Let us not slash Medicare. Let us be sensible about it and let us see this plan for exactly what it is: An attempt to deprive elderly Americans of the health care they so desperately need and the security that their families need as well.

PROPOSED REPUBLICAN CUTS WILL RESULT IN DEVASTATION OF MEDICARE

(Mr. PALLONE asked and was given permission to address theHouse for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I just want to follow up on what my colleague from New York just said. We know what happened in the last 2 years with the Republican leadership plans to cut Medicare and Medicaid.

If those plans had gone into effect, and thank goodness they did not because of the President and because Democrats in Congress constantly fought against it, if they had gone into effect what we would have seen is increased costs for senior citizens as well as the general population. We would have seen the actual costs for part B premiums under Medicare almost doubled. We would have seen copayments go up and deductibles go up for Medicare, and, at the same time, we also saw the proposal this year in 1996 that would basically have allowed doctors, if a senior stayed in traditional Medicare, to charge whatever they want over and above what Medicare pays the physician.

The bottom line is that there is no free lunch. If we impose these tremendous cuts in Medicare that were proposed by the Republican leadership in the past 2 years, and even more cuts that would be proposed because of what Presidential candidate Dole is saying, we will see devastation of Medicare.

JUST SAY NO TO ''HEMP–DOPE''

(Ms. MCKINNEY asked and was given permission to address theHouse for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to know what these guys are smoking. TheHemp-Dope ticket expects to cut taxes by $550 billion, increase military spending, balance the budget, and, at the same time, promises not to decimate Medicare and Social Security.

As always, their plan cuts taxes for the wealthy first, then leaves the hard spending cuts for future Presidents. That is what I would call a political hit and run.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, Hemp-Dope wants to abolish the Department of Education at a time when our young people will have to compete in a changing global economy. Simply put, our Nation cannot afford another decade of voodoo Reaganomics, which bankrupted us in the first place.

As the President said, we are on the right track to the 21st century. Just say no to Hemp-Dope.

ABIDING BY THE RULES OF THE HOUSE WILL MAINTAIN CIVILITY ON THE HOUSE FLOOR

(Mr. LINDER asked and was given permission address theHouse for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, in closing these 1 minutes this morning, I want to make the point that nobody here was gagged, nobody was prevented from speaking on a subject they wished to speak on. They can go outside these doors in the Speaker's lobby or upstairs and hold a press conference and say all they want to say about the matters they were referring to this morning.

What they cannot do is talk about matters before the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct on the floor of this House because it is against the rules of theHouse to do so. And that is the only point that was raised consistently this morning and was also being ignored, even ignoring rule after rule by the Speaker.

If we want to maintain some degree of civility on the floor of this House to engage in honest political debate, we should at least abide by the rules or try to change them and not continually ignore the Speaker's admonitions.

REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT, FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 13, 1996, TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 3675, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1997

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of theHouse may have until midnight Friday, September 13, 1996, to file a conference report on the bill H.R. 3675, a bill making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year 1997, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would urge that the gentleman withhold that request.

I do not personally have an objection to its being filed, I support the bill, but I have been informed by our leadership that another committee does, and absent their presence, I would feel obligated to object if the motion is made at this time.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw it. I understood it had been cleared by the gentleman's side.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, it had been cleared as far as the committee is concerned, but we were just informed by our leadership that there is a problem with another committee.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my unanimous-consent request at this time.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 3816) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes, and that I may include tabular and extraneous materials.

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

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 3816, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1997

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the previous order of theHouse, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 3816), making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of theHouse today, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of theHouse of earlier today.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS].

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

The conference agreement that we are bringing to the floor at this time for this next fiscal year is $19.973 billion of new budget authority. This is $562 million higher than the version passed by theHouse a few weeks ago and $343 million below the Senate-passed level.

The greatest amount of this increase is in Defense—a $449 million increase in Defense activities.

A lot of people do not realize that 57 percent of the energy and water bill—over half—is Defense related. Domestic discretionary programs have been reduced by $48 million below last year. $11.4 billion is in Defense. Of that amount, $5,620,000,000 is for environmental restoration and waste management. No small amount.

That is the most rapidly growing account that we have. We are cleaning up the nuclear waste and other wastes that have been accumulating through the years.

Mr. Speaker, the bill has five titles. Title I is related to water resources. We have more than 25,000 miles of inland waterways. The deep ports of our country all come under the jurisdiction

of this bill. The title contains $3.5 billion for Corps of Engineers water resource programs this year. This is $136 million more than last year, and it is $210 million above the President's request.

A great amount is for operation and maintenance. Some of the locks and dams that are operating in our country, delivering goods to the seaports for world markets, are 60 years old and in bad repair. We should really be appropriating more money for their maintenance. But unfortunately, this year, because of the budget restraints, we are unable to do the entire job that should be done.

Title II funds the Bureau of Reclamation. It appropriates $819 million. It is less than last year.

Title III contains $15.8 trillion for the Department of Energy. The biggest part of this is for Defense-related activities. Much of it is for the environmental restoration and waste management program.

Title IV funds independent agencies.

And title V is the portion of the bill containing general provisions that are the responsibility of this committee.

Mr. Speaker, there are many people to thank for this conference report, particularly our staff who worked into the wee hours this morning preparing the conference report. And they worked hard over the last weekend preparing the materials. So our staff and their capable leadership is to be thanked for the document we have today. And we are especially grateful to the members of our committee, both on the majority and minority side.

I especially want to thank my colleague for 30 years, the ranking minority member, former chairman of this subcommittee, the gentleman from Alabama, Mr. TOM BEVILL. We have worked together very closely through the years. When he was chairman, we worked very closely. He honored my requests and we always had complete agreement. That has not changed this year.

