| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Latham | Otter | Shows |
| LaTourette | Owens | Shuster |
| Leach | Oxley | Simmons |
| Lee | Pallone | Simpson |
| Levin | Pascrell | Skeen |
| Lewis (CA) | Pastor | Skelton |
| Lewis (GA) | Paul | Slaughter |
| Lewis (KY) | Payne | Smith (MI) |
| Linder | Pelosi | Smith (NJ) |
| Lipinski | Pence | Smith (TX) |
| LoBiondo | Peterson (MN) | Smith (WA) |
| Lofgren | Peterson (PA) | Snyder |
| Lowey | Petri | Solis |
| Lucas (KY) | Phelps | Souder |
| Lucas (OK) | Pickering | Spratt |
| Luther | Pitts | Stearns |
| Lynch | Platts | Stenholm |
| Maloney (CT) | Pombo | Strickland |
| Maloney (NY) | Pomeroy | Stump |
| Manzullo | Portman | Stupak |
| Markey | Price (NC) | Sununu |
| Mascara | Pryce (OH) | Sweeney |
| Matheson | Putnam | Tancredo |
| Matsui | Quinn | Tanner |
| McCarthy (MO) | Radanovich | Tauscher |
| McCarthy (NY) | Rahall | Tauzin |
| McCollum | Ramstad | Taylor (MS) |
| McDermott | Rangel | Taylor (NC) |
| McGovern | Regula | Terry |
| McHugh | Rehberg | Thomas |
| McInnis | Reyes | Thompson (CA) |
| McIntyre | Reynolds | Thornberry |
| McKeon | Riley | Thune |
| McKinney | Rivers | Thurman |
| McNulty | Rodriguez | Tiahrt |
| Meehan | Roemer | Tiberi |
| Meek (FL) | Rogers (KY) | Tierney |
| Meeks (NY) | Rogers (MI) | Toomey |
| Menendez | Rohrabacher | Towns |
| Mica | Ros-Lehtinen | Traficant |
| Millender-McDonald | Ross | Turner |
| Miller, Dan | Rothman | Udall (CO) |
| Miller, Gary | Roukema | Udall (NM) |
| Miller, George | Roybal-Allard | Upton |
| Miller, Jeff | Royce | Velazquez |
| Mink | Rush | Visclosky |
| Mollohan | Ryan (WI) | Vitter |
| Moore | Ryun (KS) | Walden |
| Moran (KS) | Sabo | Walsh |
| Moran (VA) | Sanchez | Wamp |
| Morella | Sanders | Waters |
| Murtha | Sandlin | Watkins (OK) |
| Myrick | Sawyer | Watson (CA) |
| Nadler | Saxton | Watt (NC) |
| Napolitano | Schaffer | Watts (OK) |
| Neal | Schakowsky | Waxman |
| Nethercutt | Schiff | Weiner |
| Ney | Schrock | Weldon (FL) |
| Northup | Scott | Weldon (PA) |
| Norwood | Sensenbrenner | Weller |
| Nussle | Serrano | Whitfield |
| Oberstar | Sessions | Wicker |
| Obey | Shadegg | Wilson |
| Olver | Shaw | Wolf |
| Ortiz | Shays | Woolsey |
| Osborne | Sherman | Wu |
| Ose | Sherwood | Wynn |
| | Shimkus | Young (FL) |

NAYS—2

| | |
|---|---|
| Berkley | Stark |

NOT VOTING—9

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Brown (FL) | Hall (OH) | Thompson (MS) |
| Cubin | Herger | Wexler |
| Dunn | McCrery | Young (AK) |

□ 1116

Messrs. STEARNS, SHAYS and ABERCROMBIE changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report accompanying H.R. 2311, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

## CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2311, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 272, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 2311) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 272, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of October 30, 2001, at page H7418.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) each will control 30 minutes.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present to the House the conference report on H.R. 2311, the fiscal year 2002 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act.

At the outset, I would like to state how pleased I am that the conference committee was able to work out the dramatic differences between the House and Senate bills so amicably and to such a positive effect. Given the great divide over the House and Senate priorities, many concluded that we would never be able to resolve our differences. Not only did we resolve those differences, we did so in such a way that the critical priorities of the House and Senate were carefully protected.

I am proud of the agreement struck between the House and Senate on energy and water development programs. It was a difficult and arduous negotiation, but the product of our deliberations is a package that will help strengthen our defense, rebuild our critical infrastructure, and increase our scientific knowledge.

The total amount included in the conference agreement for energy and water programs is $24.6 billion. This is $891 million over the amount included in the House-passed bill and about $2.1 billion over the budget request.

I am especially pleased with the level of funding we have recommended for the civil works program of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. At $4.5 billion, the recommended funding is $586 million higher than the administration's inadequate budget request. The majority of this increase, about $391 million, is in the Corps' construction program. While that may sound like a large increase, the amount we have recommended is about the same as the amount the Corps spent in fiscal year 2001 on construction. If we had funded the construction program at the level requested by the administration, the result would have been schedule delays, increased project costs, and the loss of project benefits.

For the Bureau of Reclamation, we have provided $914 million, which is $95 million above the budget request.

For the nondefense programs of the Department of Energy, we were able to provide modest increases over the last year for several programs. The basic research performed by the Department of Energy has led to many of the technological breakthroughs that have helped our economy grow. These programs will even be more important as we move into the 21st century.

I am pleased to report that the additional allocation we received has enabled us to fund these programs slightly above the levels requested by the administration. For renewable energy programs, we were able to provide about $19 million over the House-passed level.

For the Atomic Energy Defense Programs of the Department of Energy, the conference agreement includes $14.7 billion, a significant increase of almost $1.2 billion over the budget request. These funds will ensure that we have a reliable and safe nuclear weapons stockpile, continue to fund important nuclear nonproliferation programs to secure nuclear materiels in Russia, and meet our commitments to communities throughout the United States to clean up the damage done to the environment over the past 40 years.

I want to thank my Senate counterpart, Chairman HARRY REID, and his ranking minority member, Senator PETE DOMENICI, for their cooperation and hard work. Moreover, I would like to expression my sincere appreciation to my colleagues on the House Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, whose devoted efforts made this conference report possible.

I am especially grateful to my good friend and ranking member, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY). I want to thank our full committee chairman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) for their cooperation in enabling us to bring this conference report before the House today.

Finally, I would like to express my deep appreciation and sincere gratitude to the House Appropriations staff for the Subcommittee for Energy and Water Development: Bob Schmidt, Jeanne Wilson, Kevin Cook, Paul Tuminello, Tracey LaTurner, Dave Killian, Rich Kaelin, Jennifer Watkins, and my personal staff, Mike Sharp and Nancy Tippins.

Their expertise, knowledge, and negotiating skills have helped produce the bipartisan product that we present for Members' consideration today, and each is to be commended for their fine

effort. Additionally, I would like to thank each of them for making my first session as chairman of this subcommittee an extremely pleasurable experience.

I believe the conference agreement is balanced and fair, and I would urge a unanimous support of the House for its adoption. I would hope that we could quickly conclude action on this conference report so that we can get this bill to the White House for the President's signature.

## ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2002 (H.R. 2311)

(Amounts in thousands)

| | FY 2001 Enacted | FY 2002 Request | House | Senate | Conference | Conference vs. enacted |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - CIVIL | | | | | | |
| DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY | | | | | | |
| Corps of Engineers - Civil | | | | | | |
| General investigations | 160,584 | 130,000 | 163,260 | 152,402 | 154,350 | -6,234 |
| Construction, general | 1,716,165 | 1,324,000 | 1,671,854 | 1,570,798 | 1,715,951 | -214 |
| Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, and Tennessee | 350,458 | 280,000 | 347,655 | 328,011 | 345,992 | -4,466 |
| Supplemental appropriations (P.L. 107-20) | 9,000 | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | -9,000 |
| Operation and maintenance, general | 1,897,775 | 1,745,000 | 1,864,464 | 1,833,263 | 1,874,803 | -22,972 |
| Supplemental appropriations (P.L. 107-20) | 86,500 | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | -86,500 |
| Regulatory program | 124,725 | 128,000 | 128,000 | 128,000 | 127,000 | +2,275 |
| FUSRAP | 139,692 | 140,000 | 140,000 | 140,000 | 140,000 | +308 |
| Flood control and coastal emergencies (supplemental appropriations) (P.L. 107-20) | 50,000 | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | -50,000 |
| Rescission | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | -25,000 | -25,000 |
| General expenses | 151,666 | 153,000 | 153,000 | 153,000 | 153,000 | +1,334 |
| Total, title I, Department of Defense - Civil | 4,686,565 | 3,900,000 | 4,468,233 | 4,305,474 | 4,486,096 | -200,469 |
| TITLE II - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR | | | | | | |
| Central Utah Project Completion Account | | | | | | |
| Central Utah project construction | 19,524 | 24,169 | 24,169 | 24,169 | 24,169 | +4,645 |
| Fish, wildlife, and recreation mitigation and conservation | 14,136 | 10,749 | 10,749 | 10,749 | 10,749 | -3,387 |
| Utah reclamation mitigation and conservation account | 4,989 | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | -4,989 |
| Subtotal | 38,649 | 34,918 | 34,918 | 34,918 | 34,918 | -3,731 |
| Program oversight and administration | 1,213 | 1,310 | 1,310 | 1,310 | 1,310 | +97 |
| Total, Central Utah project completion account | 39,862 | 36,228 | 36,228 | 36,228 | 36,228 | -3,634 |
| Bureau of Reclamation | | | | | | |
| Water and related resources | 678,953 | 647,997 | 691,160 | 732,496 | 762,531 | +83,578 |
| Loan program | 9,348 | 7,495 | 7,495 | 7,495 | 7,495 | -1,853 |
| (Limitation on direct loans) | (26,941) | (26,000) | (26,000) | (26,000) | (26,000) | (-941) |
| Central Valley project restoration fund | 38,360 | 55,039 | 55,039 | 55,039 | 55,039 | +16,679 |
| California Bay-Delta restoration | ..... | 20,000 | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... |
| Policy and administration | 50,114 | 52,968 | 52,968 | 52,968 | 52,968 | +2,854 |
| Total, Bureau of Reclamation | 776,775 | 783,499 | 806,662 | 847,998 | 878,033 | +101,258 |
| Total, title II, Department of the Interior | 816,637 | 819,727 | 842,890 | 884,226 | 914,261 | +97,624 |
| TITLE III - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY | | | | | | |
| Energy supply | 659,918 | 544,245 | 639,317 | 736,139 | 666,726 | +6,808 |
| Non-defense environmental management | 277,200 | 228,553 | 227,872 | 228,553 | 236,372 | -40,828 |
| Supplemental appropriations (P.L. 107-20) | 11,950 | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | -11,950 |
| Uranium facilities maintenance and remediation | 392,502 | 363,425 | 393,425 | 408,725 | 418,425 | +25,923 |
| Supplemental appropriations (P.L. 107-20) | 30,000 | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | -30,000 |
| Science | 3,180,341 | 3,159,890 | 3,166,395 | 3,268,816 | 3,233,100 | +52,759 |
| Nuclear Waste Disposal | 190,654 | 134,979 | 133,000 | 25,000 | 95,000 | -95,654 |
| Departmental administration | 225,942 | 221,618 | 209,611 | 208,948 | 210,853 | -15,089 |
| Miscellaneous revenues | -151,000 | -137,810 | -137,810 | -137,810 | -137,810 | +13,190 |
| Net appropriation | 74,942 | 83,808 | 71,801 | 71,138 | 73,043 | -1,899 |
| Office of the Inspector General | 31,430 | 31,430 | 32,430 | 30,000 | 32,430 | +1,000 |
| Environmental restoration and waste management: | | | | | | |
| Defense function | (6,254,464) | (5,740,783) | (6,410,625) | (6,627,943) | (6,480,991) | (+226,527) |
| Non-defense function | (711,652) | (591,978) | (621,297) | (637,278) | (654,797) | (-56,855) |
| Total | (6,966,116) | (6,332,761) | (7,031,922) | (7,265,221) | (7,135,788) | (+169,672) |
| Atomic Energy Defense Activities | | | | | | |
| National Nuclear Security Administration: | | | | | | |
| Weapons activities | 5,006,153 | 5,300,025 | 5,123,888 | 6,062,891 | 5,429,238 | +423,085 |
| Supplemental appropriations (P.L. 107-20) | 126,625 | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | -126,625 |
| Defense nuclear nonproliferation | 872,273 | 773,700 | 845,341 | 880,500 | 803,586 | -68,687 |
| Naval reactors | 688,645 | 688,045 | 688,045 | 688,045 | 688,045 | -600 |
| Office of the Administrator | 9,978 | 15,000 | 10,000 | 15,000 | 312,596 | +302,618 |
| Subtotal, National Nuclear Security Administration | 6,703,674 | 6,776,770 | 6,667,274 | 7,646,436 | 7,233,465 | +529,791 |
| Defense environmental restoration and waste management | 4,963,533 | 4,548,708 | 5,174,539 | 5,389,868 | 5,234,576 | +271,043 |
| Supplemental appropriations (P.L. 107-20) | 95,000 | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | -95,000 |
| Defense facilities closure projects | 1,080,331 | 1,050,538 | 1,092,878 | 1,080,538 | 1,092,878 | +12,547 |
| Supplemental appropriations (P.L. 107-20) | 21,000 | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | -21,000 |

## ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2002 (H.R. 2311) — continued

(Amounts in thousands)

| | FY 2001 Enacted | FY 2002 Request | House | Senate | Conference | Conference vs. enacted |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Defense environmental management privatization | 65,000 | 141,537 | 143,208 | 157,537 | 153,537 | +88,537 |
| Supplemental appropriations (P.L. 107-20) | 29,600 | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | -29,600 |
| Subtotal, Defense environmental management | 6,254,464 | 5,740,783 | 6,410,625 | 6,627,943 | 6,480,991 | +226,527 |
| Other defense activities | 582,466 | 527,614 | 487,464 | 564,168 | 544,044 | -38,422 |
| Supplemental appropriations (P.L. 107-20) | 5,000 | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | -5,000 |
| Defense nuclear waste disposal | 199,725 | 310,000 | 310,000 | 250,000 | 280,000 | +80,275 |
| Total, Atomic Energy Defense Activities | 13,745,329 | 13,355,167 | 13,875,363 | 15,088,547 | 14,538,500 | +793,171 |
| Power Marketing Administrations | | | | | | |
| Operation and maintenance, Southeastern Power Administration | 3,891 | 4,891 | 4,891 | 4,891 | 4,891 | +1,000 |
| Operation and maintenance, Southwestern Power Administration | 28,038 | 28,038 | 28,038 | 28,038 | 28,038 | ..... |
| Construction, rehabilitation, operation and maintenance, Western Area Power Administration | 165,465 | 169,465 | 172,165 | 169,465 | 171,938 | +6,473 |
| Supplemental appropriations (P.L. 107-20) | 1,578 | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | -1,578 |
| Falcon and Amistad operating and maintenance fund | 2,663 | 2,663 | 2,663 | 2,663 | 2,663 | ..... |
| Total, Power Marketing Administrations | 201,635 | 205,057 | 207,757 | 205,057 | 207,530 | +5,895 |
| Federal Energy Regulatory Commission | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses | 175,200 | 181,155 | 181,155 | 187,155 | 184,155 | +8,955 |
| Revenues applied | -175,200 | -181,155 | -181,155 | -187,155 | -184,155 | -8,955 |
| Defense nuclear waste disposal (rescission) | -75,000 | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | +75,000 |
| Defense environmental privatization (rescission) | -97,000 | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | +97,000 |
| Total, title III, Department of Energy | 18,623,901 | 18,106,554 | 18,747,360 | 20,061,975 | 19,501,126 | +877,225 |
| TITLE IV - INDEPENDENT AGENCIES | | | | | | |
| Appalachian Regional Commission | 66,254 | 66,290 | 71,290 | 66,290 | 71,290 | +5,036 |
| Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board | 18,459 | 18,500 | 18,500 | 18,500 | 18,500 | +41 |
| Delta Regional Authority | 19,956 | 19,992 | ..... | 20,000 | 10,000 | -9,956 |
| Denali Commission | 29,934 | 29,939 | ..... | 40,000 | 38,000 | +8,066 |
| Nuclear Regulatory Commission: | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses | 481,825 | 506,900 | 516,900 | 516,900 | 516,900 | +35,075 |
| Revenues | -447,958 | -463,248 | -473,520 | -468,248 | -473,520 | -25,562 |
| Subtotal | 33,867 | 43,652 | 43,380 | 48,652 | 43,380 | +9,513 |
| Office of Inspector General | 5,500 | 6,180 | 6,180 | 5,500 | 6,180 | +680 |
| Revenues | -5,390 | -5,932 | -5,933 | -5,280 | -5,933 | -543 |
| Subtotal | 110 | 248 | 247 | 220 | 247 | +137 |
| Total | 33,977 | 43,900 | 43,627 | 48,872 | 43,627 | +9,650 |
| Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board | 2,894 | 3,100 | 3,100 | 3,500 | 3,100 | +206 |
| Total, title IV, Independent agencies | 171,474 | 181,721 | 136,517 | 197,162 | 184,517 | +13,043 |
| TITLE V - EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL | | | | | | |
| DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY | | | | | | |
| Atomic Energy Defense Activities | | | | | | |
| Cerro Grande fire activities (contingent emergency appropriations) | 203,012 | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | -203,012 |
| Appalachian Regional Commission (contingent emergency appropriations) | 10,976 | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | -10,976 |
| Total, title V, Emergency Supplemental | 213,988 | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | -213,988 |
| Grand total: | | | | | | |
| New budget (obligational) authority | 24,512,565 | 23,008,002 | 24,195,000 | 25,448,837 | 25,086,000 | +573,435 |
| Appropriations | (24,470,577) | (23,008,002) | (24,195,000) | (25,448,837) | (25,111,000) | (+640,423) |
| Contingent emergency appropriations | (213,988) | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | (-213,988) |
| Rescissions | (-172,000) | ..... | ..... | ..... | (-25,000) | (+147,000) |

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) and congratulate him on the work product that the subcommittee has brought before the House today. The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) is the chairman, but he is also my classmate from the class of 1984 and also my good friend. He has been a delight to work with. He is very serious about the work product, but not serious about himself. He is very deliberate, and he is very conscientious. He has done a very good job.

The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) also enumerated by name each member of the staff on both sides of the aisle, and I would like to add my own personal gratitude for the work that the staff has done. We would not be here today without them.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very good solid work product. It is good for the American economy. It is good for the national security. I would hope that all Members of this body do support this bill.

I do, however, want to make two comments. One is that I would hope as the administration looks at its budget request for 2003, that it send a realistic budget for our investment in our economic infrastructure and our national security.

On the economic front, I would point out that while we did the absolute best that we could with the resources possible, in constant dollars in fiscal year 2002, the appropriations for the Army Corps of Engineers civil works has drastically declined. In fiscal year 2002, we appropriated $4.486 billion compared to $7 billion in constant dollars for 1967.

Additionally, a similar ratio would exist for the general construction dollars. I would point out that backlog for the Army Corps of Engineers totals about $40 billion, and backlog for operation and maintenance for this year alone is estimated to be about $835 million. I hope as the administration and as the Congress looks ahead to the next year, that we recognize a greater investment in our economic infrastructure is going to be necessary.

There has also been a lot of debate on the House floor in the last several days as far as nuclear nonproliferation; and within our financial limitations, we tried to do the best job possible, but there remains problems.

As we look towards a supplement for the coming year and again in investment in ensuring that these weapons of mass destruction cannot be proliferated world-wide, we will have to make a greater investment, and again would call upon the administration. I would call upon the Congress to do a better job in a comparative fashion in fiscal year 2003.

At this time, however, the chairman has covered the elements of the bill. He has done it well. It is a good bill, and I ask my colleagues to support it.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, regarding the comment the gentleman made about the submission this year by the administration for these very important projects that are included in this bill, the gentleman is exactly right. In defense of the administration, they only had a couple of weeks to prepare for the submission of the budget that they sent to the House. In subsequent discussions with both the director of OMB and the President, I recognize that they had to submit something. But along with the gentleman from Indiana, I would like to invite him to come with me to the White House between now and the end of the year so we can have a discussion with the President and with the director of OMB to submit to this body a more realistic proposal for the energy and water needs of this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I have served on this subcommittee for 10 or 12 years at least. I know how difficult it is to balance the needs of the Members of this body and the needs of the Nation, frankly, and these vital programs that this bill covers.

I have to tell Members that the maiden voyage that the captain has steered us on this bill has been masterfully done.

□ 1130

This is the first bill that Chairman CALLAHAN has had the opportunity to work on. This is a tough bill. You have got the nuclear weapons program, of course, in this bill; all of the energy issues of such vital importance to the Nation at this time. The security issues, of course, this year are very important; and also the work of the Corps of Engineers and all of the programs that Members are so vitally interested in. It is a tough bill to try to weigh all of those interests and find enough funds with which to do the necessary work. I want to compliment the chairman and the ranking member for working together as they do, and have, and working with all the Members in such a nice spirit.

