authorization of these specific activities were included in H.R. 1000, the Aviation Investment and Reform Act for the 21st Century when it successfully passed the House earlier this year.

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would just say that we support this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Are there any other amendments to be considered at this time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TRAFICANT

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TRAFICANT:

On page 8, at the end of the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. 9. LASER VISUAL GUIDANCE RESEARCH.

The Federal Aviation Administration is encouraged to conduct research on the laser visual guidance landing system.

Mr. TRAFICANT (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, the gentleman has two amendments. Does this relate to ''Buy American''?

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would yield, no. This is the Laser Visual Guidance system. I have submitted a change to that amendment. I would like to read it.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I would ask that the Clerk read the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will continue to read the amendment.

The Clerk continued reading the amendment.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, let me take a minute on this. I know there are no other mandates in the bill, and I will respect the distinguished chairman. But this is the system that is on our aircraft carriers. It is a laser system where the pilot hones in and that craft lands at the same spot all the time. It has been most successful in that very dangerous arena.

What is happening, such as the fatality in Arkansas, is they did not have the visibility to see the runway. That pilot found himself in a position where he thought he could bank in and land. He overshot the runway, hit a light tower, and is now history, this fatality.

This system can be seen as far out as 20 miles. And once they lock in on it, with no expense to the craft itself, they land on the same spot. It is absolutely a critical safety initiative that the Committee on Transportation and the Infrastructure has prioritized.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRAFICANT. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I believe that this amendment is a very positive addition to the bill and would urge the Members to support it.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TRAFICANT

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TRAFICANT:

At the end of the bill, add the following new sections:

SEC. 9. COMPLIANCE WITH BUY AMERICAN ACT.

No funds authorized pursuant to this Act may be expended by an entity unless the entity agrees that in expending the assistance the entity will comply with sections 2 through 4 of the Act of March 3, 1933 (41 U.S.C. 10a–10c, popularly known as the ''Buy American Act'').

SEC. 10. SENSE OF CONGRESS; REQUIREMENT REGARDING NOTICE.

(a) PURCHASE OF AMERICAN-MADE EQUIPMENT AND PRODUCTS.—In the case of any equipment or products that may be authorized to be purchased with financial assistance provided under this Act, it is the sense of the Congress that entities receiving such assistance should, in expending the assistance, purchase only American-made equipment and products.

(b) NOTICE TO RECIPIENTS OF ASSISTANCE.—In providing financial assistance under this Act, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall provide to each recipient of the assistance a notice describing the statement made in subsection (a) by the Congress.

SEC. 11. PROHIBITION OF CONTRACTS.

If it has been finally determined by a court or Federal agency that any person intentionally affixed a label bearing a ''Made in America'' inscription, or any inscription with the same meaning, to any product sold in or shipped to the United States that is not made in the United States, such person shall be ineligible to receive any contract or subcontract made with funds provided pursuant to this Act, pursuant to the debarment, suspension, and ineligibility procedures described in section 9.400 through 9.409 of title 48, Code of Federal Regulations.

Mr. TRAFICANT (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, this is the ''Buy American'' amendment.

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

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, it is a constructive ''Buy American'' amendment, and I would encourage everybody to support it.

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Are there any further amendments to the bill?

If not, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CALVERT) having assumed the chair, Mr. QUINN, Chairman pro tempore 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. 1551) to authorize the Federal Aviation Administration's civil aviation research and development programs for fiscal years 2000 and 2001, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 290, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted in the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1551.

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

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, AND DEMONSTRATION AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1999

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 289 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1655.

The Chair designates the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. SUNUNU) as chairman of the Committee of the Whole, and requests the gentleman from New York (Mr. QUINN) to assume the chair temporarily.

□ 1356

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1655) to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2000 and 2001 for the civilian energy and scientific research, development, and demonstration and related commercial application of energy technology programs, projects, and activities of the Department of Energy, and

for other purposes, with Mr. SUNUNU (Chairman pro tempore) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COSTELLO) each will control 30 minutes.

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

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 1655, the Department of Energy Research, Development, and Demonstration Authorization Act of 1999, is the first stand-alone R&D energy bill to be considered on the floor of the House since 1988.

This bill authorizes $3.878 billion for fiscal year 2000 and $4.099 billion for fiscal year 2001 for the Department of Energy's Supply, Science, and Fossil Energy and Energy Conservation R&D programs.

Highlights of the bill's authorization for fiscal years 2000 and 2001 include the following: First, it boosts spending for solar and renewable energy technologies. Including the already authorized Hydrogen Research Program and related Office of Science Programs, the bill recommends $401.9 million in fiscal year 2000 for these programs, an increase of $26.8 million, or 6.7 percent above the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1999; and recommends $418.1 million for fiscal year 2001, an increase of $16.8 million, or 4.0 percent above the amount recommended for fiscal year 2000.

Second, the bill revitalizes the DOE's moribund Nuclear Energy Program and recommends $115.7 million in fiscal year 2000 for nuclear energy, an increase of $24.3 million, or 26.6 percent above the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1999 and $3.4 million above the administration's request; and recommends $127.3 million for fiscal year 2001, an increase of $11.5 million, or 9.9 percent above the amount recommended for fiscal year 2000.

Third, the bill preserves and strengthens the Nation's High Energy Physics program, fully funds U.S. participation on the Large Hadron Collider at CERN and prevents layoffs at the two premier U.S. High Energy Physics facilities, Firmi National Accelerator Laboratory, Fermilab, and the Stanford Linear Accelerator Center, SLAC.

□ 1400

Fourth, the bill also preserves and strengthens the Nation's nuclear physics program, prevents the closure of MIT/Bates Accelerator Center, and increases operations at the two premier nuclear physics facilities, the Thomas Jefferson National Accelerator Facility and the Relativistic Heavy Ion Collider at Brookhaven National Lab in New York.

Fifth, the bill fully funds important biological and environmental research on the human genome and global climate change, as well as basic environmental research.

Sixth, the bill provides robust funding for basic energy sciences, including significant increases to the operating funds for the Nation's existing premier synchroton and neutron sources, and $100 million to initiate construction of the Spallation Neutron Source at Oak Ridge National Laboratory in Tennessee.

Seventh, the bill reinvigorates DOE's fusion energy sciences, and recommends $250 million in fiscal year 2000 and $275 million in fiscal year 2001 to allow increased operations at the Nation's three premier fusion energy facilities, the DIII–D at General Atomics, the Alcator-C Mod at MIT, and the Princeton Plasma Physics Lab, as well as accelerated exploration of advanced magnetic and inertial fusion energy concepts.

Eighth, the bill makes a strong commitment to ensuring the clean and efficient use of the Nation's plentiful supply of fossil fuels, and includes $25 million in fiscal year 2000 and $50 million in fiscal year 2001 for a fossil energy science initiative for grants to be competitively awarded and subject to peer review for research relating to energy efficiency.

And, ninth, the bill also maintains a strong commitment to energy efficiency, and also includes $25 million in fiscal year 2000 and $50 million in fiscal year 2001 for an energy efficiency science initiative for grants to be competitively awarded and subject to peer review for research relating to energy efficiency.

The bill also contains a number of funding limitations and prohibitions that address amounts of funds that may be reprogrammed; demonstration projects; general plant and construction projects; obligation of funds for the construction of the Spallation Neutron Source; U.S. participation in the international thermonuclear experimental reactor engineering design activities; travel costs for DOE and its contractors or subcontractors; noncompetitive financial assistance awards to trade associations and awards of management and operating contract for DOE civilian energy labs; awards, amendments, or modifications of contracts that deviate from the Federal acquisition regulation; and preparation or initiation of requests for proposals for unauthorized programs, projects or activities.

In addition, the bill also prohibits the Secretary of Energy from admitting to any classified area of any DOE-owned or -operated nonmilitary energy laboratory, except for specific laboratories, an individual who is a citizen of a nation that is named on the DOE list of sensitive countries, unless the Secretary waives the prohibition on a case-by-case basis if it is determined that such access is necessary for the furtherance of U.S. civilian science.

I commend the bill to the House for its adoption.

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

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First let me thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL), the chairman and the ranking Democrat of the full committee, as well as the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), the chairman of the subcommittee, for bringing this bill to the floor today.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Department of Energy Research, Development, and Demonstration Authorization Act. We have been able to agree on many of the issues before coming to the floor today, and I appreciate the time all of those involved have taken to discuss our concerns and to make the necessary changes. However, I still have some concerns with this bill and hope to be able to address them on the floor today and in conference.

Unfortunately, too many of our science programs, good programs, necessary programs, are being underfunded. On one hand, we have the nuclear energy R&D, fossil energy R&D, and a number of the Office of Science programs which have fared well in this bill. On the other hand, we have the solar, renewables and conservation accounts, and the Spallation Neutron Source, which have been cut well below the President's request. Solar and renewable energy is down $84.4 million, energy conservation R&D is down $67.8 million and the Spallation Neutron Source is down $96.1 million. In total, H.R. 1655 is $200 million below the President's request.

This bill also contains draconian restrictions on foreign visitors to civilian laboratories that go far beyond the ones Congress has agreed to for the nuclear weapons laboratories. An amendment that I offered during the Committee on Science markup of another bill, as well as the language adopted in the DOD conference report, calls for a temporary moratorium on foreign visitors pending DOE and FBI certification. I believe this approach makes much more sense and I hope we can continue to work on this in conference. There have been small victories in the effort to put the bill on a more solid footing. In committee, there was an amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON) to add $100 million to the Spallation Neutron Source which passed with the support of the chairman of the committee and the entire committee unanimously. However, the $100 million had to be offset within an underfunded bill. It is my hope that we can get the project on track for the funding it needs for the future.

The Spallation project is one project I worked with the gentleman from Wisconsin and the administration to move forward during the committee's consideration. I very much appreciate all of

the efforts on behalf of the gentleman from Wisconsin and the contributions that he has made to that project. I was pleased with the ultimate cooperation that was exhibited on both sides of the Committee on Science and the Department on provisions to make sure that the project addresses some of its major problems while still moving forward. I agree that the Secretary should certify in writing to the Committee on Science in the House and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources in the other body that qualified individuals have filled senior project manager positions for the project. I also agree that the Secretary should provide Congress a cost baseline and plans for revised project management structure. It is my hope that with continued progress, we can get the Spallation project back on track to fulfill its important scientific mission.

I am pleased as well that this bill includes the methane hydrates provision that I supported in the committee as well as increases in the fossil fuel research and development program which is especially important to my congressional district in southwestern and southern Illinois. The solar, renewable and conservation programs are important to ensuring that this country has a broad, clean, affordable and sustainable domestic energy portfolio as we enter the 21st century.

For example, DOE-funded research into the use of biomass to produce ethanol could one day enable us to turn agricultural waste into a cheap, clean and sustainable source of energy. The gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) will be offering an amendment to make sure these important programs are fully authorized. I urge my colleagues to support the Udall amendment.

While this bill is not a perfect piece of legislation, I look forward to working on its improvement during the conference with the Senate and ask my colleagues to support its passage.

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

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds. The leadership has informed me that unless we get this bill done by 2:45, we will rise and we might not come back. So I would implore the Members that we keep the chatter down to a minimum and have this bill on a fast track if it is at all humanly possible.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), the subcommittee chairman.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Science, for yielding me this time.

I would like to recognize also the efforts of my close friend, colleague and neighbor in California George Brown, who recently passed away, for all of his efforts on the Committee on Science and we certainly miss him.

Mr. Chairman, as the chair of the Subcommittee on Energy and Environment of the Committee on Science and the author of this legislation, I am proud to speak in support of H.R. 1655.

My bill, H.R. 1655, authorizes civilian energy and scientific research, development, demonstration and related commercial applications of energy technology at the Department of Energy for fiscal years 2000 and 2001.