I personally want to thank the chairman and all the Members in the other body who have worked on this bill under the capable leadership of Chairman PETE DOMENICI and the ranking member, Senator JOHNSTON from Louisiana. They have worked very cooperatively with us to make this product possible.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report to accompany H.R. 3816, the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 1997.

Mr. Speaker, the committee of conference on H.R. 3816 met throughout yesterday afternoon and into the evening to revolve the substantial differences between theHouse and Senate versions of the bill. Because of the dedicated efforts of Members on both sides of the aisle and both sides of theHill, we were able to reach satisfactory compromises on a range of difficult issues.

The conference agreement appropriates $19.973 billion in new budget authority for programs under the subcommittee's jurisdiction. This amount includes $11.352 billion for atomic Defense-related activities and $8.621 billion for domestic discretionary programs of the Department of Energy, the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, and various independent agencies. The total amount is $562 million higher than appropriated by theHouse-passed bill but $343 million lower than the Senate-passed version. The greatest portion of the increase above theHouse—approximately $449 million—is committed to the Defense-related activities of the Department of Energy. These additional funds are necessary to maintain our nuclear defense capabilities and to address the environmental legacy of the nuclear production era.

While Defense spending in the energy and water bill has risen for fiscal year 1997, domestic discretionary appropriations have continued to decline. Funding for civilian energy and water programs is reduced by $48 million below last year's level. Once again, the energy and water bill turns the rhetoric of deficit reduction into reality, without sacrificing the necessary and cost-effective programs within the bill's domain.

Title I of the conference report appropriates $3.5 billion to the water resource programs of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. This represents a $136 million increase over the fiscal year 1996 level and an increase of $210 million over the administration's budget request. The conferees have taken positive action to address critical infrastructure needs throughout the country. The conferees appreciate the benefits to be derived from navigation, flood control, and harbor maintenance projects and have acted to ensure that the Nation will continue to realize a meaningful return on its infrastructure investments.

The committee on conference emphatically rejected proposed policies of the administration which would effectively terminate the role of the corps in coastal flood protection and small harbor maintenance. The conferees recognize the real national benefits—economic and otherwise—which accrue from corps activities in these areas and continue to support the agency's historical water resource missions.

Title II of the bill includes funding for the Bureau of Reclamation and the Central Utah Project completion account. The amount appropriated under title II, $819 million, is less than both the fiscal year 1996 level and the budget request for fiscal year 1997. The conferees recognize that the Bureau has largely accomplished its historical mission of reclaiming the West and expect that declining appropriations will continue to match the agency's diminishing role in western life.

Title III appropriates $15.78 billion for the Department of Energy. The conferees recognize that certain missions of the Department are critical to the welfare of the country. The Department's management of these programs, however, has evoked frustration, disappointment and, in some instances, hostility. The Department must streamline and improve its management; shed low-value and nonessential missions; and set a bold new direction for the future. Otherwise, its own institutional future will remain very much in doubt.

Funding levels for certain DOE programs include: $270 million for solar and renewable energy; $223 million for nuclear energy research; $233 million for fusion energy sciences; $996 million for general science and research; and $382 million for nuclear waste disposal activities. Spending for atomic energy defense activities of DOE includes $3.911 billion for weapons, including stockpile stewardship and management, $5.459 billion for Defense environmental restoration and waste management, and $1.606 billion for other Defense activities.

Title IV of the bill funds various agencies and commissions with missions relating to energy and water development. Within title IV, the conference agreement includes $160 million for the Appalachian Regional Commission, $16 million for the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board, $106 million for the Tennessee Valley Authority, and $472 million for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. The conferees provided final year funding for independent river basin commissions in fiscal year 1996.

Mr. Speaker, our conference could not have concluded so successfully without the dedicated and unified efforts of my colleagues on the Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development. We approached the conference in a spirit of teamwork and collegiality and stuck together through often difficult negotiations. I am proud to have been associated with each and every one of the subcommittee members during our recent deliberations and throughout the 104th Congress.

I pay a special tribute, Mr. Speaker, to the esteemed ranking minority member and longtime chairman of the subcommittee, theHonorable TOM BEVILL. Throughout his career on the committee and in the Congress, he has established a model for civility and honor. He has always approached his responsibilities in a fair and nonpartisan manner. He is a gentleman in the truest sense of the word and will be sorely missed by this institution once he begins his well-deserved retirement.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support the conference agreement.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1997 (H.R. 3816)