I was hopeful in this bill that we could have had some more money for those Krispy Kreme doughnuts, but I do not guess we are going to get that this time. But I want to compliment Chairman CALLAHAN and Ranking Member VISCLOSKY for a great job, salute them on the work that they have done, and wish them well.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR), the minority whip.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague and dear friend the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) for recognizing me and supporting our efforts to ban oil drilling in the Great Lakes.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, together this is a bipartisan effort. When we passed the amendment in the House of Representatives, we garnered, I think, somewhere in the neighborhood of 70 Republican votes on this issue and we have worked hard and long on this issue. Today we will have achieved an important bipartisan victory for both the House and the Senate. Today, that work that we have devoted over a period of years has paid off.

I want to particularly thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) and the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) and others on the other side of the aisle who have worked to make this amendment happen. I want to thank all of my friends who came together on this issue. In the other body, Senators DEBBIE STABENOW and PETER FITZGERALD were very helpful in their efforts as well.

This legislation is a terrific victory for the people of Michigan and all of the Great Lakes States. Elementary school science will teach you that oil and water do not mix. One quart of oil could contaminate 2 million gallons of drinking water. The Great Lakes contain nearly a quarter of the world's fresh water and 95 percent of all the fresh water in the United States. An accident in a contained system would indeed be catastrophic. We cannot afford the risk of drilling.

Michigan, my home State, is a land of breathtaking beauty. The Great Lakes define our communities, our recreation, our tourism, our landscape, our commerce. It is an integral part of who we are and what we are about in our history. Michigan lakes are not oil fields. Our shorelines are not pipelines. Michigan families deserve clean water and beaches free from oil rigs. We have an enormous amount of people who come into our State, Mr. Speaker, every year who visit, who come and camp. They do not come to see oil wells. They do not come to see oil derricks. They come to use our beaches, to use our sand dunes, they come to swim in our beautiful lakes. This crucial environmental protection will keep big oil and reckless drilling out of our lakes.

This is a victory for Michigan, a victory for the environment, and a victory for future generations who deserve clean drinking water and an unspoiled landscape. I thank my colleagues for their help on this issue. I urge the House to pass the conference report.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN), who is a member of our subcommittee.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time. I rise in support of our energy and water appropriations bill.

Let me first thank Chairman CALLAHAN for his forceful leadership of our committee's work and also the ranking member's leadership on this bill, and my thanks to the very forceful leadership, and to thank our subcommittee staff for their tireless efforts to put this bill together.

While much public attention is rightly focused on the war abroad, our committee continues to do its part to protect our Nation's security at home. The issue of energy security is now clearly before us. Our energy facilities must be safe and secure and we must continue the critical work of the Department of Energy to research and develop domestic sources of energy of all types and to protect our nuclear stockpile.

On another front, Chairman CALLAHAN has produced a bill, insisted on a bill, in fact, that continues the Federal commitment to work in partnership with our States and local communities to address such vital needs as flood control, shore protection, environmental restoration and improving our Nation's waterways.

I especially want to thank the chairman for his support of top priorities in my home State of New Jersey. Keeping our ports open for business is critical to our regional economy and the nearly 230,000 jobs related to port activity in both New York and New Jersey. Protecting and restoring our shoreline is also vital. This bill continues to protect communities from natural disasters such as flooding and continues New Jersey's special role to provide a future energy source that is clean and unlimited. That is the special work of the Princeton Plasma Physics Lab.

I also thank the chairman for working with me to consolidate the port dredging projects within the New York and New Jersey commercial waterways into one single project to expedite dredging to the recommended 50-foot depth. Combining these projects and expediting this critical work is a huge victory for our regional economy and for the environment and for the taxpayer at a time when our people are suffering and thousands of jobs have been lost in our area.

Finally, I want to pay special tribute to the Army Corps of Engineers for their response to the September 11 attack in Lower Manhattan and at the Pentagon. While we know the Army Corps does fantastic and important, essential work during war and in peacetime with flood control and dredging and other projects, many are not aware that the Army Corps acts in very important ways during times of disaster and national crisis. Since the day of these tragedies, the Corps has assisted in the Federal national response both in Lower Manhattan and at the Pentagon. They have worked tirelessly to do emergency dredging, debris removal and to address complex engineering and structural security issues in Lower Manhattan besides looking after thousands of people who needed transportation.

After visiting ground zero, Army Secretary White commented on the Corps effort and said, ''While your history is impressive, given the current situation your finest hour is a chapter yet to be written.'' I am sure we would agree with him.

I want to personally thank the Army Corps for all their work to meet the needs of our citizens and our communities when we needed it the most. I know our committee also shares my pride in their professionalism. Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly support the bill.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) for purposes of a colloquy.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. I thank my good friend from Indiana for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, regarding the Corps of Engineers small flood control projects, also called section 205 projects, am I right in understanding that the conference report directs the Corps to proceed with all the projects listed in both the House and Senate reports?

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

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. So that would mean the conferees intend for the Corps to proceed with the Van Bibber-Arvada Plaza drainage project in Colorado as specified in the House report?

Mr. VISCLOSKY. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. Speaker, few people ever get to witness a conference committee meeting. Generally it is in a late-night session, either in the basement of the House or the Capitol. That is where all of the serious negotiations take place rather than on the floor or even in a committee meeting. I wish the American people could have seen the professionalism and the dedication that the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM) had in trying to correct and trying to preserve some concerns that he had over the Missouri River project. He along with the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON), who is also a member of our subcommittee, should have made the people of Missouri and Iowa proud.

I am proud to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM), a member of our subcommittee.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for those kind words and also want to certainly thank the chairman for doing a fabulous job leading our subcommittee on these very, very important issues and the ranking member and the cooperation that we have on this subcommittee, and certainly the staff did an outstanding job and we really appreciate all of their efforts.

Mr. Speaker, this bill has a very broad jurisdiction but extraordinarily important when we talk about our nuclear arsenal, when we talk about research, trying to make America independent in its energy needs. This is the place where that type of research is done, and I am very pleased with the funding levels. We could always find more uses for more money, obviously, but the chairman and ranking member did an outstanding job.

I would also like to say that this bill does a lot for Iowa. We have flood control projects in Sioux City, the Perry Creek ongoing project; in Denison, Iowa, where the floods were so devastating in 1993, the levee project there is funded to our request; and a couple of very, very important projects in Fort Dodge, Iowa, the river enhancement, in trying to make sure that that community can handle not only flood control but also have enhancement of the livelihood in Fort Dodge itself; and Webster County with their flood control concerns they have downriver on the Des Moines River.

The chairman brought up the issue of the Missouri River. I was somewhat disappointed in the results in this bill. Obviously the special interests upstream, upriver had a major influence, especially in the other body, but I think working in a cooperative basis that we can be successful in the future if we all use some common sense to bring this issue finally to closure so that we can all proceed and not destroy the livelihood and endanger the lives of the people downstream.

I again thank the chairman very much for the opportunity and for his great work.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN).