But before I go on, I would like to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for his hard work and leadership in bringing this important bill to the floor and certainly congratulate the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL) taking over as the ranking member and also thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COSTELLO), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Energy and Environment for his leadership on his side of the aisle. While we do not always agree on the issues at hand, we certainly agree it is very important to pass H.R. 1655 before 2:45 this afternoon.

Without getting into the statistics of this, we increase outlays for various renewable energy and other types of technology, certainly nuclear which is necessary, core scientific research, including high-energy physics and fusion energy. The budget funds these areas of big science that legitimately are in need of basic government support. It breathes new life into the fusion energy sciences program which has been struggling to stay afloat for a long, long time.

I believe that H.R. 1655 promotes the committee's priorities for the future. The bill provides strong support for solar and renewable energy and nuclear power R&D that is critical to the United States. I am happy to support this. This is a tremendous display of how much can be accomplished when we work in a bipartisan fashion.

I ask my colleagues for their support on this important authorization bill.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, although this bill has many admirable qualities, I am hopeful that we will amend this bill and extend its reach to areas of science and energy that deserve greater funding.

As a member of the House Science Committee, I am very interested in providing sufficient monies for the civilian research and development programs of the Department of Energy. This bill authorizes a total of $3.9 billion in FY 2000, and $4.1 billion in 2001, for certain Energy Department (DOE) civilian research and development programs including: energy supply, science, fossil energy research and development, and energy conservation research and development programs. Although most of these funds are well-placed, the bill in its current form does have a number of inadequacies.

While there are sufficient (i.e., at or above the President's request) funds for nuclear energy R&D, fossil energy R&D, and most basic energy science programs, I am concerned about the other vital programs in this authorization bill that are of particular importance to the administration (solar and renewable energy, energy conservation, and the Spallation Neutron Source).

The measure authorizes $432 million in FY 2000 and $453 million in FY 2001, for certain energy supply department programs and activities. Of this amount, the bill designates $317 million in FY 2000 and $325 million in FY 2001 for solar and renewable resources technologies, including $83 million in FY 2000 and $86 million in FY 2001 for photovoltaic energy systems; $75 million in FY 2000 and $78 million in FY 2001 for biopower/biofuels energy systems; $36 million in FY 2000 and $37 million in FY 2001 for wind energy systems; and $34 million in FY 2000 and $35 million in FY 2001 for geothermal programs.

The measure also provides that $116 million in FY 2000 and $127 million in FY 2001 of the energy supply studies authorization be used for nuclear energy programs, including $37 million each year for advanced radioisotope power systems.

I am hopeful that we will provide more funding for solar and renewable energy and energy conservation. The authorization bill woefully underfunds these programs, and they fall almost $85 million below the President's request. These programs help to develop environmentally friendly technologies for electricity generation using solar, wind, biomass or geothermal energy, and energy conservation technologies that save people money on their electricity bills, such as coatings for windows that keep heat inside in the winter. It is imperative that we continue to develop these technologies because we know that our natural resources are severely limited. We do not want a return to the dark ages because we lacked the foresight to fund alternative fuel sources and energy conservation projects. I hope that we will work together as a bipartisan body to ensure that we adequately fund programs under this budget item.

I am also pleased that the Spallation Neutron Source (SNS) is receiving funding. The SNS is a large research project involving 5 DOE national laboratories that will be located at the Oak Ridge National Lab in Tennessee. The SNS could lead to important developments in materials characterization. It is clear that the SNS would provide many practical advances in science that would be applicable in the ordinary household. For instance, neutron science is necessary for materials characterization, and this has important benefits to everything from improved CD's and shatter-proof windshields to nuclear weapons materials. The measure authorizes $100 million in FY 2000 for construction of the Spallation Neutron Source (SNS) project at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory in Tennessee.

However, it is clear that these funds will not be provided unless proper management is provided. Before any SNS funds could be obligated, however, the bill requires the department to provide Congress with project information and guarantees, including certification that senior project management officials have been filled by qualified individuals; a cost baseline and project milestones for each major construction and technical system activity; certification that any taxes and fees associated with having the SNS in Tennessee are not greater than if the project were located in another state containing a DOE lab. The measure also requires the department to include in its annual budget submission a report on the SNS project.

I also have reservations about the stringent moratorium on the nonnuclear weapons labs at DOE. This portion of the bill is far stricter than the Department of Defense bill that deals

with visits to the nuclear weapons labs. A permanent moratorium on all visits by citizens of sensitive foreign countries to classified facilities of nonnuclear labs seems far too harsh. The only way a foreigner could visit such facilities is if the Secretary of Energy issues a waiver after determining that the proposed visit is found to be ''necessary for the furtherance of civilian science interests of the United States.''

Perhaps the approach found in the defense bill is more prudent. The defense bill simply states that all citizens of sensitive countries need to have background checks conducted before they can visit the nuclear weapons labs, and there is to be a temporary moratorium on such visits until the Secretary and the FBI certify to Congress that these visits do not pose a risk to national security.

In my mind, it makes no sense to require a permanent moratorium on visits to nonnuclear weapons labs when the moratorium on visits to nuclear weapons labs contained in the Defense Authorization bill is a temporary one. I hope we can address this issue as this bill moves forward, and change the language to reflect the less draconian approach that is contained in the Defense Authorization bill.

History tells us that science requires collaboration and cooperation. the Manhattan Project consisted of American and foreign scientists. German engineers taught us how to launch our astronauts beyond our horizon. By placing such a restrictive moratorium on foreign visits to civilian facilities, this bill could make ti much harder for the United States to maintain its lead in science, including the science that supports our nuclear weapons programs. The amendment would also make it much harder to recruit and retain high caliber personnel by cutting off collaboration with foreign peers, both working overseas and the many who work in U.S. academic institutions.

Foreign citizens make up a significant portion of the U.S. science and engineering graduate student population. Forty-one percent of graduate students in physics and 43 percent of graduate students in computer science are non-U.S. citizens. (Source: National Science Foundation) There are some areas in which foreign nationals by virtue of their education and training have unique skills to contribute to the Laboratories' programs.

Interactions between employees of Russian nuclear institutes and United States weapons labs are a critical part of nonproliferation efforts. If Congress no longer allows visitors from sensitive countries to enter DOE labs, Lab employees could be prevented from traveling to at-risk foreign nuclear facilities. Barring foreign nationals from DOE Laboratories would also prevent demonstrations of U.S. technology to handle nuclear materials more safely and more securely.

The National Laboratories are involved with two Federal programs, the Nuclear Cities Initiative (NCI) and the Initiatives for Proliferation Prevention (IPP), that provide collaborative project opportunities for nuclear weapons scientists from the newly independent states of the Soviet Union. The objectives of the program is to strengthen nonproliferation by keeping nuclear scientists employed in their current institutions instead of working for countries or groups interested in developing nuclear weapons. The language in this bill could undermine these important nonproliferation programs.

It is my hope that we will improve upon this bill and will provide an authorization bill that makes sense. I believe that we are close to a viable piece of legislation, but I urge my colleagues to work together to polish this measure.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in qualified support of the Department of Energy Research, Development, and Demonstration Authorization Act of 1999. This bill has a lot of good things in it and reflects the hard work of Chairman SENSENBRENNER at the full committee level and Chairman CALVERT and Ranking Member COSTELLO of the subcommittee.

My support is qualified because I realize the bill could have been better. The committee did well in the traditional energy areas, but the alternative energy sources of the future are short-changed. The Office of Science accounts fared well, but the Spallation Neutron Source is funded at half the level it needs.

Energy research may be out of style when energy prices are relatively low, but we should not be caught up in short-term thinking. Developing new energy sources and getting the most out of current ones takes time and money well in advance of when the energy is needed. I just hope that when the next energy crunch hits, we don't look foolish for not having made the necessary energy investments in fiscal years 2000 and 2001.

On a positive note, I'm pleased that the funds for nuclear energy R&D and fossil energy R&D are at or above the president's request. These programs are essential to maintaining a balanced energy portfolio. Most of our energy currently comes from fossil fuels and will continue to do so for our lifetimes. The fossil energy R&D programs help us get more oil and gas out of the ground, make our large coal resources more environmentally acceptable, and otherwise stretch our fossil energy resources further into the future.

Unfortunately, other programs authorized in this legislation did not fare as well. Some of the most striking cuts are to Solar and Renewable Energy, which is down $84.4 million, Energy Conservation R&D, down $67.8 million, and the Spallation Neutron Source, down $96.1 million from the President's request.

Even more distressing is how energy and other research programs have been faring in the appropriations process this year. We have watched a pattern of research cuts in one appropriations bill after another. How can we expect to have a strong economy in the future when our priorities are so misplaced in the present?

Last week in committee, we developed an important multiyear computing and information technology bill (H.R. 2086) which gives a real boost to understanding how to build bigger and faster computers and to use them to solve even larger problems than we can dream of tackling today. Yet, we have watched the Appropriations Committee make cuts in these programs, agency by agency, to the point that the program we have authorized can't be carried out as designed. We worked hard to make NASA lean and mean only to have the appropriators decide to slash another billion from NASA's hide.

Now today we are bringing forward a carefully thought-out budget for energy research which, while not perfect, comes close to doing the job. Unfortunately, our friends on the Appropriations Committee have cut $580 million from the administration's budget for environmental and energy research. When we reduce actual funding to these levels, how can we expect to gain the understanding we need of how energy use affects the environment we live in?

How will we reduce our dependence on foreign oil? What assurance do we have, if we are unwilling to make the investments, that new energy technologies will be there when we need them?

I hope that my colleagues support today's amendments. Even if you don't, I hope you support the bill.

Voting for H.R. 1655 is the best way we have of sending a message to our colleagues on the appropriations committees and the negotiators who will finalize next year's budget that research in general and energy R&D in particular are critical to maintaining a high-quality way of life well into the next century.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment by Representative STUPAK regarding the Department of Energy (DOE) shipment of weapons grade plutonium from Los Alamos, NM, to Chalk River, Canada. This proposed route passes directly through my district in Michigan, and it could expose millions of citizens in Michigan and other parts of the United States to dangerous health consequences.

I have serious concerns about the proposed route, and I am also concern about the process used to choose it.

No public hearing was held regarding the proposed route, nor were emergency officials alerted in order to ensure adequate response capability in case of an accident. This is particularly troubling when compared to the Canadian Government's effort to hold public meetings and inform local officials.

The route itself is also troubling. It is the second longest route based on the options considered by DOE, and it is the second riskiest route in terms of dose risk to the American public and with respect to potential cancer fatalities. In addition, the route crosses three of the Great Lakes over two bridges. This exposes the largest fresh water lake system in the world to potentially devastating contamination.

The department proposal includes no military or law enforcement escort in the United States. This is particularly troubling when compared to the Royal Mounted Police escort which is proposed in Canada.

All of these issues prove that an agency hearing should be held, because it is vital to ensuring the safety of American citizens. The department should consider the matter in a thorough and open matter, and this amendment will help ensure that process takes place.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Stupak amendment today and urge my colleagues to support it. Many of us in the Michigan delegation are concerned about the process followed by the Department of Energy (DOE) in choosing the route from Los Alamos, NM, to Chalk River, Canada, for the transportation of Mixed Oxide Fuel. I received notification of this route only 2 days before it was to be announced, and the distribution of an environmental assessment by the DOE to the citizens of Michigan was inadequate, totaling less than 60 families. The Stupak amendment merely requests that a hearing is held for public information purposes before the route is finalized. The purpose of our efforts is not to suggest the route is inherently unsafe, but to ensure that citizens near the

route are given enough information about the project. Our constituents have a right to know the details, and a hearing would facilitate this process. Given that the Canadian Government balked at other proposed routes through key Canadian industrial areas, and that this route would pass over three of the Great Lakes, the largest supply of fresh water in the world, it seems only appropriate that the DOE provide a wider forum for information on this issue. I appreciate the opportunity to address this matter, and thank Congressman STUPAK for bringing this amendment to the floor today. I again urge my colleagues to vote yes on the Stupak amendment.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. QUINN). All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the bill shall be considered by section as an original bill for the purpose of amendment, and each section is considered read.