	FY 1996 Enacted	FY 1997 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - CIVIL						
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY						
Corps of Engineers - Civil						
General investigations	121,767,000	142,500,000	153,628,000	154,557,000	153,872,000	+32,105,000
Construction, general	804,573,000	914,000,000	1,035,364,000	1,049,306,000	1,081,942,000	+277,369,000
Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, and Tennessee	307,885,000	292,500,000	302,990,000	312,513,000	310,374,000	+2,489,000
Operation and maintenance, general	1,703,697,000	1,663,000,000	1,701,180,000	1,688,358,000	1,697,015,000	-6,682,000
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 104-134)	30,000,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-30,000,000
Regulatory program	101,000,000	112,000,000	101,000,000	101,000,000	101,000,000	.....
Flood control and coastal emergencies	10,000,000	15,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	.....
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 104-134)	135,000,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-135,000,000
General expenses	151,500,000	153,000,000	145,000,000	153,000,000	149,000,000	-2,500,000
Oil spill research	850,000	850,000	.....	.....	.....	-850,000
Total, title I, Department of Defense - Civil	3,366,272,000	3,292,850,000	3,449,192,000	3,468,734,000	3,503,203,000	+136,931,000
TITLE II - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR						
Central Utah Project Completion Account						
Central Utah project construction	18,905,000	25,827,000	25,827,000	25,827,000	25,827,000	+6,922,000
Fish, wildlife, and recreation mitigation and conservation	18,503,000	11,700,000	11,700,000	11,700,000	11,700,000	-6,803,000
Utah reclamation mitigation and conservation account	5,485,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	-485,000
Program oversight and administration	1,246,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	-146,000
Total, Central Utah project completion account	44,139,000	43,627,000	43,627,000	43,627,000	43,627,000	-512,000
Bureau of Reclamation						
General investigations	12,684,000	15,095,000	14,548,000	18,105,000	16,650,000	+3,966,000
Construction program	411,046,000	392,524,000	367,496,000	398,596,700	394,056,000	-16,990,000
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 104-134)	9,000,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-9,000,000
Operation and maintenance	273,076,000	292,876,000	288,232,000	280,876,000	267,876,000	-5,200,000
Loan program	11,668,000	12,715,000	12,715,000	12,715,000	12,715,000	+1,047,000
(Limitation on direct loans)	(37,000,000)	(37,000,000)	(37,000,000)	(37,000,000)	(37,000,000)	.....
General administrative expenses	48,150,000	48,971,000	45,150,000	48,307,000	46,000,000	-2,150,000
Colorado River Dam fund (by transfer, permanent authority)	(-4,556,000)	(-3,774,000)	(-3,774,000)	(-3,774,000)	(-3,774,000)	(+782,000)
Central Valley project restoration fund	43,579,000	38,000,000	38,000,000	38,000,000	38,000,000	-5,579,000
Total, Bureau of Reclamation	809,203,000	800,181,000	764,141,000	796,599,700	775,297,000	-33,906,000
Total, title II, Department of the Interior	853,342,000	843,808,000	807,768,000	840,226,700	818,924,000	-34,418,000
(By transfer)	(-4,556,000)	(-3,774,000)	(-3,774,000)	(-3,774,000)	(-3,774,000)	(+782,000)
TITLE III - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY						
Energy Supply, Research and Development Activities	2,727,407,000	3,020,497,000	2,868,573,000	2,764,043,000	2,710,908,000	-16,499,000
Uranium Supply and Enrichment Activities	64,197,000	70,000,000	53,972,000	42,200,000	43,200,000	-20,997,000
Gross revenues	-34,903,000	-42,200,000	-42,200,000	-42,200,000	-42,200,000	-7,297,000
Net appropriation	29,294,000	27,800,000	11,772,000	.....	1,000,000	-28,294,000
Uranium enrichment decontamination and decommissioning fund	278,807,000	240,200,000	200,200,000	205,200,000	200,200,000	-78,607,000
General Science and Research Activities	981,000,000	1,009,150,000	996,000,000	1,000,626,000	996,000,000	+15,000,000
Nuclear Waste Disposal Fund	151,600,000	200,028,000	182,000,000	200,028,000	182,000,000	+30,400,000
Departmental Administration	366,897,000	244,863,000	194,000,000	218,017,000	215,021,000	-151,876,000
Miscellaneous revenues	-122,306,000	-125,388,000	-125,388,000	-125,388,000	-125,388,000	-3,082,000
Net appropriation	244,391,000	119,475,000	68,612,000	92,629,000	89,633,000	-154,758,000
Office of the Inspector General	25,000,000	29,605,000	25,000,000	23,103,000	23,853,000	-1,147,000
Environmental Restoration and Waste Management:						
Defense function	(5,557,532,000)	(5,591,310,000)	(5,543,810,000)	(5,787,210,000)	(5,619,304,000)	(+61,772,000)
Non-defense function	(900,348,000)	(891,614,000)	(822,346,000)	(801,905,000)	(792,089,000)	(-108,259,000)
Total	(6,457,880,000)	(6,482,924,000)	(6,366,156,000)	(6,589,115,000)	(6,411,393,000)	(-46,487,000)
Atomic Energy Defense Activities						
Weapons Activities	3,460,314,000	3,710,002,000	3,684,378,000	3,988,602,000	3,911,198,000	+450,884,000
Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management	5,557,532,000	5,409,310,000	5,409,310,000	5,605,210,000	5,459,304,000	-98,228,000
Fixed asset acquisitions (sec. 621)	.....	182,000,000	134,500,000	182,000,000	160,000,000	+160,000,000
Other Defense Activities	1,388,212,000	1,547,700,000	1,459,533,000	1,606,833,000	1,605,733,000	+217,521,000
Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal	248,400,000	200,000,000	200,000,000	200,000,000	200,000,000	-48,400,000
Total, Atomic Energy Defense Activities	10,654,458,000	11,049,012,000	10,887,721,000	11,582,645,000	11,336,235,000	+681,777,000

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1997 (H.R. 3816) — continued