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

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time. Let me thank the chairman and the ranking member of the subcommittee for the work that they have done on this bill. I also want to thank my fellow Texan and our colleague the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) for the help that he has provided.

Once again this bill provides necessary funds for a number of water projects in the Greater Houston Area. In particular, it provides $4 million for the Brays Bayou project which is a precursor to a large Federal-local flood control project that borders up against the Texas Medical Center, which is the largest medical center in the world; and it includes $9 million for the Sims Bayou project, which is a Federal-local project that is halfway through construction.

Last summer, as Members know, all of southeast Texas but in particular in the Greater Houston Area, we suffered a very catastrophic flood event through Tropical Storm Allison. In

fact, this was somewhat of a 100-year event. We had over 70,000 homes which had water damage. We had floodwaters come out of the banks of most of the bayous and watersheds in the area. The total cost of the storm is estimated to be in excess of $5 billion, close to $2 billion of that occurring in the Texas Medical Center with the 45 institutions that are included within that center. The four major hospitals in the Houston area were closed down for some period of time as a result of that storm as well. The funding that is in this bill will go a long way in helping to try and address and alleviate that situation for future storms.

While we would like to get more money, obviously that is true for every Member, I believe we were treated fairly in this. We also have to do this in a fiscally responsible way. I know that the chairman and the ranking member are committed to these projects for the long haul.

I would also just add that I appreciate the fact that the committee provided about $34 million for the ongoing Houston ship channel project, the deepening and widening project which will allow the Port of Houston to maintain its status as one of the powerful economic engines in the Greater Houston Area. I appreciate the work of the committee.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, putting together a bill such as this is not something one man can do. I thanked the staff earlier for their tremendous professionalism. But it also requires a lot of dedicated time and effort on the part of the subcommittee members as well as the full committee members.

With that, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER), who has dedicated untold hours and tons of professionalism towards the drafting of this bill.

□ 1145

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my chairman for those kind remarks. I rise in strong support of this bill. It is a pleasure to be on this subcommittee.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make three points about this legislation which, of course, will pass overwhelmingly in just a few moments.

First of all, the chairman and the ranking member mentioned the Corps of Engineers construction account. My chairman mentioned that the administration's request was, frankly, inadequate when it came to us. Certainly there may be reasons for that, the lack of time the administration had in being able to put the budget together. My friend from Indiana, the ranking member, called on Members to speak to the administration about the fact that, frankly, the request was unrealistic, and perhaps we can do a better job of communicating with the administration in the future about this.

But this has happened year in and year out, Mr. Speaker. It is not just the Bush administration, and it was not just the Clinton administration. Year in and year out, Democrat and Republican administrations have cut needed funds from the Corps' budget request, knowing full well that this House of Representatives and the other body would have to restore those funds in order to meet the needs.

There is a simple principle that applies to everyone's home, or if you are in a business it applies to the businesses, and it is so simple it almost goes without saying. That principle, Mr. Speaker, is that oftentimes you can spend a little money today in order to save the expense of a whole lot of money tomorrow.

If there is a problem with the seal around your front door, if you just spend a little money and it keeps the water from coming in, you are saving yourself from having to replace a whole bunch of carpet and a whole bunch of things inside the building later on. If you own a business and that roof needs to be repaired, I think all of my colleagues would agree you better go ahead and spend the little money now to repair the roof, rather than to spend all the money that it will take to correct the situation once it gets out of hand.

That is why we needed the plus-up; and that is why I commend the leadership of the committee, both in the House and in the Senate, for putting the adequate money in there and addressing the need, so we could save money tomorrow.

Now, let me just also mention a second point. Waterways are national issues. Our Nation's waterways do not recognize State lines. For example, over 40 percent of our Nation's water flows by the borders of my home State of Mississippi. So flood control and maintaining navigable waterways is a national issue, and I am pleased that this subcommittee and this bill makes the needed infrastructure investments for those activities.

Finally, I would join the rest of my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, in commending the leadership of this committee, my chairman and my ranking member, for working on a bipartisan basis. This is a bipartisan effort, and this is the sort of way in which our House of Representatives should conduct itself.

I urge overwhelming support for this legislation.

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

Mr. Speaker, before I recognize the next gentleman, I would want to agree with the points that the previous speaker, my good friend the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER), made and particularly the point that this was not just a failure of the current administration, whatever the circumstances, as far as timing, or the Clinton administration, and would reiterate in my opening remarks I mentioned in constant dollars since 1967 we have seen the Corps budget drop from $7 billion to $4.48 billion, so that clearly is a generational failure by administrations and Congresses of both parties.

It is time we all collectively come together to come to grips with this and make a solid investment in the United States of America. So I appreciate the gentleman's comments.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank my ranking member and also our Chair of the committee.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the energy and water conference report, and particularly appreciate the hard work of my friend and colleague, the gentleman from my home State of Texas (Mr. EDWARDS), and appreciate his advice during the process. I also appreciate the chairman of the committee and our ranking member, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY).

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the conferees saw fit to boost funding for the Houston-Galveston Navigation Channel and the Port of Houston by $3 million, to $33,785 million. The Houston Ship Channel and the Port of Houston are vital not just to the economy of Houston but to our national economy. It is the second largest port in America and the largest in the Nation in foreign tonnage. It is also critical to our Nation's energy industry.

In addition to this channel project, I appreciate the conferees' efforts on the flood control projects in my districts. The importance of flood control to Houston was highlighted by the disastrous flooding caused by Tropical Storm Allison in June 2001. Total damages from this storm are estimated to be $5 billion.

One of these projects is Greens Bayou, which I wish I could say was named after me, but was there long before I came around, which the committee saw fit to fund at $377,000; and I appreciate the work of the committee to provide this continuing funding. Greens Bayou alone was responsible for nearly half of the nearly 30,000 homes that were flooded by Tropical Storm Allison's heavy rains.

The other major project in my district is Hunting Bayou, which was unfortunately not included in the conference report; and I will take a minute later to clear up some confusion. Hunting Bayou was mistakenly listed by the Corps as a new start, and thus would have been funded out of the fiscal 2002 construction general account. What the Corps should have requested was the project continue to be funded under general investigation as it had been over the last 3 years.

While Hunting Bayou is progressing at a reasonable pace, it is not ready for a new start designation until fiscal year 2003, and I want to make sure this point is clear because of the critical public safety implications that we have for East Harris County.

Hunting Bayou, which flows through East Harris County, was again hit hard

by Tropical Storm Allison. Approximately 7,500 homes were flooded, with damage estimated at $250 million. This total does not count the millions of dollars that were lost to businesses in the area through the loss of sales and cost of repairs.

Currently, the Hunting Bayou project is 80 percent through its general evaluation phase; and when the construction on this project is finished, it will reduce the number of structures subject to the 100-year flooding from 7,300 to 1,000. According to the estimates, this project could deliver $8.2 million per year in flood protection, and the minimum estimated life of this project would be at least 50 years, so it makes good sense.

I would like to engage in a brief colloquy with the chairman and ranking member to clear up any of the further issues with the project and seek commitment next year that we will continue to work on this important project.