During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chair may accord priority in recognition to a Member offering an amendment that he has printed in the designated place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Those amendments will be considered read.

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone a request for a recorded vote on any amendment and may reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the time for voting on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote, provided that the time for voting on the first question shall be a minimum of 15 minutes.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute be printed in the RECORD and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The text of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Department of Energy Research, Development, and Demonstration Authorization Act of 1999''.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

For the purposes of this Act, the term—

(1) ''Department'' means the Department of Energy; and

(2) ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Energy.

SEC. 3. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) ENERGY SUPPLY.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary for Energy Supply civilian energy and scientific research, development, and demonstration and related commercial application of energy technology operation and maintenance and construction programs, projects, and activities for which specific sums are not authorized under other authority of law $432,366,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $452,577,000 for fiscal year 2001, to remain available through the end of fiscal year 2002, of which—

(1) $316,624,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $325,321,000 for fiscal year 2001 shall be for Solar and Renewable Resources Technologies, including—

(A) $3,708,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $3,819,000 for fiscal year 2001 for Solar Building Technology Research;

(B) $83,345,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $85,845,000 for fiscal year 2001 for Photovoltaic Energy Systems;

(C) $17,510,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $18,035,000 for fiscal year 2001 for Concentrating Solar Power, of which $2,000,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $3,000,000 for fiscal year 2001 shall be for experimental beamed power technology demonstrations;

(D) $75,396,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $77,658,000 for fiscal year 2001 for Biopower/Biofuels Energy Systems;

(E) $35,814,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $36,889,000 for fiscal year 2001 for Wind Energy Systems;

(F) $1,500,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $1,500,000 for fiscal year 2001 for the Renewable Energy Production Incentive Program;

(G) $6,000,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $6,000,000 for fiscal year 2001 for the International Solar Energy Program;

(H) $1,100,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $1,100,000 for fiscal year 2001 for the National Renewable Energy Laboratory;

(I) $33,500,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $35,000,000 for fiscal year 2001 for Geothermal, of which $4,000,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $4,615,000 for fiscal year 2001 shall be derived from amounts otherwise authorized under this subsection, from savings resulting from reductions in contractor travel pursuant to section 10(d);

(J) $3,348,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $3,448,000 for fiscal year 2001 for Hydropower;

(K) $41,303,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $42,542,000 for fiscal year 2001 for Electric Energy Systems and Storage; and

(L) $18,100,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $18,100,000 for fiscal year 2001 for Program Direction; and

(2) $115,742,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $127,256,000 for fiscal year 2001 shall be for Nuclear Energy, including—

(A) $37,000,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $37,000,000 for fiscal year 2001 for Advanced Radioisotope Power Systems;

(B) $6,070,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $6,070,000 for fiscal year 2001 for Test Reactor Area Landlord operation and maintenance;

(C) $1,430,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $1,944,000 for fiscal year 2001 for construction of Project 99–E–200, Test Reactor Area Electric Utility Upgrade, Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory;

(D) $1,500,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $2,500,000 for fiscal year 2001 for construction of Project 95–E–201, Test Reactor Area Fire and Life Safety Improvements, Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory;

(E) $13,500,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $16,000,000 for fiscal year 2001 for University Reactor Fuel Assistance and Support;

(F) $5,000,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $7,500,000 for fiscal year 2001 for Nuclear Energy Plant Optimization;

(G) $30,000,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $35,000,000 for fiscal year 2001 for the Nuclear Energy Research Initiative; and

(H) $21,242,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $21,242,000 for fiscal year 2001 for Program Direction.

(b) SCIENCE.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary for Science scientific and civilian energy research, development, and demonstration operation and maintenance and construction programs, projects, and activities for which specific sums are not authorized under other authority of law $2,657,761,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $2,691,465,000 for fiscal year 2001, to remain available until expended, of which—

(1) $715,090,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $753,110,000 for fiscal year 2001 shall be for High Energy Physics, including—

(A) $235,190,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $246,950,000 for fiscal year 2001 for High Energy Physics Research and Technology;

(B) $451,200,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $473,760,000 for fiscal year 2001 for High Energy Physics Facility Operations;

(C) $2,000,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $5,200,000 for fiscal year 2001 for construction of Project 00–G–307, Research Office Building, Stanford Linear Accelerator Center;

(D) $4,700,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $4,200,000 for fiscal year 2001 for construction of Project 99–G–306, Wilson Hall Safety Improvements Project, Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory; and

(E) $22,000,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $23,000,000 for fiscal year 2001 for construction of Project 98–G–304, Neutrinos at the Main Injector, Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory;

(2) $357,714,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $375,600,000 for fiscal year 2001 shall be for Nuclear Physics;

(3) $413,674,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $434,357,000 for fiscal year 2001 shall be for Biological and Environmental Research;

(4) $698,800,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $733,740,000 for fiscal year 2001 shall be for Basic Energy Sciences, including—

(A) $405,390,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $425,660,000 for fiscal year 2001 for Materials Sciences Research and Facilities Operations;

(B) $217,179,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $228,038,000 for fiscal year 2001 for Chemical Sciences Research and Facilities Operations;

(C) $18,820,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $19,761,000 for fiscal year 2001 for Engineering Research;

(D) $26,056,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $27,359,000 for fiscal year 2001 for Geosciences Research; and

(E) $31,355,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $32,923,000 for fiscal year 2001 for Energy Biosciences;

(5) $31,474,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $32,333,000 for fiscal year 2001 shall be for Computational and Technology Research, including—

(A) $17,174,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $18,033,000 for fiscal year 2001 for Mathematical, Information, and Computational Sciences; and

(B) $14,300,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $14,300,000 for fiscal year 2001 for Laboratory Technology Research;

(6) $1,000,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $1,000,000 for fiscal year 2001 shall be for Energy Research Analysis;

(7) $22,309,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $23,425,000 for fiscal year 2001 shall be for Multiprogram Energy Laboratories—Facility Support;

(8) $250,000,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $275,000,000 for fiscal year 2001 shall be for Fusion Energy Sciences, including $13,600,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $19,400,000 for fiscal year 2001 for Tokamak Fusion Test Reactor Decontamination and Decommissioning;

(9) $49,800,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $49,800,000 for fiscal year 2001 shall be for Science Program Direction;

(10) $17,900,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $13,100,000 for fiscal year 2001 shall be for Spallation Neutron Source research and development; and

(11) $100,000,000 for fiscal year 2000 shall be for construction of Project 99–E–334, Spallation Neutron Source, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, Tennessee.

(c) FOSSIL ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary for Fossil Energy Research and

Development civilian energy and scientific research, development, and demonstration and related commercial application of energy technology operation and maintenance programs, projects, and activities for which specific sums are not authorized under other authority of law $397,564,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $427,102,000 for fiscal year 2001, to remain available through the end of fiscal year 2002, of which—

(1) $126,609,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $126,614,000 for fiscal year 2001 shall be for Coal, including—

(A) $5,250,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $5,407,000 for fiscal year 2001 for Coal Preparation;

(B) $1,641,000 for fiscal year 2000 for Direct Liquefaction;

(C) $6,659,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $6,859,000 for fiscal year 2001 for Indirect Liquefaction;

(D) $2,200,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $2,310,000 for fiscal year 2001 for Advanced Clean Fuels Research Advanced Research and Environmental Technology;

(E) $3,000,000 for fiscal year 2000 for Advanced Pulverized Coal-Fired Powerplant;

(F) $7,010,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $7,220,000 for fiscal year 2001 for Indirect Fired Cycle;

(G) $38,661,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $39,821,000 for fiscal year 2001 for High-Efficiency-Integrated Gasification Combined Cycle;

(H) $15,077,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $15,529,000 for fiscal year 2001 for High-Efficiency Pressurized Fluidized Bed;

(I) $23,864,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $25,057,000 for fiscal year 2001 for Advanced Clean/Efficient Power Systems Advanced Research and Environmental Technology; and

(J) $23,247,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $24,410,000 for fiscal year 2001 for Advanced Research and Technology Development;

(2) $50,574,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $52,091,000 for fiscal year 2001 shall be for Oil Technology, including—

(A) $31,720,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $32,671,000 for fiscal year 2001 for Exploration and Production Supporting Research;

(B) $8,034,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $8,275,000 for fiscal year 2001 for Recovery Field Demonstrations; and

(C) $10,820,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $11,145,000 for fiscal year 2001 for Oil Technology Effective Environmental Protection;

(3) $107,916,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $108,831,000 for fiscal year 2001 shall be for Gas, including—

(A) $14,932,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $15,380,000 for fiscal year 2001 for Natural Gas Research Exploration and Production;

(B) $1,030,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $1,061,000 for fiscal year 2001 for Natural Gas Research Delivery and Storage;

(C) $41,808,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $41,808,000 for fiscal year 2001 for Natural Gas Research Advanced Turbine Systems;

(D) $9,330,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $9,610,000 for fiscal year 2001 for Natural Gas Research Emerging Processing Technology Applications;

(E) $3,108,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $3,201,000 for fiscal year 2001 for Natural Gas Effective Environmental Protection;

(F) $1,260,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $1,323,000 for fiscal year 2001 for Fuel Cells Advanced Research; and

(G) $36,449,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $36,449,000 for fiscal year 2001 for Fuel Cells Systems;

(4) $71,114,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $72,796,000 for fiscal year 2001 shall be for Program Direction and Management Support, including—

(A) $15,049,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $15,049,000 for fiscal year 2001 for Headquarters Program Direction; and

(B) $56,065,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $57,747,000 for fiscal year 2001 for Energy Technology Center Program Direction;

(5) $2,000,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $2,060,000 for fiscal year 2001 shall be for GP–F–100, Plant and Capital Equipment, at Energy Technology Center sites;

(6) $7,148,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $7,537,000 for fiscal year 2001 shall be for Cooperative Research and Development;

(7) $2,173,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $2,173,000 for fiscal year 2001 shall be for Fuels Conversion, Natural Gas, and Electricity;

(8) $5,000,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $5,000,000 for fiscal year 2001 shall be for Advanced Metallurgical Processes; and

(9) $25,000,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $50,000,000 for fiscal year 2001 shall be for a Fossil Energy Science Initiative to be managed by the Assistant Secretary for Fossil Energy in consultation with the Director of the Office of Science, for grants to be competitively awarded and subject to peer review for research relating to fossil energy. The Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Science and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, an annual report on the activities of the Fossil Energy Science Initiative, including a description of the process used to award the funds and an explanation of how the research relates to fossil energy.