	FY 1996 Enacted	FY 1997 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
Power Marketing Administrations						
Operation and maintenance, Alaska Power Administration	4,260,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	-260,000
(By transfer)	(5,500,000)					(-5,500,000)
Operation and maintenance, Southeastern Power Administration	19,843,000	20,900,000	18,859,000	13,859,000	16,359,000	-3,484,000
Operation and maintenance, Southwestern Power Administration	29,778,000	26,900,000	25,210,000	25,210,000	25,210,000	-4,568,000
Construction, rehabilitation, operation and maintenance, Western Area Power Administration	257,652,000	217,891,000	211,582,000	201,582,000	193,582,000	-64,070,000
(By transfer, permanent authority)	(4,556,000)	(3,774,000)	(3,774,000)	(3,774,000)	(3,774,000)	(-782,000)
Falcon and Amistad operating and maintenance fund	1,000,000	970,000	970,000	970,000	970,000	-30,000
Total, Power Marketing Administrations	312,533,000	270,661,000	260,621,000	245,621,000	240,121,000	-72,412,000
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission						
Salaries and expenses	131,290,000	159,397,000	141,290,000	146,290,000	146,290,000	+15,000,000
Revenues applied	-131,290,000	-159,397,000	-141,290,000	-146,290,000	-146,290,000	-15,000,000
Fixed asset acquisitions (sec. 621)		216,066,000				
Total, title III, Department of Energy	15,404,490,000	16,182,494,000	15,300,499,000	16,113,895,000	15,779,950,000	+375,460,000
(By transfer)	(10,056,000)	(3,774,000)	(3,774,000)	(3,774,000)	(3,774,000)	(-6,282,000)
TITLE IV - INDEPENDENT AGENCIES						
Appalachian Regional Commission	170,000,000	170,000,000	155,331,000	165,000,000	160,000,000	-10,000,000
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board	17,000,000	17,000,000	12,000,000	17,000,000	16,000,000	-1,000,000
Delaware River Basin Commission:						
Salaries and expenses	343,000	342,000		342,000		-343,000
Contribution to Delaware River Basin Commission	428,000	534,000		500,000		-428,000
Total	771,000	876,000		842,000		-771,000
Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin:						
Contribution to Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin	511,000	508,000		508,000		-511,000
Nuclear Regulatory Commission:						
Salaries and expenses	468,300,000	475,300,000	471,800,000	471,800,000	471,800,000	+3,500,000
Revenues	-457,300,000	-457,800,000	-457,300,000	-457,300,000	-457,300,000	
Subtotal	11,000,000	17,500,000	14,500,000	14,500,000	14,500,000	+3,500,000
Office of Inspector General	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	
Revenues	-5,000,000	-5,000,000	-5,000,000	-5,000,000	-5,000,000	
Subtotal						
Total	11,000,000	17,500,000	14,500,000	14,500,000	14,500,000	+3,500,000
Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board	2,531,000	3,214,000	2,531,000	2,531,000	2,531,000	
Susquehanna River Basin Commission:						
Salaries and expenses	318,000	322,000		322,000		-318,000
Contribution to Susquehanna River Basin Commission	250,000	380,000		300,000		-250,000
Total	568,000	702,000		622,000		-568,000
Tennessee Valley Authority: Tennessee Valley Authority Fund	109,169,000	120,000,000	97,169,000	113,000,000	106,000,000	-3,169,000
Total, title IV, Independent agencies	311,550,000	329,800,000	281,531,000	314,003,000	299,031,000	-12,519,000
Scorekeeping adjustments	-609,343,000	-428,000,000	-428,000,000	-421,000,000	-428,000,000	+181,343,000
Grand total:						
New budget (obligational) authority	19,326,311,000	20,220,952,000	19,410,990,000	20,315,858,700	19,973,108,000	+646,797,000
(By transfer)	(5,500,000)					(-5,500,000)

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this fiscal year 1997 Energy and Water Appropriations Conference Report. I am honored to be here with my good friend and colleague of many years, the gentleman from Indiana, Chairman JOHN MYERS, and I want to commend him for the leadership that he has shown in crafting this very difficult bill.

Also, I want to commend the staff for their outstanding work. It looked impossible about 24 hours ago for this bill to get to the floor here, but they worked, as the chairman pointed out, until 5:30 this morning, worked all night, and, as a matter of fact, day and night all week.

So, actually, this conference report is a fine example of nonpartisan legislating. There were very significant differences between theHouse and the Senate bills, and so after those many hours, and many difficult issues were worked out and compromises were made, we have come out, in my judgment, with the best possible conference report that we could with the limited funds that we were allocated.

Under the chairman's able leadership this was certainly a responsible compromise that was fashioned. He played a very important role in this, of course.

The report recommends, as the chairman has pointed out, $19.9 billion in funding for the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Department of Energy, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, which, by the way, is over last year, and many other programs. All these programs are crucial to the development and maintenance of our Nation's infrastructure as well as our science and technological research capabilities.

□ 1100

Although the conference report is a fair and balanced agreement, there just was not enough money, especially for nondefense, discretionary funds for all the good and worthwhile projects. We know and we are very much aware and very conscious of the fact that many good projects, civil works projects that are needed, we were not able to fund them. As a matter of fact, we are very much aware and very conscious of the fact that many of our locks and dams and canals and waterways, there are 25,000 miles of navigable inland waterways in this country, they are not adequately funded even for maintenance, and we know and are very much aware that this is false economics.

This conference report required us to make tough choices. I think we have done the best that we could to maintain a responsible energy and water program for America within the limited funds. I hope that Members will consider the delicate balance realized in crafting this legislation. It is a good compromise and will ensure the Nation continues to move forward with critical water projects, energy programs, vital research, and particularly one that we put a great deal of money in, as much as possible, flood control projects. With the recent floods we are all very mindful of what these mean to our Nation in saving lives and of course property damages.

I urge the Members to support this conference report. On this occasion of my last energy and water development appropriation bill, I want to take this opportunity to thank the Members for their support and friendship through the years. I admire their dedication to this country and their constituents, and I wish for them individually and as a Congress much success. They and this great institution have enriched my life and made on it better. Again, I urge my colleagues to support this conference report and I urge Members to be supportive of this throughout on this occasion.

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

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS], ranking majority member of this committee, a very valuable member of this conference. At a time when he had concerns on his own subcommittee where he is chair, he gave all of his time to this committee. We thank him for that.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, obviously, I stand here in support of a good, fiscally sound bill that provides for the national security, as well as for important comfort to small forgotten communities that are flooded routinely. I support the bill very strongly.

Mr. Speaker, I rise for a much more, I think, important reason. That is to personally state, and I think I speak for all Members of the body when I say this, how much we owe a debt of gratitude to Chairman JOHN MYERS and to his very able ranking member, TOM BEVILL. This subcommittee has truly worked in a very nonpartisan way under Chairman BEVILL earlier and now under Chairman MYERS.

Yogi Berra said you can observe a lot just by watching, and I have been watching the operation of these two men in that subcommittee for a number of years now. I have never heard a partisan word spoken in that subcommittee, never. Every member of the subcommittee, regardless of party, is given equal standing to say or do whatever they think is best. And the chairman, Chairman MYERS, and before him, Chairman BEVILL, always gave us the opportunity to speak, to make our case and, whenever possible, when they could find the money, they were always there to try to help their colleagues help their part of America.