Mr. Chairman, I want to begin by expressing my deep gratitude for the hard work you and your ranking member and staffs put on this legislation. I know you each had difficult decisions to make, and the bill we have before us today is a fair compromise for all concerned.

I just want to take the opportunity to clean up some confusion about the Hunting Bayou project created through the Corps of Engineers and maybe even our own problems.

In my earlier statement, I mentioned the Corps mistakenly classified the project as a new start under the construction account, when in fact it should have been listed as continuing investigation. Is that your understanding, Mr. Chairman?

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

Mr. GREEN of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas, and want to say his understanding is identical to mine.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I would like to thank the chairman and my ranking member, and know that we will be back next year seeking a new start for Hunting Bayou, and with the cost-benefit analysis. I certainly will appreciate your support at that time.

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

Mr. GREEN of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I will be happy to continue to work with the gentleman on the matter.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the chairman of this committee for a fine, fine bill and for working with me on several issues, and the ranking member as well.

I regrettably stand here today and tell you that I will have to vote ''no.'' There is a provision in this bill that I think is extremely dangerous. The gentleman from Michigan, a previous speaker, spoke very eloquently about protecting the Great Lakes and all that are right with our precious resources and that 20 percent of the fresh water of the whole world that resides there. I could not agree more with his intent. I could not agree more with his heart. I could not disagree more with the policy, as I think it is extremely dangerous.

In this bill, there is a section that was not added by the Members of this body, but came out of that conference committee, that has the single largest encroachment over control of the Great Lakes that I have ever seen. It says to the Great Lakes Governors and the Great Lakes legislators that we know better in the United States Congress how to protect your resources, a place of previous jurisdiction that they had themselves.

As a matter of fact, the last time Congress tried this, they exempted in navigable waterways ballast water. Now do you know what the number one threat is in our Great Lakes? It is non-native species that came to us because of that ballast water that the great wisdom in the halls of Washington, D.C. gave us.

Mr. Speaker, this is very, very dangerous stuff. What we have done now is we have taken control of the Great Lakes and given it to the majority of the southwest States that are thirsty, that see the Great Lakes as a great opportunity to water their lawns, to make their golf courses green. We have given the control of the Great Lakes to the oil-producing States that outnumber us in the Great Lakes; and believe me, there have been attempts in the past to drill on our Great Lakes. Something that started out I think pure of heart, is extremely dangerous.

The Governor, who I happen to disagree with on his position on angle drilling in the Great Lakes, is working on this issue. But both bodies of the legislature are acting, and acting now to stop angle drilling in the Great Lakes, a place, Mr. Speaker, where it ought to be debated.

We are telling the people who are debating now, the Speaker of the House of the State of Michigan in a bipartisan way is working to stop angle drilling in Michigan; but we are going to stand here today and say Mr. Speaker, back there in Michigan, you do not know what you are doing. You cannot protect your Great Lakes. We are the Federal Government. Trust us.

We did that before, Mr. Speaker; and we have the greatest threat, and I am going to say it again, to the Great Lakes, an act given to us by the United States Congress by not regulating ballast water, that gave us non-native species that are damaging and harming our Great Lakes today.

People who do not live there, people who do not work there, people who do not raise their children there, people who do not live there in February, and, believe me, Mr. Speaker, that is a trick, ought not to be making decisions about how to best protect our Great Lakes. This is the wrong direction. I think their intent is pure, but I think the results are disastrous.

I would urge those who believe that the States, our Great Lakes Governors, and Great Lakes legislators ought to control this issue, to vote ''no'' on the bill. I again regrettably, because there are a lot of good things in this bill, Mr. Speaker, will be voting ''no'' for that very specific reason.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this energy and water appropriations conference report. I want to begin by extending my sincere gratitude to the chairman, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), for all of his work and for the ranking member, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), for his great work in drafting a solid bipartisan piece of legislation, a bill that will meet many of the needs pertaining to important energy and infrastructure needs throughout our entire Nation.

Particularly, I want to thank both gentlemen for including in this bill $4.4 million for the cleanup of Flushing Bay and Creek in my congressional district. For those of you who may not be familiar where Flushing Bay is, when you land at LaGuardia Airport, between Shea Stadium and LaGuardia airport, that is Flushing Bay.

It is a gaping wound within the estuary of the Long Island Sound. For many, many years it has been in need of cleanup. The funding that will be provided here will be used to dredge parts of this water body, to clean up old sediment and other debris built up in the bay and creek for many years. The pollution built up in Flushing Bay has resulted in foul odors and water discoloration, making this a blight on the Borough of Queens. But this investment by the committee in the cleanup effort, as well as other infrastructure investments in the area, surrounding this water body, will make this portion of Flushing Sound and Creek what I believe will be the pride of Queens County.

There is a great deal of work that needs to be done. They are finishing the study stage, and we are grateful to the work of the Army Corps of Engineers; but we need to move beyond the study stage. We believe that will happen very soon, and a large portion of this $4.4 million will go towards actually dredging and cleaning up this bay, which is in desperate need of it, to bring it back to life for the people not only of my Borough of Queens County, but for all the city and all those people who visit our city on a daily basis and

fly over Flushing Bay and wonder what that exactly is.

□ 1200

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, we have no further speakers, so I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, there is much that is good in this bill, and I would commend the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. Visclosky) for a good bipartisan effort. But I would like to draw attention to a serious shortcoming in the bill.

This bill provides $69 million less than in fiscal year 2001 for nonproliferation programs to stop the development of nuclear weapons and to stop the spread of nuclear materials around the world. Is there a person in America who thinks we should be doing less this next year than this year to keep nuclear materials out of the hands of terrorists? There are at least 14 documented instances over recent years of diversion of nuclear materials from the Soviet Union. We think we have caught most of them.

On the front page of the New York Times on September 11 was an article about attempts to smuggle nuclear materials out of the Soviet Union. This is a real threat. Right now, because of new access and good agreements with the Soviet Union, we have a particularly good window of opportunity to put in place antiterrorist safeguards at numerous nuclear sites in Russia and the former Soviet Union. I do not see how we can look Americans in the face and say that we are going to shortchange this important program.

I would like to see the bill returned to committee so that we could make these very important changes.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS), a very valuable member of the subcommittee.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his time and for his leadership, along with the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. Callahan). The primary statement I would like to make, Mr. Speaker, at this moment is that I deeply appreciate the very bipartisan, fair, conscientious leadership of this subcommittee through the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY). The work of this subcommittee, Mr. Speaker, is often passed over by members of the press in Washington, D.C., but to the communities who are affected by floods, devastated by floods, this bill is as important as any that will ever be considered in this House. To communities that benefit from the infrastructure commitments of that bill, this legislation, is terribly, terribly important.

This bill deals with important university research across our country; it provides Department of Energy funding to protect American citizens from the threat of nuclear attack, terrorists; it deals with a whole range of issues that have a direct impact on the quality of life of American citizens. It is a pleasure as a member of this subcommittee to see its leadership work in a totally fair, totally nonpartisan manner.

I also want to compliment the staff for their work on dealing with unlimited numbers of very legitimate requests from flood control to energy projects, to research, yet making logical, carefully drawn out, fair decisions on how to allocate our limited resources.