(d) ENERGY CONSERVATION RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary for Energy Conservation Research and Development civilian energy and scientific research, development, and demonstration and related application of energy technology operation and maintenance programs, projects, and activities for which specific sums are not authorized under other authority of law $490,212,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $527,626,000 for fiscal year 2001, to remain available through the end of fiscal year 2002, of which—

(1) $204,935,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $210,845,000 for fiscal year 2001 shall be for the Transportation Sector, including—

(A) $129,714,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $133,606,000 for fiscal year 2001 for Vehicle Technology Research and Development;

(B) $23,500,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $24,205,000 for fiscal year 2001 for Fuels Utilization Research and Development, of which $2,500,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $2,750,000 for fiscal year 2001 shall be for biodiesel fuel research and development;

(C) $5,196,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $5,352,000 for fiscal year 2001 for Technology Deployment;

(D) $38,599,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $39,757,000 for fiscal year 2001 for Materials Technology; and

(E) $7,925,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $7,925,000 for fiscal year 2001 for Management and Planning;

(2) $155,131,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $159,534,000 for fiscal year 2001 shall be for the Industry Sector, including—

(A) $59,180,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $60,955,000 for fiscal year 2001 for Industries of the Future (Specific);

(B) $87,600,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $90,228,000 for fiscal year 2001 for Industries of the Future (Crosscutting); and

(C) $8,351,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $8,351,000 for fiscal year 2001 for Management and Planning;

(3) $70,014,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $72,115,000 for fiscal year 2001 shall be for the Building Technology, State and Community Sector (nongrants), including—

(A) $55,870,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $57,546,000 for fiscal year 2001 for Building Research; and

(B) $14,144,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $14,568,000 for fiscal year 2001 for Building Technology Assistance (nongrants);

(4) $35,132,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $35,132,000 for fiscal year 2001 shall be for Policy and Management; and

(5) $25,000,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $50,000,000 for fiscal year 2001 shall be for an Energy Efficiency Science Initiative to be managed by the Assistant Secretary for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy in consultation with the Director of the Office of Science, for grants to be competitively awarded and subject to peer review for research relating to energy efficiency. The Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Science and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, an annual report on the activities of the Energy Efficiency Science Initiative, including a description of the process used to award the funds and an explanation of how the research relates to energy efficiency.

SEC. 4. GAS HYDRATE ENERGY AND SCIENTIFIC AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary, acting through the Assistant Secretary for Fossil Energy, shall commence a program of gas hydrate energy and scientific and environmental research and development.

(b) GRANTS, CONTRACTS, COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS, INTERAGENCY FUNDS TRANSFER AGREEMENTS, AND FIELD WORK PROPOSALS.—

(1) ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary, acting through the Assistant Secretary for Fossil Energy, may award grants or contracts to, or enter into cooperative agreements with, institutions of higher education and industrial enterprises to conduct energy and scientific and environmental research, development, and demonstration programs on gas hydrate.

(2) PEER REVIEW.—Funds made available under paragraph (1) for initiating contracts, grants, cooperative agreements, interagency funds transfer agreements, and field work proposals shall be made available based on a competitive selection process and a peer review of proposals. Exceptions shall be considered on a case-by-case basis, and reported by the Secretary, acting through the Assistant Secretary for Fossil Energy, to the Committee on Science of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate 30 days prior to any such award.

(c) CONSULTATION.—The Secretary, acting through the Assistant Secretary for Fossil Energy, may establish an advisory panel consisting of experts from industry, institutions of higher education, and other entities as the Secretary considers appropriate, to assist in developing recommendations and priorities for the gas hydrate research and development program carried out under subsection (a).

(d) LIMITATIONS.—

(1) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—Not more than 5 percent of the amount made available to carry out this section for a fiscal year may be used by the Secretary, acting through the Assistant Secretary for Fossil Energy, for expenses associated with the administration of the program carried out under subsection (a).

(2) CONSTRUCTION COSTS.—None of the funds made available to carry out this section may be used for the construction of a new building or the acquisition, expansion, remodeling, or alteration of an existing building (including site grading and improvement and architect fees).

(e) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section:

(1) CONTRACT.—The term ''contract'' means a procurement contract within the meaning of section 6303 of title 31, United States Code.

(2) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT.—The term ''cooperative agreement'' means a cooperative agreement within the meaning of section 6305 of title 31, United States Code.

(3) GRANT.—The term ''grant'' means a grant awarded under a grant agreement, within the meaning of section 6304 of title 31, United States Code.

(4) INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—The term ''institution of higher education'' means

an institution of higher education, within the meaning of section 1201(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1141(a)).

(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Of the amounts authorized under section 3(c)(3), $5,000,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $7,500,000 for fiscal year 2001 shall be available for carrying out this section.

SEC. 5. NOTICE.

(a) REPROGRAMMING.—The Secretary may use for any authorized activities of the Department under this Act—

(1) up to the lesser of $250,000 or 5 percent of the total funding for a fiscal year of a civilian energy or scientific research, development, or demonstration or related commercial application of energy technology program, project, or activity of the Department; or

(2) after the expiration of 60 days after transmitting to the Committee on Science and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, a report described in subsection (b), up to 25 percent of the total funding for a fiscal year of a civilian energy or scientific research, development, or demonstration or related commercial application of energy technology program, project, or activity of the Department.

(b) REPORT.—(1) The report referred to in subsection (a)(2) is a report containing a full and complete statement of the action proposed to be taken and the facts and circumstances relied upon in support of such proposed action.

(2) In the computation of the 60-day period under subsection (a)(2), there shall be excluded any day on which either House of Congress is not in session because of an adjournment of more than 3 days to a day certain.

(c) LIMITATIONS.—In no event may funds be used pursuant to subsection (a) for a program, project, or activity for which funding has been requested to the Congress but which has not been funded by the Congress.

(d) NOTICE OF REORGANIZATION.—The Secretary shall provide notice to the Committee on Science and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, not later than 15 days before any major reorganization of any civilian energy or scientific research, development, or demonstration or related commercial application of energy technology program, project, or activity of the Department.

(e) COPY OF REPORTS.—The Secretary shall provide copies to the Committee on Science and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, of any report relating to the civilian energy or scientific research, development, or demonstration or related commercial application of energy technology programs, projects, and activities of the Department prepared at the direction of any committee of Congress.

SEC. 6. LIMITATION ON DEMONSTRATIONS.

The Department shall provide funding for civilian energy or scientific or related commercial application of energy technology demonstration programs, projects, and activities only for technologies or processes that can be reasonably expected to yield new, measurable benefits to the cost, efficiency, or performance of the technology or process.

SEC. 7. LIMITS ON GENERAL PLANT PROJECTS.

If, at any time during the construction of a civilian energy or scientific research, development, or demonstration or related commercial application of energy technology project of the Department for which no specific funding level is provided by law, the estimated cost (including any revision thereof) of the project exceeds $2,000,000, the Secretary may not continue such construction unless the Secretary has furnished a complete report to the Committee on Science and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, explaining the project and the reasons for the estimate or revision.

SEC. 8. LIMITS ON CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS.

(a) LIMITATION.—Except as provided in subsection (b), construction on a civilian energy or scientific research, development, or demonstration or related commercial application of energy technology project of the Department for which funding has been specifically provided by law may not be started, and additional obligations may not be incurred in connection with the project above the authorized funding amount, whenever the current estimated cost of the construction project exceeds by more than 10 percent the higher of—

(1) the amount authorized for the project, if the entire project has been funded by the Congress; or

(2) the amount of the total estimated cost for the project as shown in the most recent budget justification data submitted to Congress.

(b) NOTICE.—An action described in subsection (a) may be taken if—

(1) the Secretary has submitted to the Committee on Science and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, a report on the proposed actions and the circumstances making such actions necessary; and

(2) a period of 30 days has elapsed after the date on which the report is received by the committees.

(c) EXCLUSION.—In the computation of the 30-day period described in subsection (b)(2), there shall be excluded any day on which either House of Congress is not in session because of an adjournment of more than 3 days to a day certain.

(d) EXCEPTION.—Subsections (a) and (b) shall not apply to any construction project which has a current estimated cost of less than $2,000,000.

SEC. 9. AUTHORITY FOR CONCEPTUAL AND CONSTRUCTION DESIGN.

(a) REQUIREMENT FOR CONCEPTUAL DESIGN.—(1) Subject to paragraph (2) and except as provided in paragraph (3), before submitting to Congress a request for funds for a construction project that is in support of a civilian energy or scientific research, development, or demonstration or related commercial application of energy technology program, project, or activity of the Department, the Secretary shall complete a conceptual design for that project.

(2) If the estimated cost of completing a conceptual design for a construction project exceeds $750,000, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a request for funds for the conceptual design before submitting a request for funds for the construction project.

(3) The requirement in paragraph (1) does not apply to a request for funds for a construction project, the total estimated cost of which is less than $2,000,000.

(b) AUTHORITY FOR CONSTRUCTION DESIGN.—(1) The Secretary may carry out construction design (including architectural and engineering services) in connection with any proposed construction project that is in support of a civilian energy or scientific research, development, and demonstration or related commercial application of energy technology program, project, or activity of the Department if the total estimated cost for such design does not exceed $250,000.

(2) If the total estimated cost for construction design in connection with any construction project described in paragraph (1) exceeds $250,000, funds for such design must be specifically authorized by law.

SEC. 10. LIMITS ON USE OF FUNDS.

(a) CONSTRUCTION OF SPALLATION NEUTRON SOURCE PROJECT.—None of the funds authorized by section 3(b)(11) may be obligated until—

(1) the Secretary certifies in writing to the Committee on Science of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate that senior project management positions for the project have been filled by qualified individuals; and

(2) the Secretary provides the Committee on Science and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, with—

(A) a cost baseline and project milestones for each major construction and technical system activity, consistent with the overall cost and schedule submitted with the Department's fiscal year 2000 budget, that have been reviewed and certified by an independent entity, outside the Department and having no financial interest in the project, as the most cost-effective way to complete the project;

(B) binding legal agreements that specify the duties and obligations of each laboratory of the Department in carrying out the project;

(C) a revised project management structure that integrates the staff of the collaborating laboratories working on the project under a single project director, who shall have direct supervisory responsibility over the carrying out of the duties and obligations described in subparagraph (B); and

(D) official delegation by the Secretary of primary authority with respect to the project to the project director; and

(3) the Comptroller General certifies to the Congress that the total taxes and fees in any manner or form paid by the Federal Government on the Spallation Neutron Source and the property, activities, and income of the Department relating to the Spallation Neutron Source to the State of Tennessee or its counties, municipalities, or any other subdivision thereof, does not exceed the aggregate taxes and fees for which the Federal Government would be liable if the project were located in any other State that contains a national laboratory of the Department. The Secretary shall report on the Spallation Neutron Source Project 99–E–334 annually, as part of the Department's annual budget submission, including a description of the achievement of milestones, a comparison of actual costs to estimated costs, and any changes in estimated project costs or schedule.

(b) INTERNATIONAL THERMONUCLEAR EXPERIMENTAL REACTOR (ITER) ENGINEERING DESIGN ACTIVITIES (EDA).—None of the funds authorized by this Act may be used either directly or indirectly for United States participation in International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor (ITER) Engineering Design Activities (EDA).

(c) OFFICE OF SCIENCE.—None of the funds authorized by this Act may be used either directly or indirectly to fund the salary of an individual holding the position of Director or Deputy Director of the Office of Science, or Associate Director (except for the Office of Laboratory Policy and the Office of Resource Management), or Director, Office of Planning and Analysis within the Department's Office of Science unless such individual holds a postgraduate degree in science or engineering.

(d) TRAVEL.—Not more than 1 percent of the funds authorized by this Act may be used either directly or indirectly to fund travel costs of the Department or travel costs for persons awarded contracts or subcontracts by the Department. As part of the Department's annual budget request submission to the Congress, the Secretary shall submit a report to the Committee on Science and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, that identifies—

(1) the estimated amount of travel costs by the Department and for persons awarded contracts or subcontracts by the Department for the fiscal year of such budget submission, as well as for the 2 previous fiscal years;

(2) the major purposes for such travel; and

(3) the sources of funds for such travel.