They say that the only place where success comes before work is the dictionary, and I can say that on this subcommittee that certainly is true. The big success of this subcommittee has been the tremendous hard work that goes into it.

There are literally thousands of projects and programs that this subcommittee has to go through every year, many of them extremely complicated. The Nation's nuclear laboratories, for example, and the nuclear programs the subcommittee has to oversee, many of them top secret military matters which have to be heard behind closed doors, you get no glory for that type of thing. These men sought no glory, certainly, in their work on the subcommittee.

I stand here mainly to thank JOHN MYERS and TOM BEVILL, two Members obviously, of course, who are choosing to retire. TheHouse and, more importantly, the Nation will be at a great loss because the accumulated and cumulative experience and expertise of these two men on all the projects covered in this very important bill will be sorely missed. It is going to be really tough for the rest of us to try to pick up the slack that is laying there, really tough, because none of us have the experience nor the expertise that these two gentlemen have accumulated over the years. They have both been here quite a few years, not long enough but quite a few. But they have been here just long enough to pick up a vast amount of knowledge and expertise that we are going to sorely miss.

Mr. Speaker, they say that duty makes one do a job well but that love makes one do a job beautifully. I have to tell my colleagues that the job these two gentlemen have been doing for their Nation has been beautiful, and we appreciate their love of Nation and their love of their work more than we can every say.

They were also able to keep their eye on the horizon. They had to realize they have a finite number of dollars to spend and an incredible amount of work to do. They were always able to keep their eyes on that larger picture. The larger picture was something so important to our Nation that in its very earliest days it was given the highest of priorities by one of my favorite people in all time, and that is Henry Clay from my beloved State of Kentucky, who had what he called the American plan.

Henry Clay the conservative, the fiscal conservative, believed that one of the most important things that we had to do as a nation was build its canals and its roads and its infrastructure. And this great conservative led the charge to defend the American plan and promote it. And these two gentlemen have picked up that cause and have carried it to a new height, in my judgment; that is, protecting and building the infrastructure, the important things that make our Nation work for all of us. And that is their modern day American plan, one that we support. They have kept their eyes on that horizon.

I will close with this. Two stonecutters were asked the same question: What are you doing? The first one said, why, I am cutting this stone into

two blocks. But the second one said, and these would be the answers of both JOHN MYERS and TOM BEVILL, the second stonecutter said, I am on a team that is building a cathedral.

Gentlemen, you have built a great America in large part and we thank you for that.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for two purposes, first of all of all to explain that at the proper time I will have a motion to recommit at the desk, and I am offering it essentially for three reasons.

First of all, on the overall spending question, this bill is $646 million above last year. I personally find it difficult to explain that when we compare it to the spending level which is being provided in other bills for programs which affect the needs of desperately needy children.

Second, I support adequate funds for cleanup of our nuclear weapons sites and programs, and to assist the former Soviet Union in its efforts to secure nuclear material and clean up unsafe nuclear power plants, and the bill provides for these programs. I congratulate the committee for it. But I do not believe that it is rational that we continue to increase funds for nuclear weapons production in the wake of the end of the cold war.

Third, this bill contains $38 million for the advanced light water reactor program. Members may recall theHouse bill contained $17 million. The Senate bill contained $22 million. Those amounts have been added together to continue this corporate welfare program for the nuclear industry. These funds will go to large corporations to assist them in licensing new nuclear power plants which will never be built. There are several other reasons that I have concerns about this bill, as well, and that is why I will be offering a straight motion to recommit with no instructions.

Having said that, I would like to spend the rest of my time commenting on the two gentlemen who brought this bill to us today. If you took a poll of this House and asked Members to name the two most decent Members of theHouse, I would be very surprised if the name of JOHN MYERS and the name of TOM BEVILL will not wind up at the very top of the list.

There are two kinds of people in public life, just like there are two kinds of people in private endeavors. There are angle players and then there are problem solvers. I think anybody who knows these two gentleman knows that they fall into the latter category.

I have watched both of them for as long as I have had the privilege to serve in this institution, and I have never once seen either one of them in any way bring dishonor to this House or the constituents who were wise enough to elect them as many times as they elected them. This House will suffer from their departure. We respect their decision to retire, but I think that whether JOHN was speaking on the Republican side of the aisle or TOM on the Democratic side of the aisle, you could never tell which was which, had you seen them deal with the substance of the bill.

We have various responsibilities in our efforts to serve our constituents in this place. Sometimes those responsibilities are complementary and sometimes they are conflicting. We have responsibilities to country, responsibilities to this institution, responsibilities to our political parties, to our districts, to our constituents, and to our principles.

I have seen both of these gentlemen meet those responsibilities in the highest possible fashion, in the way that brings the greatest honor to this institution and to the country that this institution tries to serve. I consider it a personal privilege to have served with both of them, and I think every Member who knows them feels the same way.

I wish them both everything good that can happen in life when they leave here, and thank them on behalf of the Members of this House for their service.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to our colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KNOLLENBERG], a very valued, hard-working member of this subcommittee.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to pay tribute to the outstanding work of my good friend, the chairman, JOHN MYERS, and ranking member, TOM BEVILL. I can tell you that it really is not a partisan or challenging or confrontational kind of committee. With these two gentlemen they have been kind of like family. I do not suggest to you that it always is calm and cool, but for the most part it really is.

I think it is, it really is a case where we must and should be obligated, are obligated to salute these two fine gentlemen for all their work. I have come to know them, I think, very closely, and I value their friendship and wish them both the very, very best in their future endeavors. I understand they both have something lined up, so good luck on all of that.