A lot of people do not understand, Mr. Speaker, that this subcommittee, as a part of the Committee on Appropriations, does not make the decision on how big the pie is we spend under which committee's jurisdiction; the Committee on the Budget and other decisionmakers give us a size of the pie and the committee then has to decide how to divide it up. I think they have done excellent work.

The chairman and others know of my great concern about the overall lack of commitment of actual funds in this Congress to nuclear nonproliferation, and I frankly do wish we had been successful in convincing our colleagues in the other body in this bill that we should have spent somewhat less on strengthening the finest offensive nuclear arsenal in the world and spent significantly more using those dollars on protecting American citizens from the threat of terrorists getting their hands on nuclear material. But we did the best we could, and the leadership of this committee by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) deserve great credit for stopping a proposed reduction of $100 million in nuclear nonproliferation programs.

I look forward to joining with them in their efforts to convince others in this body and in the other body in the Capitol that we have an obligation to the American people to put homeland defense as our first priority, not as our second, third or last priority. I am confident that will happen in the days ahead with the leadership of the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY). I again want to thank them and their staff for their tremendous effort in putting together this very important piece of legislation.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I simply would conclude by again thanking the gentleman for a terrific work product, and that it is very pleasing to me that the Alabama-Indiana connection has been reestablished on this subcommittee.

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to make just a couple of comments before I yield back my time, and that is we mentioned the work of the subcommittee members and the staff people and all of that, but also the individual Members of Congress who have come to us as members of this subcommittee throughout the year explaining their projects and doing it very well, of protecting their home districts.

There are some in this country, mostly neophytes; George Wallace, when he was governor of Alabama, used to talk about those people that cannot park their bicycles straight in pointed-toe shoes, but we have some people in this country that think a great deal of this bill has to do with pork, and that is just not the fact. Actually, less than one-fifth of this bill even has to do with the Corps of Engineers. I mean this issue, this measure today is the protection for the American people for all of our nuclear programs, the safeguarding of our nuclear missiles, the safeguarding of nuclear disposal needs, the nonproliferation programs, reclamation, all of these things are always overlooked by these prognosticators of the news, and they are the ones who complain about this bill containing so much pork.

But that, in this country, is what we are all about. They have that right for their viewers. But I do wish once in a while they would take the time to look at the important issues that we address here.

Also, I mentioned the fact that many Members call on us about their issues, and one of these Members was the gentleman from New York (Mr. HOUGHTON), who is very disrupted because his office is in the Longworth Building and he does not even have an office in this Capitol, yet he has made numerous trips back to this Capitol to talk with me and others, and it is solely because of the gentleman's efforts that we have corrected a portion of the bill that some people in New York were concerned about. Had it not been for the gentleman's efforts on the West Valley project, the measure would have been right where it was when it left the House, but because of his efforts, we reinstated his requested language. One of those reporters wrote that he had nothing to do with it and gave the Members of the Senate credit for it from New York. Well, I never even heard from the Members of the Senate, I only heard from the gentleman from New York (Mr. HOUGHTON) and, as a result, we corrected the bill, as per his request.

So with that, Mr. Speaker, I thank all of those involved.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2311, the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Bill for Fiscal Year 2002.

As a new member of the Energy and Water Subcommittee this year, I enjoyed working with Chairman SONNY CALLAHAN, ranking Member PETER VISCLOSKY and the other subcommittee members in support of projects and

activities that are important to California and the nation.

Although more than two-thirds of the spending in our bill is for the Department of Energy, the important work done by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and Department of the Interior's Bureau of Reclamation demands much of our attention as our constituents request funding that will help our ports, waterways and communities.

In Los Angeles, a project to deepen the main channel of Los Angeles Harbor is key to economic activity throughout southern California. The Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach have increased container traffic by 40 percent in just one year, and it is expected to double again in the next 10 years. I am pleased that our bill contains $2.825 million to complete the pre-construction, engineering and design for this important project and immediately move forward to the construction phase.

The Energy and Water Appropriations Bill has also provided a mechanism for solving a severe problem affecting the drinking water supply for millions of southern Californians. Last year, the San Gabriel Restoration Fund was established in order to assist the San Gabriel Water Control Authority and the Central Basin Municipal Water District with cleaning up contamination in the groundwater basins they administer. Unfortunately, $23 million sat in the fund all year while contamination seeped into the Central Basin from the San Gabriel Basin at a rate of nearly three feet per day.

Working with Congressman DAVID DREIER, we included statutory language that will permit clean-up of the San Gabriel and Central Basins to get underway almost immediately. We will accomplish this by transferring administration of the San Gabriel Restoration Fund to the Bureau of Reclamation, which is better suited to administer grants for these clean-up activities. Clean drinking water is far too important to my constituents and other southern Californians to let bureaucratic hang-ups get in the way, so I am pleased that this project can now begin to move forward.

The Title XVI projects administered by the Bureau of Reclamation are also very important to southern Californians. These projects, where costs are borne primarily by the local water authorities, have been one of the keys to enabling southern California to grow over the past 15 years without requiring any additional supplies of water. By taking water that has already been used by residences or businesses and treating it again, this water can then be used for any industrial or municipal use that doesn't require drinking grade quality. Although the treatment costs can be considerable, this still saves businesses money when they use the recycled water for industrial purposes, and they enjoy the water supply reliability that results from this process. Many municipalities are also investing in recycled water to cut their costs by using reclaimed water to keep parks and golf courses green. Nearly one-third of Los Angeles County's water is recycled now, and with sufficient investment, that percentage can grow further, providing significant help with our water supply needs. I am pleased that $740,000 is included for the Los Angeles Area Water Reclamation/Reuse Project, and a number of other southern California projects are also going forward with funds in this bill.

Another key to clean drinking water for southern Californians is a clean Colorado River, which is a major source of drinking water for the entire southern California region. Within the Department of Energy, $2 million has been included to begin clean-up of a uranium mine tailings site in Moab, Utah that is perilously close to the Colorado River. This project is long overdue. Fortunately, no contamination has been detected in the Colorado River, but if it was to occur, the clean-up would be far more costly than removing the pile of tailings.

The impact of commercial marine activity, flooding, and dispersal of pollutants from contaminated coastal sites upon the southern California shoreline is of enormous importance. The Corps of Engineers has been given $400,000 to complete a study of the Los Angeles County shoreline and to determine any needs for beach nourishment based on erosion and other factors.

The scope of the bill's funding for programs of the Department of Energy is very wide and include activities vital to our national defense such as uranium facilities maintenance, nuclear waste disposal and funding for the new National Nuclear Security Administration which works to keep our nuclear stockpile safe. We also provide funding for important energy supply activities such as research into renewable energy technologies including biomass, biofuels, solar energy and wind energy. These energy sources will play a significant role in meeting the nation's energy needs of tomorrow.

I also want to take particular note of the extensive research that is conducted by our national energy laboratories, including the Lawrence Livermore and Lawrence Berkeley Laboratories in California. Whether it is high-energy physics, nuclear physics or basic energy sciences such as materials, chemical, engineering and geosciences, these laboratories are on the cutting edge of scientific breakthroughs. Our national laboratories are a valuable national resource.

