactive waste disposal. It is a problem that is not going to go away in this country. It is sort of like a ticking time bomb that gets more serious with every passing day. One in three diagnostic medical tests today uses radioactive materials. Eighty percent of all drugs are developed using some radioactive materials. Critical research on AIDS, cancer and multiple sclerosis could not take place without radioactive materials. These benefits to society, though, come at a cost. We need responsible disposal sites for the waste that is generated by these activities.

That is why I considered offering in committee, but was dissuaded by my good friend and distinguished chairman, considered offering the Ward Valley Land Transfer Act as an amend-

ment to our bill. This would have affected the long-awaited transfer of land from the Department of Interior to the State of California to serve as a site for the storage of low-level radioactive waste.

I regret that the transfer has become embroiled in election year politics. The Interior Department is reluctant to allow our State of California to manage its own waste disposal.

Now, colleagues, we know the history of this particular issue. In 1993, after years of environmental study, California licensed Ward Valley in the remote Mohave Desert as a disposal site for low-level waste. Since that time the State's actions have successfully passed the review of the National Academy of Sciences and the California Supreme Court. All that remains is the actual transfer of the land from the Department of Interior to the State of California. State officials led by our Governor, Pete Wilson, have acted in good faith and they have taken many difficult steps to carry out their duty to provide for the disposal of low-level waste. However, after originally supporting the Ward Valley land transfer, the administration has now taken the position that more study is necessary.

Well, this is the good old bureaucratic paralysis by analysis, and it is blocking our enactment of a nuclear waste policy act, a policy in this country.

We also have the same problem with respect to storing spent nuclear fuel, another problem that is not going away. Since 1983 the Federal Government has collected \$11 billion from electric ratepayers throughout the country. Now the Federal Government is seriously behind schedule in meeting its obligation to begin accepting spent nuclear fuel. If we do not enact legislation, legislation such as Yucca Mountain, 27 reactors will exhaust spent fuels storage capacity by 1998, just 2 years away. This will subject ratepayers to billions of dollars more in unnecessary costs for onsite storage of spent fuel.

So let me just tell my colleagues again that we need to be responsive in this body to the concerns of our fellow citizens. The Federal Government lacks a long-term policy for the disposal of nuclear waste. This is holding the benefits of nuclear medicine and nuclear energy hostage to politics.

So I urge my colleagues to rise above election year expediency and help to properly manage its radioactive nuclear materials.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE].

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I also want to say that I regret the retirement of both the chairman and the ranking member of the subcommittee. The two of them always worked in a bipartisan manner. They are examples in this House of Representatives of what Members and chairman and ranking members truly should be, and I want to commend them for all their efforts.

Particularly this year once again, just as an example of their forward thinking in my opinion, is the report language in this bill that once again rejects the policy that was suggested by the administration that we not, that the Federal Government cut back or eliminate its role in shore protection, beach replenishment and small navigation projects. I looked at the report language today, and I am very pleased to see that it does commend the administration for dropping its opposition to support Federal support of flood control projects; but as we know, we continue to see this distinction in the administration's eyes between flood control and beach erosion protection, and the administration even goes further and suggests that they would fund structural improvements along the coastal areas, but not sand replenishment projects.

I just give you an example in my own district where the committee has once again funded a beach replenishment project that involves both a structural sea wall as well as sand replenishment. We cannot have one without the other. It makes no sense.

□ 1715

It makes no sense for the Federal Government to say they will pay for a seawall but not pay for the protective sand that is placed in front of the seawall. Once again, the subcommittee has rightly pointed out that it is essentially discriminatory to say that coastal areas cannot have that form of flood protection, whereas inland areas would, if the administration policy was to be continued and to be enacted.

I also wanted to say the same thing is true for small navigation projects. There is really no distinction from an economic point of view for a State or locality with a small navigation project, which tends to be recreational, versus a large commercial project.

In New Jersey, tourism is actually our No. 1 industry. More money is engendered in New Jersey through tourism than any other industry. To suggest that somehow small navigational programs are not important is not accurate.

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

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I am about to make a motion which I will explain. The Committee will rise at this time. The House will go back to a conference report on the welfare bill with instructions that will take a little over an hour, probably. So that the Members understand, we will come back about 6:30 or quarter to 7, and we will take this bill up again for amendments.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, as we discuss the efficacy and safety of pyroprocessing, also known as electrometallurgical treatment, it is extremely important to remember that this technology is still in its development phase. I find many of the arguments against

pyroprocessing premature because we do not yet know how this technology may assist in reducing our country's nuclear waste. However, since 35 States currently host nuclear waste, and 22 percent of our Nation's electricity is generated by nuclear power, I think that it is imperative that we research new ways to dispose of our spent nuclear fuel. As we consider funding for further research into this technology and examine our options for safe disposal of nuclear waste, keep in mind that the National Academy of Sciences, which has been monitoring the progress of the pyroprocessing facility, recently gave a strong endorsement for further research into this technology and stressed that DOE should keep this program as a high priority.

Before addressing the anticipated benefits of pyroprocessing, it is necessary to detail its origins. As many are aware, in 1994, the Appropriations Committee terminated the advanced liquid metal reactor or ALMR. This reactor would have manufactured, used, and recycled spent nuclear fuel. The concept of pyroprocessing was born out of the recycling phase of this project. It was almost discovered by accident. When the ALMR was shut down, pyroprocessing was used to safely prepare the spent fuel from the ALMR reactor. This process was then recognized as a potential technology that could be applied to safely dispose of all spent nuclear fuel. In addition, the budget numbers also show that pyroprocessing is not a reincarnation of the ALMR.