I rise in strong support of this conference report for the Energy and Water Appropriations Act for 1997. I believe it is a good bill, and you have heard the story. It may not be perfect, but we must not let perfection become the enemy of good. I urge my colleagues on both sides to support the conference report.

As with every other appropriations bill, this conference report is a product of some tough choices. We do not simply spread the pain evenly among the programs in our jurisdiction, because I think that causes a fault of subsidizing in many cases failure, programs that should be in fact downsized or terminated.

□ 1115

Instead what we did, we prioritized spending program by program based on their efficiency and their national importance.

One thing that I like about this bill is the committee continued commitment to basic research and development especially when the nature of the research is such that it may take years or even decades to complete. It is the proper role of the Federal Government to support basic research. I am concerned that too often, however, we support applied technology and commercialization interfering with the marketplace at the expense of basic research.

The portion of this bill which I am very enthusiastic about is the initiation of the closure project fund. The conference report includes money for this fund which will accelerate the decommissioning and cleanup of former defense nuclear facilities. By stabilizing, consolidating and removing nuclear material from the facilities more rapidly, we will ensure a safer environment for our workers and our communities. To qualify for the closure project funds, the sites must demonstrate and validate several criteria including a project completion date within 10 years of the application.

Mr. Speaker, the closure project fund is a type of program that can save the EM from becoming a century-long spending fiasco. What we need and what the closure projects fund incentives is a responsible manageable cleanup program to bring closure to the EM program and free up the Department of Energy's largest fiscal expenditure for budget deficit reduction. We see this as a first step toward an accelerated cleanup program with a defined ending. We anticipate that this fund will play a much more significant role in the years to come.

This is again a good conference report. I encourage my colleagues to support this conference report. I thank the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] for yielding me this time.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to our colleague, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS].

Mr. SKAGGS. I thank the gentleman from Alabama very much for the time.

Mr. Speaker, I want join the chorus in paying tribute to our colleagues who are retiring, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL]. It was my pleasure to serve with them on their subcommittee for a couple of years, and they have been kind to me then and ever since. I think we all wish them good health and happiness in the years that lie ahead.

I also appreciate their good work in this bill and particularly with respect to funding for nuclear weapons plant cleanup sites. I am glad that the conference report, like theHouse bill, provides for a separate account for so-called privatization projects at DOE sites such as the one in my area, Rocky

Flats. My understanding is that this can be used for high-priority cleanup projects including both those that would involve construction of new treatment facilities and others that might not necessarily involve that sort of construction. If I may engage the gentleman for a moment, I just wanted to inquire whether this is a correct interpretation of that part of the bill.

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

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is correct. The funds for the privatization can be used either for new facilities for treatment, or they may be used to upgrade and to improve facilities. Rocky Flats was covered.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to our colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO].

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in obvious strong support of this legislation. This is once again an excellent product of the subcommittee that has always known how to work together. The efforts of the chairman and ranking member, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL] have resulted in a conference agreement that is fair, balanced, and which seeks to achieve many goals with few resources.

I want to congratulate these two Members on their long careers and their fine achievements in Congress. Their cooperative spirit is a valuable example of how bipartisan leadership can produce excellent results.

This year's energy and water bill manages to provide funding for many important water projects including, I might say, a number in my State of California as well as funding for environmental cleanup, renewable energy and many other vital activities.

Overall, the bill is a remarkable achievement in this time of declining budgets.

The writing is on the wall. Each year it becomes more and more difficult to meet all of the flood control, water supply, energy and environmental needs of this country. More and more emphasis is being placed on setting priorities, and, as in many other years, the Federal Government will play a reduced role in the future. It is imperative that we take a comprehensive review of our energy and water needs and focus less on incremental projects and more on broad-based solutions to our problems.

I want to point out that this bill is $200 million less than was requested by the administration. It is, I think, far more than many thought would be available to this committee, or possible to pass through this body.

I want to pay particular tribute to the chairman and his longtime sidekick, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL], for the degree to which they fought the battle that made it possible to provide the budget authority to this committee to meet the minimum needs that all of us understood needed to be provided. I want to thank both of them for their distinguished service. This year's bill is testament to their hard work, their strong leadership. I want to congratulate them for a wonderful achievement, and I can only say for those of us like the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KNOLLENBERG] and myself who will hopefully be here in the next Congress, we have no better model from which we can take whatever key to success we may have in the future.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to our colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CHAPMAN].

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

I rise in obvious support of the conference report. But more than supporting the product of the subcommittee this year in the conference work of yesterday, I want to join so many of my colleagues today in saying that what I think is a fine legislative product that theHouse will vote on in just a few minutes exemplifies, as many have said, the tremendous work not only of this subcommittee, which I have been pleased to be a member of for a number of years, but the team spirit and the nonpartisan work ethic of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS], the chairman, and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL], the ranking member. It has been my privilege to serve with these two gentleman since 1985 and on the committee since 1989.

I will say that I do not believe there exists in this body, and perhaps in the history of the country, two men who came to public life together in this institution and who have worked hand in hand in a way to fashion not just a legislative product that is good for the country and good for all of us, but a product that truly has improved the lives of all Americans because it is our infrastructure, our future, our economy. It is transportation and water resources that truly have made America without question the strongest country in the world.

The legacy of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL], and the legacy of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS], will be one that they leave this institution after three decades, with a legacy that they have made this country stronger and better, have helped its people and its families, and who leave here the kind of dedicated service and an example to which all who follow should aspire to duplicate.

My hat is off, and my congratulations to both of these gentleman. I appreciate so much just having the opportunity to work with them, to be a part of their great careers in this institution, and to have been able to serve with them on what I think is some of the best work, the best committee in the entire U.S. Congress. I congratulate them on this product and urge the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of our time.

Mr MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. HORN].