(e) TRADE ASSOCIATIONS.—No funds authorized by this Act may be used either directly or indirectly to fund a grant, contract, subcontract, or any other form of financial assistance awarded by the Department to a trade association on a noncompetitive basis. As part of the Department's annual budget request submission to the Congress, the Secretary shall submit a report to the Committee on Science and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, that identifies—

(1) the estimated amount of funds provided by the Department to trade associations, by trade association, for the fiscal year of such budget submission, as well as for the 2 previous fiscal years;

(2) the services either provided or to be provided by each such trade association; and

(3) the sources of funds for services provided by each such trade association.

(f) REDUCTIONS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act—

(1) each of the amounts authorized by this Act for fiscal year 2000 shall be reduced by 1 percent;

(2) each of the amounts authorized by this Act for fiscal year 2000, as reduced pursuant to paragraph (1), shall be further reduced by .7674 percent, with such reduction representing a reduction in travel costs; and

(3) each of the amounts authorized by this Act for fiscal year 2000 for administrative expenses, including program management, shall be further reduced proportionately to achieve additional savings of $30,000,000.

SEC. 11. MANAGEMENT AND OPERATING CONTRACTS.

(a) COMPETITIVE PROCEDURE REQUIREMENT.—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act for civilian energy or scientific research, development, and demonstration or related commercial application of energy technology programs, projects, and activities may be used to award a management and operating contract for a federally owned or operated civilian energy laboratory of the Department unless such contract is awarded using competitive procedures or the Secretary grants, on a case-by-case basis, a waiver to allow for such a deviation. The Secretary may not delegate the authority to grant such a waiver.

(b) CONGRESSIONAL NOTICE.—At least 60 days before a contract award, amendment, or modification for which the Secretary intends to grant such a waiver, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Science and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, a report notifying the committees of the waiver and setting forth the reasons for the waiver.

SEC. 12. FEDERAL ACQUISITION REGULATION.

(a) REQUIREMENT.—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act for civilian energy or scientific research, development, and demonstration or related commercial application of energy technology programs, projects, and activities may be used to award, amend, or modify a contract of the Department in a manner that deviates from the Federal Acquisition Regulation, unless the Secretary grants, on a case-by-case basis, a waiver to allow for such a deviation. The Secretary may not delegate the authority to grant such a waiver.

(b) CONGRESSIONAL NOTICE.—At least 60 days before a contract award, amendment, or modification for which the Secretary intends to grant such a waiver, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Science and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, a report notifying the committees of the waiver and setting forth the reasons for the waiver.

SEC. 13. REQUESTS FOR PROPOSALS.

None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act may be used by the Department to prepare or initiate Requests for Proposals (RFPs) for a civilian energy or scientific research, development, and demonstration or related commercial application of energy technology program, project, or activity if the program, project, or activity has not been specifically authorized by Congress.

SEC. 14. PRODUCTION OR PROVISION OF ARTICLES OR SERVICES.

None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act may be used by any civilian energy or scientific research, development, and demonstration or related commercial application of energy technology program, project, or activity of the Department to produce or provide articles or services for the purpose of selling the articles or services to a person outside the Federal Government, unless the Secretary determines that comparable articles or services are not available from a commercial source in the United States.

SEC. 15. ELIGIBILITY FOR AWARDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall exclude from consideration for grant agreements for civilian energy and scientific research, development, and demonstration or related commercial application of energy technology programs, projects, and activities made by the Department after fiscal year 1999 any person who received funds, other than those described in subsection (b), appropriated for a fiscal year after fiscal year 1999, under a grant agreement from any Federal funding source for a program, project, or activity that was not subjected to a competitive, merit-based award process, except as specifically authorized by this Act. Any exclusion from consideration pursuant to this section shall be effective for a period of 5 years after the person receives such Federal funds.

(b) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to the receipt of Federal funds by a person due to the membership of that person in a class specified by law for which assistance is awarded to members of the class according to a formula provided by law or under circumstances permitting other than full and open competition under the Federal Acquisition Regulation.

(c) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term ''grant agreement'' means a legal instrument whose principal purpose is to transfer a thing of value to the recipient to carry out a public purpose of support or stimulation authorized by a law of the United States, and does not include the acquisition (by purchase, lease, or barter) of property or services for the direct benefit or use of the United States Government. Such term does not include a cooperative agreement (as such term is used in section 6305 of title 31, United States Code) or a cooperative research and development agreement (as such term is defined in section 12(d)(1) of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 3710a(d)(1))).

SEC. 16. INTERNET AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION.

The Secretary shall make available through the Internet home page of the Department the abstracts relating to all research grants and awards made with funds authorized by this Act. Nothing in this section shall be construed to require or permit the release of any information prohibited by law or regulation from being released to the public.

SEC. 17. FOREIGN VISITORS PROGRAM.

(a) PROHIBITION.—Except as provided in subsection (b) or (c), the Secretary may not admit to any classified area of any federally owned or operated nonmilitary energy laboratory any individual who is a citizen of a nation that is named on the Department of Energy List of Sensitive Countries.

(b) WAIVER AUTHORITY.—(1) The Secretary may waive the prohibition in subsection (a) on a case-by-case basis with respect to individuals whose admission to a federally owned or operated nonmilitary energy laboratory is determined by the Secretary to be necessary for the furtherance of civilian science interests of the United States.

(2) Not later than 30 days after granting a waiver under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall transmit to the Committee on Science of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report in writing providing notice of the waiver. The report shall identify each individual for whom a waiver is granted and, with respect to each such individual, provide a detailed justification for the waiver and the Secretary's certification that the admission of that individual to a federally owned or operated nonmilitary energy laboratory is necessary for the furtherance of civilian science interests of the United States.

(3) The authority of the Secretary under paragraph (1) may not be delegated.

(c) APPLICATION.—This section shall not apply to the Ames Laboratory, the Environmental Measurement Laboratory, the Ernest Orlando Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, the Federal Energy Technology Center, the Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory, the National Renewable Energy Laboratory, the Princeton Plasma Physics Laboratory, the Radiological and Environmental Sciences Laboratory, the Stanford Linear Accelerator Center, or the Thomas Jefferson National Accelerator Facility.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. SENSENBRENNER

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Mr. SENSENBRENNER: Page 27, lines 9 through 19, amend paragraph (3) to read as follows:

(3) The Comptroller General reports on the Congress, on the basis of available information, that the tax reimbursements that the Comptroller General estimates the Department would pay to its contractors as a cost of constructing the Spallation Neutron Source at Oak Ridge National Laboratory in Tennessee would be no more than the tax reimbursements it would pay if the same project were constructed at the Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory in California, the Argonne National Laboratory in Illinois, the Los Alamos National Laboratory in New Mexico, or the Brookhaven National Laboratory in New York.

Page 36, line 5, insert ''the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, the Los Alamos National Laboratory,'' after ''Accelerator Laboratory.''

Page 36, lines 8 and 9, strike ''Stanford Linear Accelerator Center, or the Thomas Jefferson National Accelerator Facility'' and insert ''Sandia National Laboratories, the Stanford Linear Accelerator Center, the Thomas Jefferson National Accelerator Facility, or the Y–12 Plant''.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, this is a manager's amendment. It does two things. One, it clarifies the provisions for a GAO report on sales or use taxes for the Spallation Neutron Source, and, secondly, at the request of the Committee on Armed Services, the

amendment adds Lawrence Livermore, Los Alamos and Sandia National Labs and the Y–12 Plant to the list of labs in the bill excluded from the provision that prohibits citizens of a nation on the DOE's list of sensitive countries from entering any classified area of a federally-owned or operated non-military energy laboratory. This provision was included in the defense authorization bill that was approved earlier today. I know of no controversy on this amendment.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the manager's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TRAFICANT

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TRAFICANT:

At the end of the bill, add the following new sections:

SEC. 18. COMPLIANCE WITH BUY AMERICAN ACT.

No funds authorized pursuant to this Act may be expended by an entity unless the entity agrees that in expending the assistance the entity will comply with sections 2 through 4 of the Act of March 3, 1933 (41 U.S.C. 10a–10c, popularly known as the ''Buy American Act'').

SEC. 19. SENSE OF CONGRESS; REQUIREMENT REGARDING NOTICE.

(a) PURCHASE OF AMERICAN-MADE EQUIPMENT AND PRODUCTS.—In the case of any equipment or products that may be authorized to be purchased with financial assistance provided under this Act, it is the sense of the Congress that entities receiving such assistance should, in expending the assistance, purchase only American-made equipment and products.

(b) NOTICE TO RECIPIENTS OF ASSISTANCE.—In providing financial assistance under this Act, the Secretary shall provide to each recipient of the assistance a notice describing the statement made in subsection (a) by the Congress.

SEC. 20. PROHIBITION OF CONTRACTS.

If it has been finally determined by a court or Federal agency that any person intentionally affixed a label bearing a ''Made in America'' inscription, or any inscription with the same meaning, to any product sold in or shipped to the United States that is not made in the United States, such person shall be ineligible to receive any contract or subcontract made with funds provided pursuant to this Act, pursuant to the debarment, suspension, and ineligibility procedures described in section 9.400 through 9.409 of title 48, Code of Federal Regulations.

Mr. TRAFICANT (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, before I offer the amendment, let me say to the gentleman from Wisconsin, I think it is very important under his leadership, I would like to make this statement briefly. It has been reported that the Department of Energy labs have been selling technologies developed by our lab scientists using American taxpayer dollars to companies in Japan and Germany and those companies then compete against American companies in the United States. I want to cite a couple of examples briefly. The Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory supposedly sold 10 of 30 licenses, I would like to have an answer to that, for micropower impulse radar technology to Japan and Germany; and the Idaho National Environment Engineering Lab just announced it was going to give away, no less, American technology funded by American dollars to an Italian agriculture equipment company. Not only should the Department be buying American, if they are they should stop selling out American companies.

This is a ''Buy American'' amendment that I have offered to every other bill.

□ 1415

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment.

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

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, we support the amendment.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. ANDREWS

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Mr. ANDREWS:

Page 17, after line 10, insert the following new subsection:

(e) ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZATION.—The Secretary shall designate $2,000,000 of the amounts authorized by this section for each fiscal year for biometric technology security, including Iris Recognition Technology.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I want to first thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COSTELLO), and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL) for their cooperation in bringing this amendment forward. It calls for the Secretary of Energy to designate $2 million for the development of iris and other biometric technology for identification. The amendment, I believe, has three virtues:

First, it will significantly enhance security at our labs and other facilities in the short run; second, it will have the results of that successful technology shared with our military, with our other federal agencies such as aviation; and third, it is a further investment in the new economy of this country that is generating new products, new jobs and new opportunities.

I very much appreciate the cooperation we have received, and I would urge the amendment's adoption.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, let me say I support the amendment and will note that it is not an add on, but merely designates $2 million of the amounts in the account for this purpose. I think it is a constructive amendment and would urge the House to support it.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, we support the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. UDALL OF COLORADO

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. UDALL of Colorado:

Page 2, line 19, strike ''$432,366,000'' and insert ''$482,266,000''.

Page 2, line 20, strike ''$452,577,000'' and insert ''$504,595,630''.

Page 2, line 23, strike ''$316,624,000'' and insert ''$366,524,000''.

Page 2, line 24, strike ''$325,321,000'' and insert ''$377,339,630''.

Page 3, line 1, strike ''$3,708,000'' and insert ''$5,500,000''.

Page 3, line 2, strike ''$3,819,000'' and insert ''$5,665,000''.

Page 3, line 4, strike ''$83,345,000'' and insert ''$93,309,000''.

Page 3, line 5, strike ''$85,845,000'' and insert ''$96,108,270''.

Page 3, line 7, strike ''$17,510,000'' and insert ''$18,850,000''.

Page 3, line 8, strike ''$18,035,000'' and insert ''$19,415,500''.

Page 3, line 13, strike ''$75,396,000'' and insert ''$92,391,000''.