Proposed funding for the ALMR for fiscal year 1995 was \$70.5 million. Total proposed funding for further pyroprocessing research is \$20 million for fiscal year 1997—\$15 million in defense funding for disposal of DOE spent fuel and \$5 million in civilian funding for further research in this field. The additional \$25 million that completes the \$45 million mentioned in this amendment is to complete the termination of the EBR-II reactor that was part of the ALMR—it is not part of the funding for pyroprocessing research.

Pyroprocessing technology prepares spent fuel by the degrading uranium and harnessing plutonium with transuranic and other fissionable products to render it inaccessible for proliferation purposes. Pyroprocessing has often been confused with enrichment. However, to relate these two technologies is like comparing a water wheel to a house plant—both need water to function but are very different.

Enrichment and pyroprocessing both work with uranium. However, enrichment increases the radioactivity of the uranium while pyroprocessing decreases the radioactivity level. Pyroprocessing takes high-level uranium and converts it to low level, which makes it much easier and safer to dispose of. In addition, unlike enrichment, pyroprocessing produces minimal radioactive waste, so the whole process is relatively clean with results that are significantly safer and better for the environment than any other technology we have researched up to this point.

As we know from other discussions in both the House and Senate, the safe disposal of nuclear waste is of urgent concern to our Nation. We keep producing more waste and yet we still do not have a permanent disposal facility. While we continue to develop the technology for such a facility, we need to contain our existing waste. Pyroprocessing may offer the answer to this critical problem. It reduces

the inventory of highly enriched uranium, stores plutonium in a way that is not a proliferation risk, and does not create any new waste streams. Considering our waste disposal needs at this time, it would be premature to stop research of pyroprocessing technology.

I encourage my colleagues to examine the true benefits of this technology as a solution to our nuclear waste disposal needs and vote against this amendment.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to oppose the amendment offered by my friend Mr. BEREUTER of Nebraska. We share many similar concerns about the management of the Missouri River and the revision of the Army Corps Master Manual currently underway. While I do not have any specific objection to his intent to prevent the corps from instituting a "spring rise" a part of the management of the river, I do object to legislating changes in the Master Manual through an appropriations bill.

The Army Corps of Engineers currently is undertaking an exhaustive 6 year \$23 million study to revise the Missouri River Master Manual. This tremendous undertaking seeks to resolve contentious issues between all interests on the river, those upstream, in North Dakota and likewise those downstream in Missouri. This is no small endeavor. The corps has received exhaustive testimony and input on this revision and although the recently announced delay in the release of the revisions was disappointing, I am confident the process is steadily moving forward.

This amendment is especially troubling given another attempt to circumvent the Master Manual process that will soon be before this body. The Water Resources Development Act of 1996 contains language, inserted in the full committee, without hearing or input, that will have a devastating impact throughout the Missouri River basin. This language proposes to extend the navigation season on the river by 1 month. While seemingly straightforward, the effect of this provision would be to lower upper basin water storage levels, threaten water supply and quality throughout the basin, increase flood risks from ice jams along the entire river, and wreak havoc with fisheries and endangered species populations.

As my colleagues can see, this type of amendment sets a dangerous precedent. Instead of leaving water management up to the professional engineers at the Army Corps, amendments of this type transfer control of water management to the whims of Congress, regardless of impact. For that reason, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank Chairman JOHN MYERS and ranking minority member TOM BEVILL, not just for their work on this bill, but for their many years of service to the House and the country. I wish them well in their future endeavors.

The energy and water development bill provides funds for programs that are critically important to preserving the environment and maintaining our national security. California is particularly affected by the programs in this measure. I am pleased that we were able to maintain the balance that most Californians want between environmental protection and continued economic growth. In my remarks today, I wish to focus on a few issues of concern to me and my constituents.

## SMALL HARBOR SAFETY

One of the highlights of our consideration of this bill was the total rejection of Clinton administration recommendations to terminate the Army Corps of Engineers' role in shore protection and small navigation projects. This would have hurt coastal States like California. Instead, we will continue studies and construction projects that save lives and property.

## FUSION ENERGY

Within the Department of Energy, I do have some concerns about the Fusion Energy Sciences Program. Fusion is important to the Nation because it is one of our most promising future energy sources. I am pleased that there is a strong fusion presence in California, resulting in high technology jobs and spin-offs at universities, national laboratories, and industrial facilities.

Funding for the fusion program has decreased significantly over the past 2 years. Last year, in connection with a \$130 million cut, conferees asked the Department of Energy and its Fusion Energy Advisory Committee to restructure the program.

This year, we adopted an amendment in subcommittee which gives guidance to the DOE on allocation of even more limited funds. While I supported the amendment, I am concerned that, in prescribing how 90 percent of the fusion funds are to be spent, we may be contradicting some of our prior direction to the Department.

It is entirely appropriate that the committee suggest to DOE how its fusion funds should be used. However, the restructuring that was put into place as a result of last year's budget, and the accompanying peer review process, have been widely praised.

As we proceed to conference with the Senate, we need to evaluate how we can achieve the appropriate balance between identifying funding priorities and giving program managers necessary flexibility.

## RADIOACTIVE WASTE

I finally want to focus on action I wish we had taken in committee, but did not—that is, dealing with our radioactive waste disposal problem.

One in three diagnostic medical tests today uses radioactive materials. Eighty percent of all drugs are developed using some radioactive materials. Critical research on AIDS, cancer, and multiple sclerosis could not take place without radioactive materials.