My only regret in the bill is that we didn't do more for non-proliferation activities. I supported the effort made by Congressman CHET EDWARDS at the House-Senate conference committee to provide additional resources for our non-proliferation program. The report issued by Howard Baker, Lloyd Cutler, and Sam Nunn on the DOE's nonproliferation programs with Russia said:

> The most urgent unmet national security threat to the United States today is the danger that weapons of mass destruction of weapons-usable material in Russia could be stolen and sold to terrorists or hostile nation states and used against American troops abroad or citizens at home.

Unfortunately, the conference amendment to transfer funds from some of our nuclear maintenance programs to this non-proliferation effort was unsuccessful. However, I am glad that House and Senate leaders of the Energy and Water Subcommittee gave their commitment to pursuing significant funds in a supplemental appropriations bill to address this continuing threat to the security of the U.S. and the world.

It has been a delightful and satisfying year working with Chairman CALLAHAN and Ranking Democrat VISCLOSKY, and I look forward to years of service on this subcommittee and to working with these important agencies as they carry out their missions in service to our nation.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2311, the Energy & Water Appropriations Conference Report. The bill contains important funding for America's waterways, irrigation infrastructure, flood control and programs administered by the Department of the Energy.

While I will support the conference report, I am disappointed that the conferees chose not to include an increase in borrowing authority for the Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) to fund critical transmission improvements. The Northwest is still experiencing an electricity crisis caused by a shortage of new development, the failed attempt by California to achieve deregulation and a severe drought. Additional generation is under construction and on the drawing board. More than 3,000 megawatts of generation is now fully permitted in the Northwest with 20,000 more megawatts in the regulatory pipeline. BPA will need increased Treasury borrowing authority to assist the agency in upgrading and building transmission lines. Without additional transmission capacity in the Northwest, additional generation coming online may not be able to reliably reach consumers.

BPA's transmission investments will easily pay for themselves in the long run and are essential in order to improve wholesale electricity markets in the Western United States, and to maintain the basic reliability of our region's electrical system. The increase is supported by the Northwest Energy Caucus, consisting of every House Member from Oregon, Washington, Idaho and Montana. We will continue to pursue an increase in BPA's borrowing authority through other venues.

I am pleased that the Conference Report continues funding for the Inland Northwest Natural Resources Research Center at Gonzaga University, albeit at a substantially lower level of funding than was provided by the Energy and Water Appropriations Conferees for fiscal year 2001. I will work to ensure that funding is provided in future years to allow for the smooth continuation of this project.

$1 million was provided at my request for the Walla Walla River feasibility study, the same level as was included in the House bill. The Walla Walla basin has established a successful broad-based watershed planning/HCP process. This formal process includes participation by federal, state, and local governments and the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation (CTUIR). It also includes participation by local and regional environmental groups and stakeholders representing local businesses, agri-business, recreational, and cultural interests. At its core, the watershed planning/HCP effort focuses on restoring adequate flows for listed species.

To insure that the federal funding provided does not create a parallel process to the existing process underway, it is the intent of Congress that the Crops shall integrate its activities into the framework of the existing watershed planning/HCP process already established in the basin. In addition, to maintain the success of the efforts underway, it is the intent of Congress that the Corps shall not develop an instream flow target that is inconsistent with flow targets set through the Watershed Planning/HCP process.

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

move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

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

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

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

## REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 981

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 981.

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

There was no objection.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the consideration of the conference report on the bill (H.R. 2647) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes, and that I may include extraneous and tabular material.

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

There was no objection.

## CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2647, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 273, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 2647) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 273, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of October 30, 2001 at page H7512.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR).

(Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today to present the Legislative Branch Appropriations Conference Report for Fiscal Year 2002 to the House for consideration. I would like to thank the ranking member, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) and all of the members of the subcommittee, for their support in crafting this legislation. I would like to also say thank you to the staff for all of their hard work during these times, especially to Chuck Turner, Manny Crupi, Ed Lombard, Liz Dawson, Mark Murray and Tim Aiken. All Members owe them a special thanks for their work.

I would like to say a special thank you to the Capitol police who are listed under this bill. We have gone through unusual times in the last almost 60 days, and we owe them a special thanks for their undying efforts to maintain protection for the Members of the House, our staff, and our guests who come to the Capitol.

Mr. Speaker, we have a non-controversial, bipartisan bill. With respect to the items that were sent to the Senate in the House passed bill, we have held the increase over the 2001 bill to 4.6 percent. Now, that is an increase which is well below the President's request for 2002 appropriations.

And the committee bill meets our 302(b) allocations for budget authority and is $15 million below our outlay target.

Mr. Speaker, the House has approved the rule for this report. The committee has done its job and it has done its job well, I believe, and this bill deserves the overwhelming support of the House. I do not intend to extend the debate, and I will include a summary of comparison of accounts in the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, this bill does contain the funds and language to implement the tuition loan reimbursement plan for our agencies, for the Congressional Budget Office and the Senate, and the bill contains funds from committee and members' representational allowances accounts to fund the program for House employees. We are awaiting the Committee on House Administration to respond to our call for rules and regulations in this area, and we feel that will be forthcoming.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to present the Legislative Branch Appropriations Conference Report for Fiscal Year 2002 to the House for consideration.

I'd like to thank the ranking member, Mr. MORAN, and all the members of the subcommittee for their support in crafting this legislation.

I would like also to say a thank you to the staff for all their hard work during these times. Especially to Chuck Turner, Manny Crupi, Ed Lombard, Liz Dawson, Mark Murray, and Tim Siken—all members owe them special thanks.

And, Mr. Speaker a special thanks to the Capitol police who risk their lives daily, and have been doing so diligently, since the September 11 attacks, to protect House members and staff, and our visitors. They are heroes to all of us.

Mr. Speaker, we have a non-controversial, bipartisan bill. With respect to the items that were sent to the Senate in the House passed bill, we have held the increase over FY2001 to 4.6 percent. That's an increase which is well below the President's request for 2002 appropriations.

And the Committee bill meets our 302(b) allocation in budget authority and is $15 million below our outlay target.

We have had some questions about a student loan repayment program for House staff. The Committee has no objection to including the appropriate legislation in the Legislative bill. But it is a complicated technical matter that involves internal House policy and must be integrated into the legislative authority for allowable uses of members' allowances and committee funding. Under the rules, those mattes are within the jurisdiction of the Administration Committee.

We have received no requests from the Administration Committee to include such authority. Therefore, the joint statement of the managers that accompanies this conference report encourages the House Administration Committee to develop and recommend guidelines and appropriate legislative language to establish a student loan repayment program. The funds to carry this out are included in the bill. The Appropriations Committee will be happy to carry such authorizing language in the appropriations bill. That is in accord with long standing practice of the Appropriations Committee to assist House Administration and the Leadership in achieving administrative improvements in the operations of the House.

Mr. Speaker, the House has approved the rule for this conference report by unanimous vote.

The Committee has done its job; it has done a good job. This bill deserves the overwhelming support of the House. I do not intend to extend the debate and will include a summary of the comparisons of accounts in the record.

I urge my colleagues to support the bill.