Page 3, line 14, strike ''$77,658,000'' and insert ''$95,162,730''.

Page 3, line 16, strike ''$35,814,000'' and insert ''$45,600,000''.

Page 3, line 17, strike ''$36,889,000'' and insert ''$46,968,000''.

Page 3, line 19, strike ''$1,500,000'' and insert ''$4,000,000''.

Page 3, line 20, strike ''$1,500,000'' and insert ''$4,120,000''.

Page 4, line 1, strike ''$1,100,000'' and insert ''$3,900,000''.

Page 4, line 2, strike ''$1,100,000'' and insert ''$4,017,000''.

Page 4, line 12, strike ''$3,348,000'' and insert ''$7,000,000''.

Page 4, line 13, strike ''$3,448,000'' and insert ''$7,210,000''.

Page 4, line 17, strike ''$18,100,000'' and insert ''$19,171,000''.

Page 4, line 18, strike ''$18,100,000'' and insert ''$19,746,130''.

Page 14, line 18, strike ''$490,212,000'' and insert ''$577,915,000''.

Page 14, line 19, strike ''$527,626,000'' and insert ''$619,502,480''.

Page 14, line 21, strike ''$204,935,000'' and insert ''$246,999,000''.

Page 14, line 22, strike ''$210,845,000'' and insert ''$254,409,000''.

Page 15, line 1, strike ''$129,714,000'' and insert ''$168,080,000''.

Page 15, line 2, strike ''$133,606,000'' and insert ''$173,122,400''.

Page 15, line 10, strike ''$5,196,000'' and insert ''$7,000,000''.

Page 15, line 11, strike ''$5,352,000'' and insert ''$7,210,000''.

Page 15, line 16, strike ''$7,925,000'' and insert ''$9,820,000''.

Page 15, line 17, strike ''$7,925,000'' and insert ''$10,114,600''.

Page 15, line 19, strike ''$155,131,000'' and insert ''$171,000,000''.

Page 15, line 20, strike ''$159,534,000'' and insert ''$176,130,000''.

Page 15, line 22, strike ''$59,180,000'' and insert ''$74,000,000''.

Page 15, line 23, strike ''$60,955,000'' and insert ''$76,220,000''.

Page 16, line 4, strike ''$8,351,000'' and insert ''$9,400,000''.

Page 16, line 5, strike ''$8,351,000'' and insert ''$9,682,000''.

Page 16, line 7, strike ''$70,014,000'' and insert ''$92,116,000''.

Page 16, line 8, strike ''$72,115,000'' and insert ''$94,879,480''.

Page 16, line 11, strike ''$55,870,000'' and insert ''$62,018,000''.

Page 16, line 12, strike ''$57,546,000'' and insert ''$63,878,540''.

Page 16, line 14, strike ''$14,144,000'' and insert ''$30,098,000''.

Page 16, line 15, strike ''$14,568,000'' and insert ''$31,000,940''.

Page 16, line 17, strike ''$35,132,000'' and insert ''$42,800,000''.

Page 16, line 18, strike ''$35,132,000'' and insert ''$44,084,000''.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I want to begin by thanking my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), for his interest in working on my amendment. I also want to express my thanks to my colleague from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) for working with me as well on the amendment.

I will be brief.

The amendment is quite simple. It restores authorization levels for the Department of Energy solar and renewable energy and energy efficiency research programs to the levels of the fiscal 2000 year request.

Mr. Chairman, our colleagues have heard me speak about the reasons why we need to invest more in renewable energy and energy efficiency programs. They benefit our economy by stimulating private sector activity and adding jobs, they reduce our reliance on imported oil, and they have a positive impact on air and water quality.

I want to just provide a few examples for the record of what these increased levels will accomplish:

$10 million will go into research on photovoltaic energy systems. While sales of PVs are at a billion dollar level this year, these systems cannot reach their true potential until we learn how to reduce their cost and increase their efficiency.

Another $10 million will go to wind energy systems. These systems again have dropped in price by about 80 percent, but we still have another 40 to 50 percent to go before wind energy can compete economically with other forms of energy. We forecast in the long run over 100,000 megawatts created through this source alone.

$17 million of the increase goes to biopower and biofuels. The additional research will permit restoration of projects dealing with co-firing with coal and modular systems development.

And finally, almost $40 million will be put back into the program for next-generation vehicles. This program is showing major potential in increasing auto fuel efficiency while also meeting our stringent environmental requirements.

Clearly, Mr. Chairman, this is an area where federal investment can really make an enormous difference. Renewable energy and energy efficiency is all about an investment in our future, the future of our security, protecting our environment and enhancing our competitiveness internationally. The authorization levels in 1655 do not give us sufficient flexibility to utilize the potential benefits these programs can provide. This amendment would give us that flexibility, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I am proud to cosponsor this amendment with my colleague, and I would point out that this amendment is very simple. We want to put the House on record clearly stating that solar and renewable energy programs and energy efficient and conservation programs are a priority. That is really one of the major reasons we take up authorization bills, to state as a matter of policy what kinds of programs and funding levels we should be striving to provide to meet national needs.

So the question then is why, as a matter of policy, are these programs a priority? Two reasons: national security, as my colleague has mentioned, and environmental protection, as we both strongly identify with. And, oh, a third: they have been proven to work.

I am proud to say that the chairman and the ranking member have worked constructively with us on this, and it is my understanding that the chairman and the ranking member are going to accept this amendment. I applaud them on their good judgment and their reasoning abilities.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment I have introduced with Mr. UDALL. The point of this amendment is simple: We want to put the House on record clearly stating that solar and renewable energy programs, and energy efficiency and conservation programs, are a priority.

That's really one of the major reasons we take up authorization bills—to state, as a matter of policy, what kinds of programs and funding levels we should be striving to provide to meet national needs. We must not be careless or unrealistic in setting authorization levels, but nor are we bound by the same strictures as we are in taking up spending bills or the budget. This bill is a policy assessment primarily, not a fiscal assessment.

So the question, then, is: Why, as a matter of policy, are these programs a priority? Two reasons: national security and environmental protection. Oh, and a third—they've been proven to work.

Let me talk about security first. As a member of the Intelligence Committee, I am acutely aware of the potential threats faced by our country. And one threat about which we have become far too complacent is the susceptibility of our energy supplies to foreign manipulation. Our nation is far more dependent on foreign oil than it was at the time of the oil shocks of the 1970s. We need to find more ways to wean ourselves from this supply.

Our long-term security will also be bolstered by making our economy more energy efficient, both by improving our overall competitiveness and by making us less vulnerable to changes in energy supply. Yet we waste far more energy than do many of our economic competitors.

The second reason to support these programs is environmental. Despite the progress that we have made over the past 30 years in cleaning our air and water, we still have a lot of work to do, and indeed we are in danger of backsliding. Electric generation is still a major source of pollutants—particularly of pollutants that poison lakes in regions like the Adirondacks in my area. Our long-term hope is to move to more environmentally friendly forms of generation.

In addition, if we take the threat of global climate change seriously—and I think we should—we need to redouble our efforts to find economical alternatives to fossil fuels. Now let me emphasize that these programs have nothing to do with the Kyoto Protocol and indeed they predate any concern with climate change. They are a good idea in and of themselves that also just happen to reduce carbon dioxide emissions as well.

And these programs do work. Technologies that have been supported by the Department of Energy have saved consumers billions of dollars through advances in building design, solar and renewable energy, lighting design and other areas.

But some will ask, ''If this research is such a good idea, how come the private sector isn't doing more of it?'' The answer is pretty obvious. At a time of low energy prices, there is little incentive for the private sector to plow money into advances whose initial benefits will be more societal than private. This is the classic, textbook case economists make for public research funding.

And yet the sad history of federal energy program funding is that the federal government—which is supposed to have the public interest at heart—is just as short-sighted as the private sector.

Federal energy funding has tended to go up in times of energy crisis and down once those crises have passed. It's time to break that absurd pattern and to invest when times are

good, when funding is available, when there is still time to plan ahead and perhaps to forestall or even avoid the crises that we know full well lie ahead of us on our current path.

Now, the Committee has brought forward a reasonable bill, and I imagine some will say, ''I agree with all your arguments, but the bill already has taken them into account.'' But I think we can do better.

First, the funding levels in H.R. 1655 for energy conservation and efficiency are actually below those the House passed last month as part of the Interior appropriations bill. And the figures in H.R. 1655 are below those in the Senate Interior appropriations bill as well.

In terms of solar and renewal energy programs, our amendment would indeed authorize more than has been appropriated. But we believe that, again, as a matter of policy, we ought to be making these programs a higher priority. The shape of our energy future will determine our future security, prosperity and environmental health.

All those Members concerned with our energy future—in particular, the 150 member of the House Renewable Energy Caucus, should vote for this amendment. All those Members concerned with our environmental future should vote for this amendment, which will be scored by the League of Conservation Voters. All those Members from the Northeast who are concerned with the power plant emissions that foul our air, should vote for this amendment. And indeed every Member should vote for this amendment because it makes clear that this House understands how critical energy policy is to our future and how inadequate that policy is today.

Let me close by quoting from a report issued by the President's Council of Advisors on Science and Technology—a report issued by a panel that included significant corporate, as well as academic representation.

The report concluded that DOE's program ''are not commensurate in scope and scale with the energy challenges and opportunities the 21st century will present.'' I think we need to respond to those challenges and opportunities now—before there's an energy crisis, now—when times are good. I urge support for the Udall-Boehlert amendment.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to accept the amendment, but I do not think that it is fair to say that the Committee on Science has been parsimonious relative to solar renewable energy. The base bill recommends a 6.7 percent increase above appropriated 1999 levels to 401.9 million for fiscal 2000 and an additional 4 percent increase to $418.1 million for fiscal 2001. This amendment pluses those numbers up further at a time when we are operating under discretionary spending caps and under some severe budget constraints.

During my early years on the Committee on Science we, on a bipartisan basis, attempted to put some sense and some market forces into solar and renewable energy research because frankly the programs were overfunded following the 1979 oil crisis, and those efforts were successful; and I think we were able to better focus the money on it so that the taxpayers got more bang for the buck.

So I am going to tell my friends from Colorado and New York that there is going to be a little quid pro quo to my good judgment in support of this amendment, and that is going to be some vigorous oversight over the solar and renewable energy programs over the next year; and I hope that they will exercise equally good judgment to support that so that we do not go back to the morass of merely throwing money at the program like we did in the late 1970s and early 1980s, over two administrations, one a Democratic administration and one a Republican administration.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the Udall of Colorado amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Udall amendment to H.R. 1655.

This is not an appropriations bill, it's an authorization bill. If the appropriators do not have sufficient funds, then clearly all of these programs may have to be cut. All this amendment does is restore the authorization levels to the level of the President's request for these programs. Almost every other program authorized in this bill is at or above the President's request—why should these programs be any different?

H.R. 1655 only provides $75.4 of the $92.4 million requested for biopower and biofuels. These cuts will reduce R&D in areas that could lower the costs of producing ethanol. The ethanol industry currently provides 40,000 jobs, or $1 billion in household income. Displacing gasoline with ethanol in automobiles reduces carbon emissions by 95%; if you merely mix a 10% blend of ethanol with gasoline, you reduce emissions by 25–30%. Voting for the Udall amendment will help to continue the important R&D that could lead to the development of cheap, sustainable and clean energy sources such as ethanol.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the Udall amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) who is a member of the committee.

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. COSTELLO) for accepting this amendment. I rise in support of the Udall of Colorado amendment.

I rise today in support of the Udall amendment. It is so important that we plan for our children's future, which includes making certain they have a clean environment and a sustainable energy source in years to come.