These benefits to society come at a cost. We need responsible disposal sites for the waste that is generated by these activities. That is why I considered offering the Ward Valley Land Transfer Act as an amendment to the pending bill. This would have effected the transfer of land from the Department of the Interior to the State of California to serve as a site for storage of low-level radioactive waste.

I regret that the Ward Valley Transfer has become embroiled in election-year politics. The Interior Department is reluctant to allow the State to manage its own waste disposal.

We have given the States responsibilities under the Low-Level Radioactive Waste Policy Act, just as we have under the Nuclear Waste Policy Act. The State of California has acted responsibly to fulfill its obligations, but the Federal Government's reply has been irresponsible.

In 1993, after years of environmental study, California licensed Ward Valley in the remote Mojave Desert as a disposal site for low-level

waste. Since that time, the State's actions have successfully passed the reviews of the National Academy of Sciences and the California Supreme Court. All that remains is the transfer of the land from the Department of the Interior.

State officials have acted in good faith and taken many difficult steps to carry out their duty to provide for disposal of low-level waste. However, after originally supporting the Ward Valley Transfer, the administration now has taken the bureaucratic low road, opting for "more study."

This failure of Federal leadership means that Californians—just as the citizens of other States—are faced with a growing accumulation of low-level waste at neighborhood hospitals, businesses and research facilities. Unless we respond, benefits from the use of radioactive materials will disappear.

Paralysis by analysis is the same problem we are facing as we seek to enact a Nuclear Waste Policy Act. We must end costly delays in achieving a national policy for safely storing spent nuclear fuel.

Since 1983, the Federal Government has collected \$11 billion from electric ratepayers throughout the country. Now, the Government is seriously behind schedule in meeting its obligation to begin accepting spent nuclear fuel. If we do not enact legislation, 27 reactors will exhaust spent fuel storage capacity by 1998. This will subject ratepayers to billions of dollars more in unnecessary costs for on-site storage of spent fuel.

We must assure that the Federal bureaucracy responds to the needs of our citizens. The benefits of nuclear medicine and nuclear energy should not be held hostage to politics. I urge my colleagues to rise above election year expediency and help the country properly manage its radioactive materials.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the fiscal year 1997 Energy and Water Appropriations Act. I know that Chairman MYERS and Representative BEVILL, the ranking minority member on the subcommittee, have had to work especially hard this year to report this legislation in light of their original allocation. Once again, they have done an incredible job of balancing the many requests they received with the available funding. As I noted earlier this year in hearings, I appreciate the outstanding leadership Chairman MYERS and Representative BEVILL have provided. They will be sorely missed.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation includes \$500,000 to complete a reconnaissance study for the Rio de Flag floodplain in Flagstaff, AZ. The residents of Flagstaff, AZ are grateful for the \$200,000 provided by the committee last year to initiate this study. The Corps of Engineers anticipates beginning this study this spring. As a result of the Federal Emergency Management Agency designating much of Flagstaff's downtown and southside areas as a special flood hazard area, Flagstaff is prevented from moving forward with new development or important redevelopment projects. The city of Flagstaff is aware of the cost-sharing requirements associated with planning and constructing this project and is a willing partner.

Finally, I want to note my strong support for an amendment offered by one of my colleagues from Arizona, JIM KOLBE. Representative KOLBE intends to offer an amendment which I believe is unprecedented. Instead of

looking for ways to score easy political points by attempting to find spending cuts in someone else's backyard, he has looked to Arizona for ways to save money. Specifically, the amendment will cut over \$20 million from water projects in Arizona. I am proud of my colleague's courage and vision to offer this amendment and happy that I can stand with a unified delegation from Arizona in supporting it. I hope that as the House continues its efforts to balance the budget, other State delegations in Congress will follow our example.

I urge a "yes" vote for the Kolbe amendment and for final passage of this important legislation.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my concern for the future of our Nation's fusion program. First of all, I am disappointed with the funding level for fusion research in H.R. 3816. This cut from last year's funding level is significantly below the recommendation of the Fusion Energy Advisory Committee's for a strong U.S. fusion program. The FEAC report warned that any sustained funding level below \$250 million would adversely impact the productivity of the U.S. fusion facilities and severely strain our relationship with our international partners.

What concerns me most about the fusion funding level is the language in the committee's report to H.R. 3816. On pages 82 and 83 of the report, the committee recommends that 90 percent of the \$225 million for fusion research be allocated for specific programs of the fusion research program. While each of these specific projects are important aspects to a comprehensive U.S. fusion program, this language does not include key elements of the program plan outlined by the FEAC report and is inconsistent with the guidelines Congress provided the fusion community when ordering a restructuring of the program.

The FEAC report's key component for the new domestic fusion program plan is the pursuit of new innovative approaches to fusion through small scale experiments at universities and laboratories throughout the country. This program element was explicitly mandated by Congress and was given top priority by FEAC even at budget levels below \$250 million. The committee report cannot support this priority area because there is simply not enough unspecified funding remaining in the fusion budget. The unfortunate consequence is that university experimental fusion research would be virtually eliminated from the fusion program.

Mr. Chairman, it is my hope and expectation that members of the House-Senate conference for this appropriation bill will take another look at the congressional guidelines to the fusion community as well as the FEAC report. This earmarking language must be reconsidered to ensure that the fusion community continues its peer review process and that vital small-scale university programs are maintained.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to take this opportunity to thank Chairman MYERS of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, and Ranking Member BEVILL, for their long standing support of water development in South Dakota.