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

I just want to say as these two gentleman leave the Chamber after years of distinguished service, when I came here as a freshman in 1993, they were among the first two leaders I met, and I remember the gentleman from Indiana, JOHN MYERS, when we were going up to what was called the Princeton Conference, but should have been called Plainsboro because that is where it was, I remember he said on the way, ''Don't let anyone tell you how to vote, including me,'' and I have not forgotten that, and I have followed his wisdom, and I can remember the distinguished chairman at that time, the gentleman from Alabama, [Mr. BEVILL] who was nice enough when he met me to take me back to his office, offered me a cup of tea and introduced me to his wife, and both of these gentleman are the type of hard-working legislators, they do not always hit the headlines, they are both very civil gentleman, and they are the key and the core of what makes the Congress of the United States work. We have a few colleagues on both sides that get up and scream and shout and do a lot of things. Not much happens. We have a few that even violateHouse rules in terms of assaulting other Members occasionally. Nobody much cares about them. But when it comes to the team of MYERS and BEVILL and that is replicated in a few places, I think all of theHouse and the American people can take pride in what these two gentleman have done during their career in Congress, and I wish them both the best in the years ahead.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to say, ''Thank you'' for the nice things people have said about this subcommittee, and more particularly, what they have said about the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL] and me. There are three of us on the subcommittee who are voluntarily not coming back next year: the gentleman from Texas, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. BEVILL, and myself. While we are retiring from Congress, that does not mean we are quitting. We are still going to be concerned about Congress and what it is doing and the activities of this subcommittee.

It has been a great honor for 30 years to serve in theHouse, but even more particularly, to serve with my colleague Mr. BEVILL. The subcommittee truly has been not bipartisan, but nonpartisan. But under Mr. BEVILL's leadership, the subcommittee has always disregarded politics. So it has been a

honor to have served on this committee. I thank the staff and the committee for their charity, their understanding, and the help that they have provided for both TOM and me.

So we thank you very much from deep in our heart.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to briefly address section 302 of H.R. 3816, the Energy and Water Development Conference Report for Fiscal Year 1997. Section 302 pertains to section 3140 of the 1997 Defense Authorization Act, H.R. 3230, which I had introduced in the National Security Committee and which has been approved by both theHouse and Senate.

Section 3140 addresses an issue of critical importance to our national security—the management of the Nation's nuclear weapons complex and, specifically, whether a management structure which was designed 45 years ago is able to meet the challenges we face today. Numerous studies completed over the past several years have revealed that it is not.

As far back as 1981, in a report revealingly entitled ''A New Headquarters/Field Structure Could Provide a Better Framework for Improving Department of Energy Operations,'' the General Accounting Office was recommending that changes needed to be made to the basic management structure at DOE.

More recently, in August 1993, the GAO issued a detailed criticism of past management practices in the Department entitled ''Management Problems Require a Long-Term Commitment to Change.'' The report lauded recent initiatives by the DOE over the previous year, but noted that strong leadership was needed to build an effective management structure for the future. The report noted communication problems and a weak work force with limited technical and administrative skills. Overall, GAO concluded, ''DOE has significant management problems, as reported by many oversight groups and acknowledged by agency leadership.'' As examples, the report cited a number of telling observations and conclusions, including:

According to over 90 percent of the 114 senior DOE managers we interviewed, organizational lines of authority need to be clarified * * *. Many of DOE's senior managers told GAO that ''fiefdoms'' throughout the field structure hampered their operations.

Management of the nuclear weapons complex and the national laboratory system * * * is today in disarray * * * its management is under severe stress.

GAO believes that having field units report directly to senior officials at headquarters who are responsible for a program is a promising strategy. We have supported stronger headquarters-to-field-program accountability in DOE, and having field offices report directly to program assistant secretaries is a way to establish accountability. [Our goal] is to establish a more direct line of command between headquarters and field program personnel.

Overall reporting between field offices and headquarters must be established and understood. And direction and guidance on program matters and oversight from headquarters offices needs to be clarified, coordinated, and integrated if the [O'Leary reporting scheme] or any other scheme is to work effectively.

The GAO followed its August 1993 report with another in February 1994 in which it once again found that, ''DOE's management of the laboratories is highly fragmented, lacking both a strategic focus and consistency across program lines.''

Two years later, and 2 years after the most recent reforms by the current Secretary were put in place, the GAO released another report which uncovered still more problems. In this report, entitled ''Department of Energy, A Framework for Restructuring DOE and Its Missions,'' the GAO found that: ''Attempts to establish direct accountability among program offices at headquarters, administrative units, field offices, and the national laboratories have been especially difficult. Reporting relationships changed often and sometimes have been confusing.''

But GAO is not the only one who has been critical of DOE's management structure over the past several years.

In 1989, in a report to the Secretary of Energy, the Advisory Committee on Nuclear Safety recommended that the Secretary: ''streamline management to make responsibilities clear, that you put knowledgeable people in line positions of responsibility, and that you give them authority. This is important for assurance of nuclear safety. Solving the DOE's problems will require upper management and operating personnel to work together closely and effectively. This will not be possible if the staff must work through buffers of people who are not technically competent.''

The Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board—whose members are appointed by the President—has echoed these concerns. In March of 1996, one of its members, John W. Crawford, issued a report titled ''Assessment Concerning Safety at Defense Nuclear Facilities: The DOE Technical Personnel Problem.'' The report contained a number of conclusions regarding DOE management and internal efforts to fix the problems, including:

Field organizations have had a long history of relative independence from subordination to Headquarters; thus these differences are likely to be difficult to resolve. A recent effort to do so was led by an action group of senior Headquarters and field managers under the aegis of the Strategic Alignment Implementation Group. The results of the deliberations by the action group were reported to the Associate Deputy Secretary for Field Management in a memorandum dated June 22, 1995, from the Manager Richland Operations Office. The document states that ''The Strategic Alignment Team identified the need for clarity in roles, responsibilities, authority, and accountability between Headquarters [and] the operations offices * * * to improve coordination and eliminate duplication of work.'' It offered a plan for doing so. However, the plan was submitted in draft form and, as far as the Board has been made aware, no action has been taken on it.

The Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board has recommended a strengthened and streamlined managerial approach and clear lines of authority and control. The DNFSB acknowledges that years of doing things a certain way and bureaucratic inertia has made reform next to impossible.

It is because of these studies that section 3140 was included as part of the 1997 Defense Authorization Act. The section would accomplish three main objectives aimed at streamlining the DOE management structure and addressing the concerns raised in these numerous reports. These objectives include: Establishing a clear and streamlined reporting channel between the Assistant Secretary of Energy for Defense Programs and the area offices of the four production sites, three labs and the Nevada test site. The direct reporting channel applies only to site operations matters within the context of the site's security function. Site operations matters are defined to include budget, personnel and procurement matters.

Requiring the Secretary of Energy to report to Congress on how to further reorganize field activities and management of the national security functions of the Department of Energy. The plan must identify all significant functions presently performed by the operations offices relating to any of the facilities and laboratories covered by this section and which of these functions could be performed: (1) by the area offices of the Department of Energy located at the facilities and laboratories; or (2) by the Assistant Secretary of Energy for Defense Programs. The plan must also recommend and address other internal streamlining and reorganization initiatives that the Department of Energy could pursue.

Establishing a Defense Programs Management Council to advise the Secretary on policy matters, operational concerns, strategic planning, and development of priorities relating to the Department's national security functions. The Council shall be composed of the directors of the four production sites, the three labs, and the Nevada test site and shall report directly to the Assistant Secretary for Defense Programs. The Council shall be operated and staffed by the Assistant Secretary for Defense Programs through resources available to the Office of the Secretary of Energy.

Section 3140 would apply to the following facilities and laboratories of the Department of Energy: the Kansas City plant, Kansas City, MO, the Pantex plant, Amarillo, TX; the Y–12 plant, Oak Ridge, TN, the Savannah River site, Aiken, SC; the Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM; the Sandia National Laboratory, Albuquerque, NM; the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, CA; the Nevada test site, Nevada.

The provision in this appropriation bill pertains to section 3140 requires that the Secretary of Energy ''develop a plan to reorganize the field activities and management of the national security functions of the Department of Energy.'' I have been assured by officials within the Department of Energy that they recognize the seriousness of the problem, and they will conduct a serious study in response to this provision and that they will take action.

Therefore, I support the conference report. I will, however, closely follow the actions of the DOE to ensure that the safety of workers and civilians are protected, that taxpayer dollars are used wisely and efficiently, and that the security of the country is protected.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Is the gentleman opposed to the conference report?

Mr. OBEY. Yes, I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. OBEY moves to recommit the conference report to the committee of conference.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

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

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XV, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 383, nays 29, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 413]

YEAS—383

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allard
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cardin
Castle
Chambliss
Chapman
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Deal
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Doolittle
Dornan
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Engel
English
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Filner
Flanagan
Foglietta
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Frost
Funderburk
Furse
Gallegly
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Green (TX)
Greene (UT)
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
LaHood
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Longley
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McDermott
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
McKinney
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Riggs
Rivers
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Rose
Roth
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Salmon
Sanders
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Schumer
Seastrand
Serrano
Shadegg
Shaw
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Studds
Stump
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thornton
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zimmer

NAYS—29

Burton
Chabot
Cooley
Davis
DeFazio
Ensign
Gekas
Hilleary
Holden
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Klug
McHale
Moran
Morella
Neumann
Obey
Oxley
Petri
Ramstad
Reed
Roemer
Royce
Sanford
Schroeder
Sensenbrenner
Shays
Stearns
Stockman

NOT VOTING—21

Bass
Brown (CA)
Bryant (TX)
Clay
Clinger
de la Garza
Dooley
Flake
Ganske
Hayes
Heineman
Lincoln
McNulty
Meyers
Payne (NJ)
Richardson
Ros-Lehtinen
Scott
Smith (TX)
Stokes
Zeliff

□ 1150

Messrs. PETRI, SHAYS, and BURTON of Indiana changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mrs. MALONEY, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. SCHUMER changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENDING MOST-FAVORED-NATION TREATMENT TO CAMBODIA

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 1642) to extend nondiscriminatory treatment—most-favored-nation treatment—to the products of Cambodia, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Senate amendment: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

SECTION 1. CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS.

The Congress finds that—

(1) despite recent increases in acts of repression by the Cambodian Government and growing government corruption that has contributed to substantial environmental degradation, Cambodia has made some progress towards democratic rule after 20 years of undemocratic regimes and civil war, and is striving to rebuild its market economy;

(2) extension of unconditional most-favored-nation treatment would assist Cambodia in developing its economy based on free market principles and becoming competitive in the global marketplace;

(3) establishing normal commercial relations on a reciprocal basis with Cambodia will promote United States exports to the rapidly growing Southeast Asian region and expand opportunities for United States business and investment in the Cambodian economy; and

(4) expanding bilateral trade relations that includes a commercial agreement may promote further progress by Cambodia on human rights and democratic rule and assist Cambodia in adopting regional and world trading rules and principles.

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF NONDISCRIMINATORY TREATMENT TO THE PRODUCTS OF CAMBODIA.

(a) HARMONIZED TARIFF SCHEDULE AMENDMENT.—General note 3(b) of theHarmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States is amended by striking ''Kampuchea''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) applies with respect to goods entered, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, on or after the effective date of a notice published in the Federal Register by the United States Trade Representative that a trade agreement obligating reciprocal most-favored-nation treatment between Cambodia and the United States has entered into force.

SEC. 3. REPORT TO CONGRESS.

The President shall submit to the Congress, not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, a report on the trade relations between the United States and Cambodia pursuant to the trade agreement described in section 2(b).

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have discussed