Our current dependence on foreign oil and fossil fuels can not continue indefinitely. Regrettably, this bill increases nuclear energy by $3.4 million above the President's request, but does not fully fund the Renewable Energy Program. This is an outrage.

How can we take care of our children and their future with such a short-sighted approach? Renewable Energy is efficient, cost effective, and unlimited in its capacity.

We need to capture these resources—wind, solar, biomass, and geothermal—and put them to better use. Not only do we solve our energy problem, but we save our environment as well so that our children and their children can grow up in a clean, safe and healthy world.

As a member of the Science Committee, I fought for this funding increase during our committee markup. It failed by a narrow margin. We can not let that happen again. I strongly urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the Udall amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STUPAK

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STUPAK:

Page 22, line 10, insert ''(a) IN GENERAL.—'' before ''The Department shall''.

Page 22, after line 15, insert the following new subsection:

(b) PARALLEX PROJECT.—The Secretary shall not, as part of the test and demonstration Parallex Project, select a route for the transportation of Mixed Oxide Fuel from Los Alamos, New Mexico, to Chalk River, Canada, without issuing a rule based on the record after an opportunity for agency hearing.

Mr. STUPAK (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Chairman, as I begin, first let me thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COSTELLO) for their help and understanding on this very important amendment, to the residents of my district and to a number of other congressional districts throughout the country.

It concerns the shipment of nuclear material containing weapons-grade plutonium from Los Alamos, New Mexico, to Chalk River, Canada. The Department of Energy has proposed to ship fuel rods manufactured from plutonium, formerly used in nuclear weapons, across the West and the Midwest including St. Louis, Chicago, and a number of other population centers.

Behind me is a map of the route DOE has chosen.

At the outset let me say that it is, it is in the United States strategic interests to decrease the oversupply of weapons-grade plutonium in this country and Russia. Furthermore, I agree that it is important to maintain a partnership with Russia to encourage the destruction of their plutonium. However the process, the process that has been used to determine a route which the MOX fuel will take has been completely inappropriate and without

congressional or public input. The DOE prepared an environmental assessment, an EA, on the project which was distributed to only 52 residents in the State of Michigan for comment, none of whom live near the two bridges where the material will be transported.

Although DOE staff informed some congressional staff that more people were notified of the EA, they could provide no records of such input. The decision was made without a public hearing in Michigan. Even when the Michigan governor sought public hearing, DOE denied this request. None of the emergency response crews along the route have been notified of the shipment. One emergency response coordinator in my district stated there is no plutonium chapter in his disaster response manual.

Who has the responsibility, the jurisdiction, the liability and evacuation authority in case there is a transportation accident? The EA examined seven routes to Canada that would be appropriate for the transportation of this material.

DOE staff explained that the Canadian Government objected to two of the routes because they traveled through the golden triangle of heavily industrialized area in Canada. Canada objected to a third route due to concern that the police vehicle accompanying the fuel would not be allowed to transit an Indian reservation along the route. Canadians and the Canadian native tribes can object to the route, but U.S. citizens and Native American Indians cannot.

I would point out that the proposed route will travel over three of the five Great Lakes, the world's largest supply of fresh water and one of our country's greatest natural resources. The proposed route would pass along a minimum of four Native American tribes in my district. The DOE's own environmental assessment ranks the Sault Ste. Marie route, the one that is here on the map in the red, as both the second highest-risk route, the second highest exposure level and the second longest in distance of miles traveled.

Although the DOE argues that there is minimal amount of risk associated with the transport of this material, the risk was obviously high enough that the Canadian Government did not want it to go through their golden triangle. If the route is the second riskiest, then why is it chosen? Furthermore, the Mackinac Bridge where it will have to cross Lake Huron and Lake Michigan is undergoing maintenance, the same reason why the Blue Water Bridge in Port Huron, Michigan, was removed from consideration. If one route is chosen because a bridge is under repair, then why would DOE choose the Mackinac Bridge, the world's largest suspension bridge, which is undergoing maintenance as a suitable route?

My amendment would just simply delay the decision to choose the transportation route until there has been adequate opportunity for public comment on a particular route and the citizens, Members of Congress, governors and emergency response personnel have an opportunity to ask questions. The Canadian Government is affording their citizens the opportunity for comment, and we should demand our citizens have the same rights.

I agree it is important to dispose of the excess U.S. and Russian nuclear weapons material; however, I believe the process for determining the route should be made after, only after, the public has been notified of the proposed route and Department of Energy has solicited comments about the selection and to answer our questions.

I urge my colleagues, and I urge the leadership on this floor here today to support my amendment requiring, just requiring, a public hearing before choosing the route for this plutonium shipment.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COSTELLO) for the opportunity to present this amendment.

□ 1430

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, let me say, first of all, I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COSTELLO) and others for allowing us to present this amendment today. I want to commend my friend from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK). The gentleman's amendment, as he so articulately put it, would protect something that is extremely important: the right of the public to closely examine and respond to proposed shipments of radioactive plutonium through our communities.

This nuclear waste is, as one can imagine, inherently dangerous and proposals to ship it through our communities over the Great Lakes, the largest bodies of freshwater in the world, 20 percent of all the freshwater in the world, 95 percent of all the freshwater in our country, this has sparked a widespread concern about health and safety.

People in our region, the Great Lakes region, have many legitimate questions; and they have a right to know the risks to which their communities could be subjected. Are there alternative routes that would steer clear of major cities, towns, and avoid transporting this waste over water? How will it be shipped? What precautions will be taken to prevent an accident? Are such shipments vulnerable to theft and hijacking? What are the potential hazards if something goes wrong?

We need to answer these questions before we even consider any shipments that would put our families and our communities and our water at risk. Remember something. As I said, the freshwater in this region here represents 20 percent of the world's freshwater, which is in high demand given the fact that we have 6 billion people on this Earth, and it is exponentially increasing in demand, especially in Asia and other countries.

It is a serious problem, and this is a very fine resource. We cannot afford to put that resource at the risk of contamination.

Last year, I opposed a proposal to ship, as the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) pointed out, this weapons-grade plutonium through my district and across the Blue Water Bridge from Port Huron to Sarnia because the risks are too great.

I was just in my office now, and came down to the floor, talking to a member of the parliament, my counterpart across the way, Roger Gallaway, who expressed his dismay and his anger as well about these shipments potentially through our district.

Now the Department of Energy has come back with another route, this one passing through major cities like St. Louis, Chicago before crossing three of five of the Great Lakes. Then the new route would actually cross the Mackinac Bridge, the world's longest single-span suspension bridge, which stretches 5 miles over open water.

To make matters worse, the Department of Energy did not even bother to consult the emergency response team along the way. One would think that would be one of the first things that would be done here. Nor was there any public input that I have been able to ascertain. This proposed route is wrong and the people deserve to have their voice heard.

Here in this Congress we are accustomed to making laws, but there is another law out there that often takes precedence over what we do here, and it is called Murphy's Law: if something can go wrong, it probably will. So let us not take a chance with a truckload of radioactive plutonium spoiling our communities, poisoning our very precious resource, our water, our fresh water, and endangering our families.

The Stupak amendment establishes an important safeguard against such disasters by establishing an official public forum for exchange of information and for a careful scrutiny of any proposed shipment. It is necessary, it is a very necessary response, to a planning process that has been flawed from the beginning. I urge my colleagues to support the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) in his amendment.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to support this amendment, but I am absolutely shocked that an administration that was committed to preserving the environment would be planning such a thing. So perhaps we Republicans can help wake an administration that has been insensitive to environmental concerns such as those that the minority whip of the House of Representatives has brought to our attention to wake up. I urge support of the amendment.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, we strongly support and commend the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) for his amendment and move its adoption.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MS. BERKLEY

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Ms. BERKLEY:

Page 36, after line 9, insert the following new section:

SEC. 18. NUCLEAR WASTE TRANSMUTATION RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall commence a program of research and development on the technology necessary to achieve onsite transmutation of nuclear waste into nonradioactive substances.

(b) GRANTS, CONTRACTS, COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS, INTERAGENCY FUNDS TRANSFER AGREEMENTS, AND FIELD WORK PROPOSALS.—

(1) ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary may award grants or contracts to, or enter into cooperative agreements with, institutions of higher education and industrial enterprises to conduct a research, development, and demonstration program on the technology necessary to achieve onsite transmutation of nuclear waste into nonradioactive substances in a manner consistent with United States environmental and nonproliferation policy. The Secretary shall not support a technology under this section that involves the isolation of plutonium or uranium.

(2) PEER REVIEW.—Funds made available under paragraph (1) for initiating contracts, grants, cooperative agreements, interagency funds transfer agreements, and field work proposals shall be made available based on a competitive selection process and a peer review of proposals. Exemptions shall be considered on a case-by-case basis, and reported by the Secretary to the Committee on Science of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate 30 days prior to any such award.

(c) CONSULTATION.—The Secretary may establish an advisory panel consisting of experts from indust4ry, institutions of higher education, and other entities as the Secretary considers appropriate, to assist in developing recommendations and priorities for the research, development, and demonstration program carried out under subsection (a).

(d) LIMITATIONS.—

(1) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—Not more than 5 percent of the amount made available to carry out this section for a fiscal year may be used by the Secretary for expenses associated with the administration of the program carried out under subsection (a).

(2) CONSTRUCTION COSTS.—None of the funds made available to carry out this section may be used for the construction of a new building or the acquisition, expansion, remodeling, or alteration of an existing building (including site grading and improvement and architect fees).

(c) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section:

(1) CONTRACT.—The term ''contract'' means a procurement contract within the meaning of section 6303 of title 31, United States Code.

(2) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT.—The term ''cooperative agreement'' means a cooperative agreement within the meaning of section 6305 of title 31, United States Code.

(3) GRANT.—The term ''grant'' means a grant awarded under a grant agreement, within the meaning of section 6304 of title 31, United States Code.

(4) INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—The term ''institution of higher education'' means an institution of higher education, within the meaning of section 1201(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1141(a)).

(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Of the amounts authorized under section 3(a)(2)(G), $2,000,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $4,000,000 for fiscal year 2001 shall be available for carrying out this section.

(Ms. BERKLEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment to H.R. 1655. This amendment is intended to help America harness the brain power of top scientists in a quest to solve one of the great technological challenges facing our Nation, neutralizing, not merely storing, high-level nuclear waste.

I would like to thank the chairman of the Committee on Science and the ranking member for their support of this amendment.

My colleagues in this chamber are well aware of my views on the proposed plan to bury nuclear waste in my home State of Nevada. I am adamantly opposed to it. I am not here today, however, to debate the Yucca Mountain project. Rather, I offer an amendment that I hope will capture the imagination of my colleagues, whether my colleagues oppose or support the Yucca Mountain program.

Billions of dollars are being spent studying how to store high-level nuclear waste because it is deadly. No matter where it is put, it is deadly, and the United States and the rest of the world have produced hundreds of thousands of tons of it. Even if we build a repository within a few years, it will be over capacity. We would have to build another multibillion facility and another and another as the next century unfolds.

There would still be thousands of tons of waste at the reactors sites across the country. All of this waste is just as toxic as the day it was generated. Even if it was generated 40 or 50 years ago, it is still just as toxic. It takes 250,000 years to fully neutralize it. The scientists who unlocked the power of the atom in the 1940s knew about this problem and the Federal Government knew about it; but with no solution immediately at hand they simply put their trust in science itself, believing that a process would be invented to neutralize high level nuclear waste.

I urge support of my amendment to H.R. 1655. The time is overdue to accept responsibility of finding a technological solution to nuclear waste, ridding the Nation of this threat.

My amendment would establish a nuclear waste transmutation research and development program. The goal is to develop the technology we need to transmute nuclear waste right at the reactor sites. Transmutation is a process which turns radioactive waste into nonradioactive substances.