Mr. MYERS and Mr. BEVILL, the announcement of your retirements will be a great loss to water development efforts in South Dakota and across the Nation. The two of you have demonstrated leadership, bipartisanship and

statesmanship as you have helped America develop critically important infrastructure. I am proud to have served with each of you. I look forward to having one more opportunity to work with both of you to move forward on important water development efforts in South Dakota.

Sound water development is crucial to our State, whether it is rural water delivery, wetland and wildlife enhancement, irrigation or flood control. These projects stabilize the rural economy and greatly contribute to rural economic development since water is a vital component to ensure future growth.

I appreciate the time and hard work the members of the subcommittee and subcommittee staff have devoted to developing water infrastructure, especially the efforts in meeting the needs of South Dakota and rural America. I look forward to continued close cooperation with the committee to meet the needs of our Nation.

Again, my heartfelt thanks to Chairman MYERS and Ranking member BEVILL for their distinguished service in the House of Representatives.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, this Member would like to commend the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS], the Chairman of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Subcommittee, and the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL], the Ranking Member of the subcommittee for their exceptional work in bringing this bill to the floor.

Also, in light of the impending retirements of the distinguished Chairman and the distinguished Ranking Member, this Member would like to take this opportunity to express his sincere gratitude for the dedication, good judgment and wisdom they have consistently demonstrated. The entire country has benefited from their hard work and outstanding leadership on the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Subcommittee. This Member certainly appreciates the distinguished Chairman's and the distinguished Ranking Member's far-sighted actions and equitable treatment which will continue to have a positive impact on America for many years to come. They have left a very impressive legacy.

This Member recognizes that extremely tight budgetary constraints made the job of the subcommittee much more difficult this year. Therefore, the subcommittee is to be commended for its diligence in creating such a fiscally responsible bill. In light of these budgetary pressures, this Member would like to express his appreciation to the subcommittee and formally recognize that the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 1997 includes funding for several water projects that are of great importance to Nebraska.

First, this Member is very pleased that the bill includes \$400,000 to complete plans and specifications and initiate construction of the Pender, Nebraska Section 205 Logan Creek Project. There is an urgent need for this funding and this Member is particularly grateful to the Subcommittee for agreeing to this appropriations item during a time when the restrictions on available funding are exceedingly tight.

The amount of money presently spent on the planning process to date is in excess of \$350,000. The Village of Pender, a small municipality, and the Lower Elkhorn Natural Re-

sources District have expended approximately \$160,000 of their own funds to date. The Village has expended an additional approximate amount of \$25,000 on the costs of engineering, project coordination, and other related costs. Without the flood control project the community will remain at risk and will be stymied from undertaking future developments in their community due to FEMA flood plain development restrictions (60 percent of Pender is in the floodplain and 40 percent is in the floodway).

The plan calls for right bank levees and flood walls with a retention pond for internal storm water during flood periods. The project will remove the entire community from the FEMA 100-year flood plain. This project is needed to protect life and property, eliminate or greatly reduce flood insurance costs, and allow community and housing development.

Mr. Chairman, quite simply, at great expense the State and local entities involved in the project have held up their end of the agreement. If federal-local partnerships are to work, Federal commitments need to be met; therefore, this Member is pleased that this legislation will greatly facilitate the completion of this project.

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

Additionally, the bill provides \$175,000 in continued funding for an ongoing floodplain study of the Antelope Creek which runs through the heart of Nebraska's capital city, Lincoln. The purpose of the study is to find a solution to multi-faceted problems involving the flood control and drainage problems in Antelope Creek as well as existing transportation and safety problems all within the context of broad land use issues. This Member continues to have a strong interest in this project since this Member was responsible for stimulating the City of Lincoln, the Lower Platte South Natural Resources District, and the University of Nebraska-Lincoln to work jointly and cooperatively with the Army Corps of Engineers to identify and effective flood control system for downtown Lincoln.

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

The goals of the study are to anticipate and provide for the control of flooding of Antelope Creek, map the floodway, evaluate the condition of the underground conduit, make recommendations for any necessary repair, suggest the appropriate limitations of neighbor-

hood and UN-L city campus development within current defined boundaries, eliminate fragmentation of the city campus, minimize vehicle/pedestrian/bicycle conflicts while providing adequate capacity, and improve bikeway and pedestrian systems.

Unfortunately, this legislation includes a significant reduction in funding for the Missouri River Mitigation Project. Despite the importance and effectiveness of this project, the Administration's FY97 budget called for drastic reductions in its funding. The FY96 appropriations measure provided \$5.7 million for this project, but the Administration's budget slashed funding in FY97 to \$1.6 million with the Omaha Corps District receiving only \$100,000. Last year the Omaha District received \$3.7 million for mitigation activities. This Member believes that funding at last year's level is fully justified.

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

The Missouri River Mitigation Project addresses fish and wildlife habitat concerns much more effectively than the Corps' overwhelmingly unpopular and ill-conceived proposed changes to the Missouri River Master Manual. Although the Corps' proposed plan was designed to improve fish and wildlife habitat, these environmental issues are already being addressed by the Missouri River Mitigation Project. In 1986 the Congress authorized over \$50 million to fund the Missouri River Mitigation Project to restore fish and wildlife habitat lost due to the construction of structures to implement the Pick-Sloan plan.

This Member is pleased, however, that the bill provides \$200,000 for operation and maintenance and \$100,000 for construction of the Missouri National Recreational River Project. This project addresses a serious problem in protecting the river banks from the extraordinary and excessive erosion rates caused by the sporadic and varying releases from the Gavins Point Dam. These erosion rates are a result of previous work on the river by the Federal Government.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, this Member recognizes that H.R. 3816 also provides funding for a Bureau of Reclamation assessment of Nebraska's water supply (\$100,000) as well as funding for Army Corps projects in Nebraska at the following sites: Harlan County Lake; Pappillion Creek and Tributaries; Gavins Point Dam, Lewis and Clark Lake; and Salt Creek and Tributaries.

Again, Mr. Chairman, this Member commends the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS], the chairman of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Subcommittee, and the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL], the ranking member of the subcommittee for their long-standing support of projects which are important to Nebraska and the 1st Congressional District, as well as to the people living in the Missouri River Basin.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend Chairman MYERS for his hard work

in crafting the Energy and Water Appropriations bill in light of our budget constraints. I also appreciate his support of fusion energy by providing \$225 million for these programs.

Fusion research takes place at a number of universities and institutions around the country. San Diego is particularly blessed: we host major programs at the University of California at San Diego and at General Atomics. In addition, we serve as the host to the U.S. team for the International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor—a major international science and engineering project.

Last year's Energy and Water conference report called for a restructuring of the fusion program and set into motion an extensive and effective peer review process carried out through the Fusion Energy Advisory Committee. The restructured program and this ongoing peer review process has been widely praised and I believe the fusion community should be congratulated for a job well done.

Because of the budget difficulties in achieving a higher level for fusion energy, the committee included prescriptive report language concerning fusion programs. This language is not consistent with the recommendations of the Fusion Energy Advisory Committee and the ongoing peer review process. I am also concerned about its impact on university and other aspects of the fusion programs. For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to support a higher funding level for fusion energy in conference. A higher level could enable the current fusion programs to continue their important work, thus making report language unnecessary to keep these programs intact.

I appreciate the opportunity to bring these important issues to the attention of my good friend from Indiana, the distinguished chairman of the Energy and Water Development Subcommittee, and to my other colleagues concerned about fusion programs. I hope my concerns will be kept in mind as the House works with the Senate in conference.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, the management of the Missouri River has been an ongoing source of conflict between interest groups of States both upstream and downstream for many years. The current Master Manual for the Missouri River was written in 1970 with only minor revisions taking place in 1975 and 1979. While almost everyone agrees that the revision of the outdated Master Manual is long overdue, differences of opinion continue to exist about what changes to the operating plan should be included in the revised Master Manual. Downstream States contend that more water needs to be released from upstream reservoirs to ensure that navigation interests are served on a regular basis, while South Dakota and other upstream States press for dependable water levels to support fish and wildlife management and the recreation/tourism industry.

I rise today in opposition to Representative BEREUTER's amendment. The amendment essentially ensures that the so-called "spring rise" proposed by the Corps in the first revision of the Master Manual is never implemented. While I do not necessarily oppose the intent of the amendment because I am not a strong advocate of a so-called "spring rise," I strongly object to the amendment because it circumvents the Master Manual revision process that all interested parties have been actively engaged in for several years. Further, I do not believe it is appropriate nor good policy

for the Congress to establish water management policy with little or no debate during consideration of an appropriations bill—especially when the Corps of Engineers is currently completing a 6-year, \$23 million study to update the Manual. I have offered to work with Mr. BEREUTER to address his concerns regarding the spring rise by working with the Corps on this issue. Unfortunately, he prefers to offer this amendment and so I must oppose it and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the fiscal year 1997 energy and water appropriations bill and in particular the provision of \$250,000 to begin the feasibility portion of the coastal erosion study on the North Shore of Long Island. I want to thank the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS], as well as the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL], for their assistance in providing this funding for the North Shore.

Mr. Chairman, the North Shore has a considerable history of tidal flooding, shore erosion, and damage to shorefront development. Hurricanes affecting the area occurred in 1938, 1944, 1954, and 1960. In addition, tropical storms occurred in the area in 1950, 1953, 1955, 1962, and in 1992. Recent coastal storms have caused shoreline erosion resulting in storm damage to several communities, including Bayville in Nassau County and the Village of Asharoken in Suffolk County. The December 1992 Nor'easter inundated hundreds of residential and business properties with damages estimated at \$12 million. In addition, approximately 300 people were evacuated, and sections of Bayville, the village of Asharoken and Eatons Neck were impassable for days.

So far this year we have been lucky. There have been several severe storms in the northeast with some flooding but none has resulted in the extensive damage caused by the '92 Nor'easter. It is probably only a matter of time.

In September last year, the Army Corps of Engineers completed the reconnaissance study of the North Shore which found that, based on a general assessment of coastal flooding and beach erosion, the area is particularly susceptible to storm damage and that the villages of Bayville and Asharoken typify the flooding and erosion problems in the study area.

Finally, the study recommended that further feasibility studies for beach erosion control and storm damage reduction be conducted in order to formulate the most appropriate plan for any proposed storm damage protection project.

The Federal interest in the North Shore is well documented. The Army conducted a study of hurricane damage to coastal and tidal areas in response to series of hurricanes in 1954.

In 1963, the Army began a study of beach erosion and hurricane protection which was completed in 1969. Clearly the area has been much studied. It is time to move beyond identifying the problem to designing the solution.

Last year's report identified two plans for Bayville and two for Asharoken both of which have positive benefit to cost ratios. The plans for Bayville use a combination of features including a buried seawall, a composite bulkhead/revetment and floodwalls. The plans for Asharoken use a combination of buried seawall and beach nourishment to provide erosion

control and flood protection. The report went on to note that "a feasibility study having a greater level of detail is required to formulate the most appropriate plan for any proposed storm damage protection project."