This amendment fully complies with environmental and nuclear nonproliferation policies. It prohibits development of technology that could isolate plutonium and uranium. This amendment instructs the Secretary of Energy to commence a program of research and development, and it authorizes the secretary to award grants or contracts to industries and universities.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. BERKLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, we are very pleased to support this amendment and hope we can have a vote on it promptly.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we are in strong support of the amendment.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Berkley amendment. As most of you know, I have spoken at length to explain the reasons why nuclear waste should not be sent to an interim or permanent storage facility in Nevada.

I have been asked many times what the alternative is to permanent burial of high level nuclear waste. The answer is transmutation.

The word transmutation originates from the goal of ancient alchemists to transform, or transmute base metals into gold. Today scientists seek ways, and have developed proven systems to transmute radioactive waste into nonradioactive elements, thereby eliminating the radiological hazards and waste disposal problems.

The first mistake this country made in regards to the problem of spent nuclear fuel occurred in 1977, when President Carter halted all U.S. efforts to reprocess spent nuclear fuel.

The concern was that when reprocessing occurs it could potentially create a smaller, but refined fuel that could be stolen and used in nuclear weapons. He argued that the United States should halt its reprocessing program as an example to other countries in the hope that they would follow suit.

As we can see today other countries did not follow our example and in the end harmed our efforts to deal with spent nuclear fuel.

Senator DOMENICI understands this problem well and has presented a solution, a solution that is supported by this amendment before you today. He stated in regards to the transmutation of nuclear waste:

Let me highlight one attractive option. A group from several of our largest companies, using technologies developed at three of our national laboratories and from Russian institutes and their nuclear navy, discussed with me an approach to use that waste for electrical generation. They use an accelerator, not a reactor, so there is never any critical assembly.

There is minimal processing, but carefully done so that weapons-grade materials are never separated out and so that international verification can be used—but now

the half lives are changed so that it's a hazard for perhaps 300 years—a far cry from 100,000 years. This approach, called Accelerator Transmutation of Waste, is an area I want to see investigated aggressively.

We are realizing some of the benefits of nuclear technologies today, but only a fraction of what we could realize. [W]e aren't tapping the full potential of the nucleus for additional benefits. In the process, we are shortchanging our citizens.

While some may continue to lament that the nuclear genie is out of his proverbial bottle, I'm ready to focus on harnessing that genie as effectively and fully as possible, for the largest set of benefit for our citizens.

Senator DOMENICI is correct and we should not be shortchanging or endangering our citizens. And that is exactly what will happen if we fail to further the development and utilization of transmutation.

Let's not bury our hands in the sand, the same approach this country is currently taking with the permanent burial of our nuclear waste.

The alternative that we face is disastrous because the nuclear power industry has spent millions of dollars in their campaign to convince members of Congress that storage of high level nuclear waste in Nevada is sound science, fiscally responsible and poses no dangers to public health and safety.

Unfortunately, none of this is true. In 1987, in political haste, Congress arbitrarily selected Yucca Mountain, 95 miles northwest of Las Vegas (the fastest growing metropolitan city in the country), to host a permanent repository for high level nuclear waste.

Realizing that the Yucca Mountain project has become a failure and has needlessly expended millions of taxpayer dollars, the nuclear industry has now changed its focus to ''interim storage.''

This so-called interim storage lasts for over 100 years. Aside from the fact that Nevada has never benefitted from nuclear generated power, there are numerous reasons why this legislation is irresponsible, indefensible and wrong.

First, transporting nuclear waste recklessly endangers the rights of millions of private property owners across the United States and ignores over 20 years of environmental statutes. The private property implications could significantly add to the federal tab.

A precedent has already been set in New Mexico. In 1992, Mr. John Komis was awarded over $800,000 for the devaluation of his property because of the public's perceived fear of nuclear waste. The City of Santa Fe condemned 43 acres for construction of a highway to transport nuclear waste to the Waste Isolation Pilot Project site.

The District Court and the New Mexico Supreme Court both upheld a decision to award Komis the money because there was a perceived devaluation of land due to the transportation of nuclear waste adjacent to that land.

As this high level nuclear waste travels from the 109 nuclear reactors located primarily on the east coast to a facility in Nevada, the transportation routes cross 43 states and run through thousands of local communities across the country. Imagine the burden on the federal Treasury if all the property owners adjacent to these proposed transportation routes were awarded like Mr. Komis. The cost to the federal government would be staggering.

Second, permanent disposal clearly does not go far enough to protect our environmental and jurisdictional concerns. It still blatantly ignores many environmental and public health statutes, such as the Clean Water Act, Safe Drinking Water Act, and the Clean Air Act.

In addition, it completely ignores the public process that is specifically outlined in the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, which requires federal agencies to consider alternatives, seek public comment and consider any and all environmental ramifications before proceeding with a major federal action.

Transportation of high level nuclear waste also warrants serious concern, because the consequences would be devastating. A 1985 DOE contractor report concluded that a severe, credible accident involving a single, current-generation rail cask could result in release of radioactive materials to the environment.

According to the study, release of only a small fraction of the cask's contents would be sufficient to contaminate a 42 square-mile area. The costs of cleanup after such an accident would exceed $620 million, and the cleanup effort would require 460 days, if it occurred in a rural area. Now imagine the cost of a similar cleanup in an urban area, realizing these costs cannot include the intangible cost of human life and health.

The environment and the health and safety of millions of people will be jeopardized because of political expediency.

With all the attention of the nuclear waste debate focusing on a solution that does not consider good, sound science, economic or social implications or health and safety or environmental issues it is easy to lose sight of possible solutions.

We need to shift the focus from concentrating on an industry wish list to a viable, realistic solution that considers these vitally important issues.

In truth, while we were developing the technology to transport the waste, we discovered and perfected the safest storage capability available. It is known as dry cask storage. The scientific, economic and safety arguments all result in dry-cask storage as the best solution to store high level nuclear waste. Articles in the San Francisco Chronicle and The Washington Post both aggressively support this approach to solving this dilemma.

This coupled with the technology of transmutation is truly the best long term solution for our country.

In the future, spent nuclear fuel could become a very valuable resource. With technology using transmutators with accelerators, we will be able to use spent nuclear fuel as an energy source and in the process drastically reduce the volume from approximately 90% unused nuclear fuel to less than 10% unused.

In addition, this substantially decreases the half-life of this dangerous substance. By keeping this spent fuel on site, it is the best environmental solution, and it is easily retrievable for the purpose of transmutation.

When taking a close look at the details, it is easy to see a realistic solution to the nuclear waste dilemma that the nation is facing. It is time to abandon the track of political expediency and look to sensible, responsible alternatives.

On-site, dry cask storage and transmutation does not bust the budget, does not endanger private property rights, public health and safety, nor does it roll back years of environmental statutes.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and support a common sense solution for our nations spent nuclear fuel.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas:

Page 36, after line 9, insert the following new section:

SEC. 18. MINORITY RECRUITMENT AND EMPLOYMENT.

It is the sense of the Congress that the Department should increase its efforts to recruit and employ qualified minorities for carrying out the research and development functions of the Department.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I would like to particularly thank the ranking member, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COSTELLO), and thank the chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), for allowing the dialogue on this amendment.

Let me emphasize that I am gratified that there has been some improvement because of the work of our Committee on Science on the idea of recruiting and employing qualified minorities, for carrying out the research and development functions of the Department of Energy.

We have spoken, as we move into the 21st century, of the importance of including and enforcing, or in emphasizing, diversity in our math and science technical and research areas. This amendment would ask or indicate that it was a sense of Congress that the Department of Energy would increase its efforts to recruit and employ qualified minorities for carrying out the research and development.

I would like to note in a visit that I had this past recess to Los Alamos National Laboratory, in reviewing the security issues I also asked questions about its diversity. Let me applaud them for the percentages of Hispanics that they have working in a number of their programs, but on the other hand they had very low numbers of American Indians, Asian Americans and African Americans.

If we are to move into the 21st century, it is crucial that in areas that produce income and research and advancement in science that it has a well-diversified population of researchers from American Indians, from African Americans, from Asians and Hispanics.

I could go on about the importance of this issue, but I would ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this amendment to emphasize diversity in research, one of the cutting stones of the 21st century, and the work of the 21st century, which is science and technology.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I am very happy to support the gentlewoman's amendment and hope that it will be promptly voted upon, unanimously.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I thank the chairman for his support.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, we strongly support the amendment and urge its adoption.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank both of my colleagues for their support.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further amendments?

If not, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MCHUGH), having resumed the chair, Mr. SUNUNU, 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. 1655) to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2000 and 2001 for the civilian energy and scientific research, development, and demonstration and related commercial application of energy technology programs, projects, and activities of the Department of Energy, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 289, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1655, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2490, TREASURY AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 291 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 291

Resolved, that upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2490) making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the United States Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain Independent Agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read.

□ 1445

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SUNUNU). The gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During the consideration of this resolution, all time is yielded for the purposes of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, the proposed rule before the House today provides for consideration of the Conference Report to accompany H.R. 2490, the Treasury, Postal Service and General Government Appropriations bill for fiscal year 2000. The proposed rule waives all points of order against the conference report and against its consideration. The rule also provides that the conference report will be considered as read.

Mr. Speaker, the underlying legislation, which makes the appropriations for the Treasury Department, United States Postal Service, the executive office of the President, and certain Independent Agencies, is important legislation. A large portion of the activities funded under this bill are devoted to the salaries and expenses of approximately 163,000 employees who are responsible for administering programs such as drug interdiction, collection of revenues, presidential protection, violent crime reduction, and Federal financial management. Through a judicious bipartisan process of hearings and testimony, the Committee on Appropriations arrived at the funding levels contained within this legislation. The funding levels are consistent with this Congress's policy of fiscal discipline, yet provide sufficient funding for agencies within the bill's jurisdiction to carry out those important statutory responsibilities.

Americans who have experienced frustration with the Internal Revenue Service will be pleased to know that this legislation also appropriates funds necessary to carry out the IRS reforms that were passed by the last Congress and stand to benefit taxpayers all across America.

This legislation was crafted in a bipartisan manner. The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE), chairman of the Committee on Appropriations Subcommittee on the Treasury, Postal Service and General Government, along with the ranking member, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) deserve accolades for not only their hard work, but also for working together. This rule and conference report deserve bipartisan support today.

It is understandable that some Members may not feel this is the perfect appropriations legislation, but this legislation does represent a consensus, bipartisan agreement. Members should be reminded that the legislation maintains the fiscal restraints mandated in the Balanced Budget Act of 1997.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying legislation.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the customary half-hour.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate my colleagues, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE), the chairman of the subcommittee, and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for their hard work in bringing this bill to the floor. It has certainly had its ups and downs, and I am very happy to lend my full support to the bill that is before us today. The conferees that brought the Treasury-Postal appropriations bill back from the grave, and they are to be congratulated.

Once upon a time, Mr. Speaker, this bill contained some cuts that would have made it very hard for some of our major agencies to function. It was so bad, Mr. Speaker, that it passed the House by only one vote. But today, those cuts have been reversed. Today, this bill funds the Treasury Department at $12 billion; it includes funding for the new law enforcement agencies; it funds the office of national drug control policy to the tune of $460 million. Mr. Speaker, this bill also allows government agencies to use appropriated money to provide child care for lower-income Federal employees, which will help them make sure their children are well taken care of when they work.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, this bill makes sure that the Federal employees receive a 4.8 percent COLA, equal to that of the military. Mr. Speaker, these people work hard for a living, and at the very least their salaries should keep up with inflation.

Mr. Speaker, once again, I thank the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for their hard work, and I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the bill.