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased that the Subcommittee saw fit to include funding for the next phase of the North Shore feasibility study. Now we can identify the solution to the North Shore's longstanding erosion problem.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to bring to my colleagues' attention an issue that is of great interest to the citizens of the State of Washington, that of the Hanford Thyroid Morbidity Study. The Hanford Thyroid Study is the first study of its kind and will determine the long-term thyroid disease effects, if any, of the releases of radioactivity from the Hanford nuclear site from 1949 to 1957.

Over the course of the past 7 years, this study has been jointly funded by the Center for Disease Control and the Department of Energy. Due to be completed in 1998, this study is an excellent example of two Federal agencies—the Department of Health and Human Services and the Department of Energy—working together in the interest of the American people.

By the end of fiscal year 1996, the Department of Health and Human Services will have spent a total of approximately \$12 million and the Department of Energy will have spent \$3.4 million since 1989. A combined \$4,600,000 is necessary in fiscal year 1997 from HHS and DOE and a total of \$2,700,000 would be necessary from these departments in 1998 to complete the project. I am sure that my colleagues will agree that completion of this project is of paramount importance and necessary to bring 7 years of research data already collected to its natural conclusion.

I was pleased to assist the Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center, the contractor on the study, in 1995 when administrative delays threatened the release of funds under the DOE-HHS Memorandum of Understanding. We were successful in obtaining the release of the funds from the DOE. I am confident that we can keep this project on track in 1997.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, nobody can doubt that this is a major bill, one that includes many items of national importance and also a number of things of particular interest to specific States and cities.

I want to briefly discuss one part of the bill that's of great national significance, but that's also particularly important to Colorado—funding for the Energy Department's environmental restoration and waste management programs.

These are the programs that pay for cleaning up the sites where America developed, produced, and tested the atomic and nuclear weapons that brought us first national security, and then victory, in the cold war. That mission was accomplished—but the job isn't finished. We still have to clean up these sites. That is very much a part of the job, and paying for it is very much a part of the price, of our victory in the cold war.

One of these sites is in Colorado, at Rocky Flats. In fact, Rocky Flats, which houses tons of plutonium and other dangerous materials, sits only 15 miles from the center of the Denver metropolitan area, with a population of 2.3 million people. Obviously, it's of utmost importance to all Coloradans that the Congress give high priority to making sure Rocky Flats is safe and cleaned up.

This was made clear by the Colorado Senate, which has formally urged that the Federal Government "make a sustained commitment to completing environmental cleanup at Rocky Flats" and has asked for "full funding of all necessary cleanup activities at Rocky Flats." For the RECORD, I am including a copy of this document from our State's Senate at the end of my remarks.

That's why I'm glad this bill provides the full amount of cleanup funds requested by the administration—something that makes it much better than last year's bill, which provided far too little for these crucial tasks. I want the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MEYERS] and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL] to know that all of us in the Colorado delegation very much appreciate the fact that this part of the bill fully reflects our joint request.

Chairman MEYERS, I know, well remembers that I was very unhappy about the cleanup funding in last year's bill. I was then prepared to offer an amendment to increase those funds. Rather than put the Chairman to making a point of order on the amendment, I withdrew it after a colloquy with the chairman made it clear that the cuts made last year were done without prejudice for future years, that he agreed with me about the necessity for providing the resources to meet our national responsibilities in this area, and that he would work with me on it in connection with the bill for this year, 1997. The Chairman has kept his commitment in that regard, as I knew he would, and I want him to know that I greatly appreciate his cooperation and assistance. He will not be returning to the House next year—and he will be missed very much.

Mr. Chairman, I'm also grateful that the Committee report appropriately points out that real progress is being made at Rocky Flats. Last week, for example, Federal and State officials came together in Colorado to sign a new cleanup agreement and a set of "vision" documents for Rocky Flats—documents that lay the foundation for cleaning up the site in ten years, so that it can be converted to other appropriate uses. Establishment of a "project closure fund", as called for by the Committee, holds real promise for further expediting completion of the job at Rocky Flats, because I believe that Rocky Flats can and will meet the criteria to qualify for receiving the benefits of this important initiative. In short, this part of the bill is an improvement over last year not only in terms of funding, but also because it includes important initiatives that should help speed up the vital job of cleaning up Rocky Flats and other such sites around the country.

Having said that, I have to say that I find other parts of the bill less satisfactory. In particular, I am concerned about the bill's failure to fund adequately very important solar and renewable energy programs. It's true that in Committee we restored some funds for wind energy and some other renewable-energy programs that would have been zeroed-out. But even so, the bill still calls for deep cuts in these programs—something that's very short-sighted. Investing in these programs pays big dividends, by reducing our dependence on imported fossil fuels, reducing federal spending on energy, and increasing opportunities for American business in the markets of the world.

We can and should do better than this, and I hope that this part of the bill will be improved through the process of amendment and in

conference. If that is done, and some other improvements are made, this bill will be one that deserves broad support in the House.

SENATE MEMORIAL 96-1

By Senators Feeley, Norton, Hernandez, Linkhart, Matsunaka, Pascoe, Thiebaut, Casey, Perlmutter, Rupert, and Weissmann.

MEMORIALIZING CONGRESS REGARDING THE CLEANUP OF ROCKY FLATS AND OTHER NUCLEAR WEAPONS FACILITIES IN THE UNITED STATES

Whereas, for more than 40 years, the federal government developed, produced, and tested nuclear weapons in a number of government-owned facilities throughout the country, including Rocky Flats in Colorado; and

Whereas, contamination from these facilities has contributed to environmental damage at the sites, including radiological and hazardous surface and subsurface soil and groundwater contamination at Rocky Flats; and

Whereas, as a result of the end of the Cold War, the federal government has shifted its focus to environmental restoration and waste cleanup at the facilities; and

Whereas, the Department of Energy has committed to clean up the nuclear weapons complex; and

Whereas, if the nuclear weapons complex is not cleaned up in accordance with known health standards, citizens in Colorado and across America will be affected directly or indirectly by the dangers that will continue to exist; and

Whereas, the cost of cleaning up the Rocky Flats site is estimated to be \$9 billion or more; and

Whereas, to reach total cleanup, an increase in funding over the next five years is needed but no commitment to this funding has yet been made by the federal government; and

Whereas, commitment by the federal government to the full funding of the necessary costs associated with these cleanup activities may be sacrificed as a result of current budget discussions by Congress; now, therefore,

*Be It Resolved by the Senate of the Sixtieth General Assembly of the State of Colorado, the House of Representatives concurring herein:*

That we, the members of the Colorado General Assembly, urge the federal government to recognize that cleanup of Rocky Flats and other weapons facilities is a related expenditure to the \$4 trillion spent for the Cold war.

*Be It Further Resolved,* That we urge the federal government to:

(1) Make a sustained commitment to completing environmental cleanup at Rocky Flats and its other facilities at a reasonable and justifiable pace that protects human health and the environment;

(2) Strive not only to comply with environmental laws, but also to be a leader in the field of environmental cleanup, including addressing public health concerns, ecological restoration, and waste management; and

(3) Consult with officials in Jefferson county, Colorado, and other affected county governments regarding transportation of clean-up materials.

*Be It Further Resolved,* That we urge Congress and the President of the United States to approve full funding of all necessary cleanup activities at Rocky Flats and other nuclear weapons facilities.

TOM NORTON,

*President of the Senate.*

JOAN M. ALBI,

*Secretary of the Senate.*

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, today I rise in strong support of H.R. 3816, the fiscal year 1997 Energy and Water Develop-

ment Appropriations Act. The House Energy and Water Development Appropriations Subcommittee have drafted an excellent bill that meets our Nation's water resources and energy needs, and I urge its adoption by the House.

Although H.R. 3816 contains many worthy provisions, I would like to bring to my colleagues' attention a project contained in the bill of particular importance to the people of central New Jersey. The project to which I refer is the Green Brook Flood Control project.

As my colleagues may recall, this project was authorized by Congress under the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (P.L. 99-662, Sec. 401). During the past 10 fiscal years, Congress has appropriated over \$23 million for this project. In fiscal year 1986, Congress appropriated \$484,000; in fiscal year 1987, \$1.37 million; fiscal year 1988, \$1.4 million; fiscal year 1989, \$1.5 million; fiscal year 1990, \$1.2 million; fiscal year 1991, \$2 million; fiscal year 1992, \$3.169 million; fiscal year 1993, \$3.5 million; fiscal year 1994, \$2.8 million; fiscal year 1995, \$2 million; and fiscal year 1996, \$3.6 million. This bill appropriates \$2.781 million for this project.

Mr. Chairman, as the preliminary work for this project draws to a close, I requested that the Green Brook Flood Control Commission obtain resolutions of support from the communities this project impacts within New Jersey's Seventh Congressional District. Considering a decade has elapsed since Federal funds were first appropriated for this project, I wanted to make sure this project still enjoyed local support before it entered the more expensive construction phase. Moreover, these resolutions service the dual purpose of reminding local officials of the fiscal and physical impact this project will have on their community.

To date, I have received resolutions of support from Bound Brook, Bridgewater, Warren, Watchung, Green Brook, North Plainfield, Plainfield, Scotch Plains, Middlesex, Union County, Middlesex County, and Somerset County. The only resolution I received in opposition to the project was from Berkeley Heights. I have asked the Commission and the Corps to work closely with the Berkeley Heights Township Committee to address and resolve, to the greatest extent possible, the concerns of the township.

Mr. Chairman, while the need for flood control in the Green Brook Drainage Sub-basin still exists, this project should only proceed in the most environmentally sensitive manner possible. I grew up along the "Ridge," which is the term used to describe the communities along the Watchung Mountains, and I am acutely aware of the innate value of the Watchung Reservation. As the reservation is one of the largest green spaces left in my congressional district, I intend to zealously protect it from any unnecessary environmental degradation.

Mr. Chairman, I commend Chairman MYERS and ranking minority member, Mr. BEVILL, for again producing an excellent bill. Although their roles have been reversed since the last Congress, the subcommittee's work product remains undiminished. I wish these two distinguished Members, both of whom are leaving Congress this year, the best of luck in their retirement.

I also commend my good friend and fellow New Jersey colleague, RODNEY FRELINGHUYSEN, with the able assistance of his legislative director, Ed Krenik, for the outstanding

work on this bill. Representative FREILINGHUYSEN has done an excellent job in ensuring our State's needs were addressed in this bill, and I look forward to working with him on these issues in the years to come.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all of my colleagues to vote "aye" on H.R. 3861.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 3814, the Commerce, Justice, State Appropriations for the upcoming year. This bill is particularly important among the measures we consider each year, because it funds what more and more Americans identify as their top priority: fighting time.

This bill increases funding for the Justice Department at a time when hard choices have been made across the board. Nevertheless, we've committed to funding Law Enforcement Block Grants, which will help local public safety officials develop the kinds of programs they most need to prevent crimes and to solve them when they do happen.

We've also fully funded the popular Community Oriented Policing Service [COPS] program. In my own community of Milwaukee and its metropolitan region, this program has had a significant impact, enabling us to hire 30 new police officers this year, and 500 statewide since the program began in 1994. This is something tangible that has a real impact on the cities and towns that we represent, and I am happy that the COPS program continues to receive congressional support.

I think the American people will also be happy that we've funded the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund that was included in last year's anti-crime bill. In addition, the Violence Against Women grants will receive a boost—helping stem domestic violence and strengthening police effectiveness in dealing with this national scourge.

I'm pleased that the Congress was able to restore some of the funding for the Legal Services Corporation, which provides our Nation's poor and badly needed legal service. While the funding level is lower than last year, it will allow the Legal Services Corporation to fulfill its important mission.

There is, however, much to support in this bill. I commend the committee for reporting strong legislation.

Mr. LAZIO of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to support H.R. 3816, the fiscal year 1997 Energy and Water Appropriations bill.

As you may know, part of my district lies along New York's Atlantic Coast. Like coastal areas in many parts of the country, the barrier islands along the coast in my district have been hit extremely hard by the storms of the past few winters and remain in a delicate state, vulnerable to breaches and overwashes from future storms which could be devastating to the mainland of Long Island.

The barrier islands protect Long Island in the same manner that the levees on the Mississippi River protect the river towns. A vulnerable barrier island system cannot protect Long Island's south shore, which has a multibillion dollar economy and significant public infrastructure. The barriers afford protection to the freshwater wetlands and waters of the back bays, thus nurturing the clamming and fishing industries. Furthermore, Fire Island, Jones Island, Long Beach Island and the rest of Long Island's barrier system provide recreation for the citizens of Long Island and tourists from all over the world. As the tourism industry is the largest employer on Long Island, loss of this

vital resource will mean loss of jobs. Long Island's rich commercial and recreational fishing heritage would also be affected if these barrier islands are threatened.

While the President's budget recommends that the Army Corps of Engineers get out of the business of local flood and shore protection, I believe the Army Corps has a cost-effective and justifiable role in these projects. Savings can surely be made in the way the Corps carries out its mission. But the mission itself is vital to the Nation's coastal communities, and it is not one that can be transferred to State or local governments. From the commercial fishermen to the seaside merchants, the engine that drives our economy, small business, relies on the protection afforded by these Army Corps projects. The shoreline protection projects in which the Corps are involved are vitally important to the livelihood of the communities they protect and will save taxpayers money in the long run.

The first project funded by this bill would provide New York with accurate, real-time information on its coastal processes. Many coastal States already have monitoring systems in place, and such a system is essential for New York. A federally funded monitoring system was authorized for New York in the 1992 Water Resources Development Act, and appropriations have been made over the past 2 years to initiate its implementation.

As the authorization states, successful implementation will take \$1.4 million for up to 5 years, at which time the State of New York will take over funding and program implementation. The fiscal year 1997 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Bill also allocates this amount.

The second project in the bill, the reformulation study of the area from Montauk Point to the Fire Island Inlet, will provide valuable long-term information on the coastal processes of Long Island's south shore. It is expected to take approximately 10 years and \$14 million to complete. Over the past 3 fiscal years, over \$7 million has been appropriated by this committee for the reformulation study. This has provided important information and will lay the groundwork for possible interim projects needed to shore up Long Island's coastline. The fiscal year 1997 segment of the study will cost \$2.5 million, and this amount was included in H.R. 3816.

The third project in the bill will assist with navigation as well as coastal protection. The area involved, Fire Island Inlet, is the channel between Robert Moses and Jones Beach State Parks. This biannual dredging project, last completed in 1995, is essential to not only allowing marine traffic to flow smoothly between these barrier islands, but will also help nourish Gilgo Beach by depositing the dredged sand on this beach which will help prevent further erosion to this area. These two beaches provide the only line of protection for the State's Ocean Parkway, which runs along the south shore of Long Island and is an alternative route to the heavily traveled roads of the mainland. The fiscal year 1997 Energy and Water Development Appropriations bill allocates \$5.3 million for this project.

As a member of the Budget Committee, I understand the fiscal constraints we face. I agree that every expenditure must pass stringent economic tests, and I am confident that, upon examination, expenditures for these projects will pass such tests. The importance

of the waterways and the barrier islands to homes and businesses on Long Island and New York cannot be overstated. As history has shown us, the establishment of protective measures now will save the Federal, State, and local government millions of dollars in the long term. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. KNOLLENBERG) having assumed the chair, Mr. OXLEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 38916) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 3734, WELFARE AND MEDICAID REFORM ACT OF 1996

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 3734), to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 201(a)(1) of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1997, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. SABO

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SABO moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the House of Representatives and the Senate on H.R. 3734 be instructed to do everything possible within the scope of the conference to—

(1) eliminate any provisions in the House and Senate bills which shift costs to states and local governments and result in an increase in the number of children in poverty;

(2) maximize the availability of Food Stamps and vouchers for goods and services for children to prevent any increase in the number of children thrown into poverty while their parents make the transition from welfare to work;

(3) ensure that the bill preserves Medicaid coverage so that the number of people without access to health care does not increase and more children and old people are not driven into poverty; and

(4) provide that any savings that redound to the Federal Government as a result of this legislation be used for deficit reduction.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under rule XXVIII, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] will control 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO].