what is a surplus situation and make sure that it is protected from raids.

What will happen in the future is that it will be a deficit situation, and there may be a different dynamic that goes on with respect to that, which I do not think the Constitution would provide for.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The leader's time has expired.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1186) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill

Pending:

Domenici amendment No. 628, of a technical nature.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, in a couple minutes, we will be in a position where, after a few remarks, Senator JEFFORDS has one remaining issue.

There is a package of amendments, which is already at the desk. This unanimous consent request has been checked with the minority and is satisfactory with them.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 637, 638, 639, 661, 643, 630, AND 633, EN BLOC

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, there are a number of amendments that have been cleared on both sides. I ask unanimous consent that the following amendments be considered en bloc: Nos. 637, 638, 639, 661, 643, 630, and 633. I further ask unanimous consent that the amendments be agreed to and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments (Nos. 637, 638, 639, 661, 643, 630, and 633), en bloc, were agreed to, as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 637

(Purpose: To provide funds for development of technologies for control of zebra mussels and other aquatic nuisance species)

On page 8, lines 7 and 8, strike ''facilities:'' and insert ''facilities, and of which $1,500,000 shall be available for development of technologies for control of zebra mussels and other aquatic nuisance species in and around public facilities:''.

AMENDMENT NO. 638

On page 8, line 12, insert the following before the period: '': *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, may use not to exceed $300,000 for expenses associated with the commemoration of the Lewis and Clark Bicentennial''.

AMENDMENT NO. 639

(Purpose: To make a technical correction providing construction funds for the Site Operations Center at the Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory)

Title III, Department of Energy, Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management, on page 26, line 2 insert the following before the period: ''*Provided*, That of the amount provided for site completion, $1,306,000 shall be for project 00–D–400, CFA Site Operations Center, Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory, Idaho''.

AMENDMENT NO. 661

(Purpose: To clarify usage of Drought Emergency Assistance funds)

At the end of Title II, insert the following new section: SEC. . Funds under this title for Drought Emergency Assistance shall only be made available for the leasing of water for specified drought related purposes from willing lessors, in compliance with existing state laws and administered under state water priority allocation. Such leases may be entered into with an option to purchase, provided that such purchase is approved by the state in which the purchase takes place and the purchase does not cause economic harm within the state in which the purchase is made.

AMENDMENT NO. 643

At the appropriate place add the following: ''*Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Interior may provide $2,865,000 from funds appropriated herein for environmental restoration at Fort Kearny, Nebraska.''

AMENDMENT NO. 630

(Purpose: To strike the rescission of appropriations for the Hackensack Meadowlands flood control project, New Jersey)

On page 37, strike lines 20 and 21.

AMENDMENT NO. 633

(Purpose: To strike the rescission of appropriations for the Lackawanna River project, Scranton, Pennsylvania)

On page 37, strike lines 25 and 26.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 629, 631, 634, 642, 645, AND 646, AS AMENDED, EN BLOC

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that six second-degree amendments, which are at the desk, to amendments Nos. 629, 631, 634, 642, 645, and 646 be considered agreed to; that the first-degree amendments be agreed to, as amended; and that the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments were agreed to, en bloc, as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 629

(Purpose: To make funds available for the University of Missouri research reactor project)

On page 22, line 7, before the period at the end insert '', of which $100,000 shall be used for the University of Missouri research reactor project''.

AMENDMENT NO. 672 TO AMENDMENT NO. 629

(Purpose: A second degree amendment to the Bond amendment numbered 629)

On line 2, strike '', of which $8,100,000'' and insert: '', of which $3,000,000 shall be used for Boston College research in high temperature superconductivity and of which $5,000,000''.

AMENDMENT NO. 631

(Purpose: To provide funding for the Minnish Waterfront Park project, Passaic River, New Jersey)

On page 4, between lines 12 and 13, insert the following: ''Minnish Waterfront Park project, Passaic River, New Jersey, $4,000,000;''.

AMENDMENT NO. 673 TO AMENDMENT NO. 631

(Purpose: A second degree amendment to the Torricelli amendment numbered 631)

On line 4, strike ''$4,000,000'' and insert: ''$1,500,000''.

AMENDMENT NO. 634

(Purpose: To provide funding for water quality enhancement)

On page 4, line 20, strike ''$4,400,000:'' and insert ''$4,400,000; and Metro Beach, Michigan, $422,500 for aquatic ecosystem restoration.''

AMENDMENT NO. 674 TO AMENDMENT NO. 634

(Purpose: A second degree amendment to the Abraham amendment numbered 634)

Strike: ''Metro Beach, Michigan, $422,500 for aquatic ecosystem restoration.''

And insert: ''Lake St. Clair, Metro Beach, Michigan, section 206 project, $100,000:''.

AMENDMENT NO. 642

On page 8, line 16, strike all that follows ''expended:'' to the end of line 24.

AMENDMENT NO. 675 TO AMENDMENT NO. 642

(Purpose: A second degree amendment to the Boxer amendment numbered 642)

Strike ''line 16, strike all that follows 'expended:' to the end of line 24.'', and insert the following: ''line 23, strike all that follows 'tions' through 'Act' on line 24.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 645

(Purpose: To make a technical correction with respect to a Corps of Engineers project in the State of North Dakota)

On page 5, lines 19 through 21, strike ''shall not provide funding for construction of an emergency outlet from Devils Lake, North Dakota, to the Sheyenne River, unless'' and insert ''may use funding previously appropriated to initiate construction of an emergency outlet from Devils Lake, North Dakota, to the Sheyenne River, except that the funds shall not become available unless''.

AMENDMENT NO 676 TO AMENDMENT NO. 645

(Purpose: A second degree amendment to amendment numbered 645 offered by Mr. Dorgan and Mr. Conrad)

On line 4 strike: ''may use funding previously appropriated'', and insert: ''may use Construction, General funding as directed in Public Law 105–62 and Public Law 105–245''.

AMENDMENT NO. 646

(Purpose: To prohibit the inclusion of costs of breaching or removing a dam that is part of the Federal Columbia River Power System within rates charged by the Bonneville Power Administration)

On page 33, between lines 2 and 3, insert the following:

SEC. 3 . PROHIBITING THE INCLUSION OF COSTS OF BREACHING OR REMOVING A DAM THAT IS PART OF THE FEDERAL COLUMBIA RIVER POWER SYSTEM WITHIN RATES CHARGED BY THE BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION.

Section 7 of the Pacific Northwest Electric Power Planning and Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 839e) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(n) PROHIBITING THE INCLUSION OF COSTS OF BREACHING OR REMOVING A DAM THAT IS PART OF THE FEDERAL COLUMBIA RIVER POWER SYSTEM WITHIN RATES CHARGED BY THE BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, rates established under this section shall not include any costs to undertake the removal of breaching of any dam that is part of the Federal Columbia River Power System.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 677 TO AMENDMENT NO. 646

(Purpose: A second degree amendment to the Gorton amendment number 646)

Strike line 2 and all thereafter, and insert the following:

SEC. 3 . LIMITING THE INCLUSION OF COSTS OF PROTECTION OF, MITIGATION OF DAMAGE TO, AND ENHANCEMENT OF FISH, WITHIN RATES CHARGED BY THE BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION, TO THE RATE PERIOD IN WHICH THE COSTS ARE INCURRED.

Section 7 of the Pacific Northwest Electric Power Planning and Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 839e) is amended by adding at the end the following:

(n) LIMITING THE INCLUSION OF COSTS OF PROTECTION OF, MITIGATION OF DAMAGE TO, AND ENHANCEMENT OF FISH, WITHIN RATES CHARGED BY THE BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION, TO THE RATE PERIOD IN WHICH THE COSTS ARE INCURRED.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, rates established by the Administrator, in accordance with established fish funding principles, under this section shall recover costs for protection, mitigation and enhancement of fish, whether under the Pacific Northwest Electric Power Planning and Conservation Act or any other act, not to exceed such amounts the Administrator forecasts will be expended during the period for which such rates are established.''.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 678, 679, 680, AND 681, EN BLOC

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I finally ask unanimous consent that four additional first-degree amendments, which are at the desk, be considered agreed to and that the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, all of the above occurring en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments (Nos. 678, 679, 680, 681) were agreed to, as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 678

(Purpose: To provide for continued funding of wildlife habitat mitigation for the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe, Lower Brule Sioux Tribe, and State of South Dakota)

On page 13, between lines 15 and 16, insert the following:

SEC. 1 . CHEYENNE RIVER SIOUX TRIBE, LOWER BRULE SIOUX TRIBE, AND STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA TERRESTRIAL WILDLIFE HABITAT RESTORATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Army shall continue to fund wildlife habitat mitigation work for the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe, Lower Brule Sioux Tribe, and State of South Dakota at levels previously funded through the Pick-Sloan operations and maintenance account.

(b) CONTRACTS.—With $3,000,000 made available under the heading ''CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL'', the Secretary of the Army shall fund activities authorized under title VI of division C of Public Law 105–277 (112 Stat. 2681–660 through contracts with the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe, Lower Brule Sioux Tribe, and State of South Dakota.

AMENDMENT NO. 679

(Purpose: To provide funds for the Lake Andes-Wagner/Marty II demonstration program)

On page 15, line 1, after ''expended,'' insert ''of which $150,000 shall be available for the Lake Andes-Wagner/Marty II demonstration program authorized by the Lake Andes-Wagner/Marty II Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4677),''.

AMENDMENT NO. 680

(Purpose: To appropriate funding for flood control project in Glendive, Montana)

On page 2, between line 20 and 21 insert the following after the colon: ''Yellowstone River at Glendive, Montana Study, $150,000; and''.

AMENDMENT NO. 681

On page 3, line 14, strike ''$1,113,227,000'' and insert ''$1,086,586,000''.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. The next amendment in order, as I understand, is the Jeffords amendment; is that true?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator from Nevada that it will take unanimous consent to set aside amendment No. 628.

Mr. DOMENICI. We have a technical amendment that stands in the way?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Amendment No. 628 is pending.

Mr. DOMENICI. Is that not the amendment that the Senator from New Mexico put in as a technical amendment early on?

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we go to that amendment and that it be considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 628.

The amendment (No. 628) was agreed to.

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank the Chair.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the time Senator JEFFORDS comes to the Chamber, I be recognized on that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, while we wait for Senator JEFFORDS, who has a very important matter to bring before the Senate, let me thank the many Senators who have cooperated in an effort to get this bill passed. We still have the issue that Senator JEFFORDS will raise before the Senate, but I suggest, in a bill that is about $600 million less than the President requested with reference to the nondefense part of this bill, we have done a pretty good job of covering most of the projects in this country that are needed, that the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation talk about and a number of projects in the sovereign States that our Senators, from both sides of the aisle, represent.

We have done our best. We were not able to fund everything, nor were we able to fund at full dollar, and we had to reduce funding for the ongoing projects substantially in the flood line of money and projects that the Corps of Engineers has going for it.

We understand that the allocations for this subcommittee, which is made up with a significant amount of defense money and a lesser amount of nondefense money, have been allocated in the House in a manner that is about $1.6 billion less than this bill. We do not know how that can ever be worked out in conference, so we are very hopeful that before the House is finished, they will do some of the things that have been done in the Senate to alleviate the pressure on committees such as the energy and water subcommittee and others.

We have no assurance of that, but obviously everything is in place so that when this is passed today, if it is passed, we will be on a path to be ready for the House bill when they send it over and immediately go to conference. We will be ready to do that at the beck and call of the House to try to get this bill done at the earliest possible time.

I will await the arrival of the distinguished Senator from Vermont, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I say to my friend, the senior Senator from New Mexico, that I appreciate his hard work on this measure. This has been very difficult. As he has pointed out, we do not have the money we had last year. To meet all the demands on this very important subcommittee has been very difficult.

We have harbors that need to be dredged. We have water projects that are ongoing which are important to prevent flooding and to allow people to develop commerce in various parts of the country. We have been unable to do all that was required to be done under this bill, but we have done our best.

I extend my appreciation to those Members on this side with whom we have had to work on these amendments. It has been very difficult. There has been some give-and-take on both sides.

Senator DOMENICI and I have worked together now on three different bills, and each year it seems that it gets more difficult.

But for our relationship, this bill would even be more difficult.

I also say what the Senator has said but perhaps in a different way. From this side of the aisle they must hear the message in the other body that we need at least this much money to do a bill. For the other body to come in and say that we are going to cut even more than is cut here means we are not going to get a bill. This has been cut to the bear bones. We cannot go any deeper.

Senator SCHUMER from New York has done an outstanding job in advocating things he thinks the State of New York deserves in this legislation. We have been able to meet many of the things he has suggested and advocated—in fact, most everything. I had a longtime relationship with his predecessor, who was an extremely strong advocate for

the State of New York. Senator SCHUMER certainly stepped into those shoes and has been as strong an advocate as Senator MOYNIHAN.

The one thing we were unable to do for the State of New York dealt with the Community Assistance and Worker Transition Program, and that was at the Brookhaven National Laboratory. Interestingly, yesterday, the one meeting I was able to have off the floor was with Assistant Secretary Dan Reicher. The reason I say ''interestingly'' is because this is the program he works with in the Department of Energy, the Worker Transition Program.

In this bill, there is money for that program. We are ratcheting this down every year. In our bill, we have $30 million for that program. Senator SCHUMER thought there should be an earmark for Brookhaven National Laboratory. We thought that was inappropriate. It had not been done in the past; we could not do it on this bill.

I have indicated to the Senator from New York that we will work in conference to see if there can be something done. But more important, the Senator from New York must know that Assistant Secretary Reicher said Brookhaven was a prime candidate for that.

In short, I believe this can be done administratively and will not require legislation. So if, in fact, the people of Brookhaven are laid off permanently—and it has not been determined yet whether they are going to be laid off permanently—Secretary Reicher indicated there was a real strong possibility they would fit right into the Community Assistance and Worker Transition Program that has been able in the past to cover people at Savannah River in South Carolina, Oak Ridge National Laboratory in Tennessee, the Pinellas Nuclear Facility in Florida, and the Nevada Test Site in Nevada.

So Brookhaven National Laboratory has many of those same conditions and problems. We are going to work very hard to make sure we do what we can to protect those workers at the Brookhaven National Laboratory.

If the reactor at Brookhaven is decommissioned, and the workers have left because of a loss of confidence, or other reasons, the lab certainly will lose its efficiency in its mission. If the reactor is restarted, the decontamination team will need transition assistance.

The simple expedient of providing some assistance now, I believe, will avoid the waste and needless suffering. In short, we are going to do what we can, both from a legislative standpoint, but more importantly from an administrative standpoint, to take care of those problems. So I appreciate, I say to the manager of this bill, the cooperation of the Senator from New York.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I state here for the RECORD my sincere appreciation and thanks to Senator REID, the ranking minority member, and his staff—all of them. This is a complicated bill involving everything from the deepest military needs in terms of research, in terms of development, maintenance, safekeeping of all of our nuclear weapons at our nuclear laboratories around the country, the maintenance of all the other laboratories that DOE runs, to water, inland waterways and barges and seaports and flood prevention. Many Members have an active interest. We have had to work very hard to do what we think is a reasonably good job under the circumstances.

I also say to the distinguished junior Senator from New York, with reference to Brookhaven, I am totally familiar with the situation at Brookhaven. I worked on it for 2 years in a row when they had some problems up there. We worked with the administration and the Department. Clearly, if they qualify for the Worker Transition Program, we ought to be able to handle it administratively. The Department ought to be able to do that.

I say to Senator REID, I will be there helping wherever I can. I am very grateful we did not have to have a vote on this issue, because I think we would have had to object to it. I think it is much better that it be handled administratively. If they are entitled to it, they will get it because the program is already there.

I yield the floor.

Mr. REID addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. We have been told the Senator from Vermont will be here in a matter of a couple minutes. While we are waiting for the Senator to come, I want to just build upon some of the things the senior Senator from New Mexico talked about.

This bill, I am confident, is one of the most complicated bills in the entire 13 Appropriations subcommittees. It deals with the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Department of Energy, atomic energy, defense activities, the Power Marketing Administrations, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, the Appalachian Regional Commission, the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board, and the Tennessee Valley Authority. I think I have covered most all of them.

But this bill deals with a myriad of very difficult problems. We find each year the requests—which are valid requests—from Members trying to protect interests in their State get bigger because the problems become more complex. It has made it most difficult, because the numbers we are allowed to work with are going down all the time.

Not only do we deal with problems in the continental United States, but, of course, our two newest States, Alaska and Hawaii. We also deal with problems in American Samoa, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands. This is very difficult as it relates to the Corps of Engineers.

The construction account for the Corps of Engineers deals with problems that are all over this part of the world. We even deal with problems that some say have gone on too long. The fact of the matter is that sometimes when we are not able to give the full amount of the money in a given year, then the projects take more money. We may start out with a program that costs $100, and if you spread that out over, instead of 1 year, 3 years, it winds up costing more than $100. Those are some of the problems we have faced in this bill.

The Bureau of Reclamation was first authorized in 1902. The Bureau of Reclamation manages, develops, and protects water reclamation projects in arid and semiarid areas in 17 of the Western States. The first ever Bureau of Reclamation project in the history of the United States was in arid Nevada. It was called the Newlands project, named after a Congressman from Nevada named Francis Newlands, who later became a Senator. It was going to make the desert blossom like a rose; and it did. It diverted water from the Truckee River. It created some very difficult problems. In this bill we are working on it. Even though it was 96 years ago that the first act took place, we are still trying to correct some of the problems that were created. The Bureau of Reclamation provides in this bill over $600 million to handle water and related resources accounts. It is something that has been made more interesting as a result of something I talked about when the bill came up on Monday, and that is the CALFED project.

This is a huge project. It is a program that the private sector has invested in, the State of California has invested in, and local government in California has invested in, along with the Federal Government. This project, the Bay Delta in California, CALFED project, deals with two-thirds of the water, the potable water, the water they drink in the State of California—a difficult project. It is something that is extremely important to a State that has 35 million people in it. Yet we have projects from the Bureau of Reclamation to some of our smallest States and populations, but we have to work with this multitude of problems with less money. And we keep going down, as I said.

The Department of Energy, a large part of this bill: We deal there with energy programs, nondefense environmental management, uranium enrichment and decontamination, decommissioning funds; we deal with science programs, atomic energy, defense activities, which take up a large amount of money in this bill; and we have to do this to support the safety and reliability of our nuclear stockpile. This program is becoming even more important with the emphasis that has been focused on our nuclear programs as a result of the China problem dealing with the supposed theft, the alleged

theft, the spying that has taken place in one of our laboratories, and maybe more than one of our laboratories.

Power marketing administrations: We have had to work money there to see what we can do to maintain that very important program.

The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission is part of our responsibilities.

We have also had for many years the responsibility of a program established in 1965 called the Appalachian Regional Commission. This is a regional economic development agency. This program, which has been going on for some 44 years, receives over $70 million in this bill, which is important for a large part of the United States. The amount of money we have been asked to increase for this program has been very difficult to come by. There have been the increased construction costs of the Richie County Dam, and the cost has gone up because of delays due to a legal challenge over some problems in the Fourth Circuit. This caused our bill to be required to spend more money.

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission: This bill provides $465.4 million. There are some offsetting revenues that we reduced the amount we need to put in this bill.

For each of these entities, everything we do is vitally important. Each dollar we do not put in is something less that they can do that certainly is required.

Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board: This is a board which reviews what happens with this very important issue of nuclear waste. Just this morning, the full committee, authorizing committee, chaired by the junior Senator from Alaska, reported out a very important nuclear waste bill. Part of what happens with nuclear waste has to be reviewed by the Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board. We fund that program.

One of the programs that has been ongoing for many, many years, back in the days of the Depression, is the Tennessee Valley Authority. Under this bill, they receive some $7 million.

We have a lot to do in this bill. It seems it becomes more complicated each year because of the cut in moneys that we receive. We have worked very hard, as the Senator from New Mexico has indicated, trying to resolve most of these amendments. We have been able to do it with the cooperation of Senators on both sides of the aisle.

AMENDMENT NO. 648

(Purpose: To increase funding for energy supply, research, and development activities relating to renewable energy sources, with an offset)

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I make a point of order that amendment No. 648, offered by Senator JEFFORDS, violates section 302(f) of the Budget Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is not pending. The Senator would have to call for the amendment.

Mr. REID. I believe that was already done with a unanimous consent request.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, as far as I know, my amendment has not been called up.

Mr. REID. That is what the Chair just said.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada is recognized.

Mr. REID. I ask that amendment No. 648 be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. JEFFORDS], for himself, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. ROTH, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. KERRY, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. KENNEDY, proposes an amendment numbered 648.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the amendment.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The regular order is the reading of the amendment.

The amendment shall be read to completion until consent is granted to dispense with the reading.

The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 20. strike lines 21 through 24 and insert "$791,233,000, of which $821,000 shall be derived by transfer from the Geothermal Resources Development Fund and $5,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from the United States Enrichment Corporation Fund, and of which $70,000,000 shall be derived from accounts for which this Act makes funds available for unnecessary Department of Energy contractor travel expenses (of which not less than $4,450,000 shall be available for solar building technology research, not less than $82,135,000 shall be available for photovoltaic energy systems, not less than $17,600,000 shall be available for concentrating solar systems, not less than $37,700,000 shall be available for power systems in biomass/biofuels energy systems, not less than $48,000,000 shall be available for transportation in biomass/biofuels energy systems (of which not less than $1,500,000 shall be available for the Consortium for Plant Biotechnology Research), not less than $42,265,000 shall be available for wind energy systems, not less than $4,000,000 shall be available for the renewable energy production incentive program, not less than $7,600,000 shall be available for support of solar programs, not less than $5,100,000 shall be available for the international solar energy program, not less than $5,000,000 shall be available for the National Renewable Energy Laboratory, not less than $27,850,000 shall be available for geothermal technology development, not less than $27,700,000 shall be available for hydrogen research, not less than $6,400,000 shall be available for hydropower research, not less than $32,000,000 shall be available for high temperature superconducting research and development, not less than $3,000,000 shall be available for energy storage systems, and not less than $18,500,000 shall be available for direction of programs).".

Mr. REID addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I make a point of order that amendment No. 648 offered by Senator JEFFORDS violates section 302(f) of the Budget Act which prohibits consideration of legislation that exceeds the committee's allocation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, in the long tradition of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to amend the amendment by deleting the word "unnecessary" as it first appears in the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is objection.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative assistant proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, because we were in a quorum call, I wanted to point out to my colleagues that a group of us, just moments ago, held a press conference discussing the issue——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The rules require unanimous consent for the Senator to proceed at this point because a point of order has been made against the pending amendment.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, under the rules of the Senate, does the Senator object to having to identify himself?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would ask, object to what?

Mr. DURBIN. The Senator who objects to the unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is a matter of order in the Senate not to proceed when there is a pending point of order.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Objection to what?

Mr. DOMENICI. What is the request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Would the Senator from North Dakota state his request.

Mr. DORGAN. I asked consent to be recognized. My understanding is we were in a quorum call. I asked consent to be recognized for the purpose of discussing a press conference we just held on the Patients' Bill of Rights. Because we were in a quorum call and not conducting other Senate business, I wanted to have a few minutes to discuss

that subject. So I ask unanimous consent to be able to do so.

Mr. DOMENICI. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is objection.

Mr. JEFFORDS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, at this time, I would like to take the floor to discuss the amendment that I have just withdrawn. I do so with some reluctance, but denying a Senator the right to amend his own amendment is such a rare situation—if not unprecedented—that I think it is only fair and appropriate for those of us who have worked long and hard on this amendment and know they have sufficient votes to pass it, as modified, to have the opportunity to at least discuss and to let this body know what they are being prevented from doing by virtue of this rare use of the rules.

Mr. REID. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JEFFORDS. I yield for a question.

Mr. REID. I want to state to the Senator that as one of the managers of this bill, I think the content of his amendment is very good. I think he has had a record of looking out for programs like solar and renewable energy. I have a personal commitment to work with the Senator from Vermont and the senior Senator from New Mexico as this matter goes to conference to see how well we can do in regard to the matters he has put before the Senate.

In short, my statement is in the form of a reverse question. I want the Senator to understand that certainly there was nothing personal in regard to exercising my rights under the rule. In fact, it is one of the more difficult things I have done in my time here. The Senator from Vermont offered something that I think needs to be spoken about. He has done it before very eloquently, and we will do the best we can from the time that this bill leaves this body until it gets to conference, keeping this amendment in mind.

Mr. DOMENICI. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DORGAN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMENICI. Without losing your right to the floor.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Yes.

Mr. DOMENICI. I have no objection to the Senator from Vermont debating and discussing the issue, as he sees it. I would just like to ask, in the interest of moving things along—there are no other amendments. Everything is finished on the bill—I wonder how long the Senator from Vermont would like to discuss it. Is it possible that he might tell us?

Mr. JEFFORDS. I cannot give the Senator anything but a guesstimate because I have many supporters of this amendment who may or may not desire to speak. But I have no intention of trying to filibuster this bill.

Mr. DOMENICI. I didn't say that.

Mr. JEFFORDS. I understand. I just wanted to make it clear. But what I do want to have everyone understand is that this modification of the amendment is by taking one word out in order to meet a requirement of the budget. The budget requirement may or may not be valid, but once you get it, there is not much you can do about it. The whole disagreement here is with respect to the one word ''unnecessary,'' which we want to delete, because by using that word we inadvertently created a budget point of order. Because as far as the Budget Committee is concerned, there is never any unnecessary use of the airplane, or travel by the Department of Energy, even though they spent some $250 million traveling where and why and who I do not know, which was more than enough, with a reasonable cut in the use of their airplanes, to fund a very important amendment dealing with more emphasis on renewable resources.

I would like to, certainly for a question, yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, let me just propound a question. But before I do, let me state to the Senator from Vermont that I am a cosponsor of what he is trying to do. I think what he is trying to do is very important.

I regret that we found this parliamentary situation that created a point of order. I don't quite know how one gets out of this at this point. I regret that the Senator felt that he had to withdraw the amendment, but I think what he and I and others are trying to do makes a lot of sense in terms of investment for this country and investment in the future with alternative energy resources. It is very important, especially because some of the programs show such great promise for our country's future.

I regret that we are not able to proceed with his amendment. I think the offset is appropriate. I think the amendment would advance this country's energy interests. I know because of the press of time that folks want to move forward. I will not say more except to say that I appreciate the leadership of the Senator from Vermont on this. I hope this is not the end of it. I hope that perhaps by this process by committees in the Senate and in the House we can find a way to do what the Senator and I and so many others want to do.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I would be happy to yield to the Senator from Delaware without giving up my right to the floor.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I want to congratulate my colleague for the leadership that he has provided in this renewable energy program.

I strongly believe that renewable energy technology represents our best hope for reducing air pollution, creating jobs, and decreasing our reliance on imported oil and finite supplies of fossil fuel. These programs promise to supply economically competitive and commercially viable exports. I believe that the nation should be looking toward clean, alternative forms of energy, not taking a step backward by cutting funding for these important programs.

Indeed this is a sentiment shared by a majority of the American people. Public support for renewable energy programs is strong. For the fifth year in a row, a national poll has revealed that Americans believe renewable energy along with energy efficiency should be the highest energy research and development priority.

My own State of Delaware has a long tradition in solar energy. In 1972, the University of Delaware established one of the first photovoltaic laboratories in the nation, the Institute for Energy Conversion, which has been instrumental in developing photovoltaic technology. Delaware's major solar energy manufacturer, Astro Power, has become the largest U.S.-owned photovoltaic company and has doubled its work force since 1997.

While the solar energy industry might have evolved in some form on its own, federal investment has accelerated the transition from the laboratory bench to commercial markets by leveraging private sector efforts. This collaboration has already accrued valuable economic benefits to the nation. Solar energy companies—like Astro Power—have already created thousands of jobs and helped to reduce our trade deficit through exports. My state has demonstrated that solar energy technology can be an economically competitive and commercially viable energy alternative.

International markets for solar energy systems are virtually exploding, due to several key market trends. Most notably, solar energy is already one of the lowest cost options available to developing countries that cannot afford to build large, expensive centralized power generation facilities with elaborate distribution systems.

The governments of Japan, Germany, and Australia are investing heavily in aggressive technology and market development in partnership with their own solar energy industries. Until recently, Japan and Germany held the lead in world market share for photovoltaics; the United States has only recently recaptured international market dominance.

Cutting funding for these technologies would have a chilling effect on the U.S. industry's ability to compete on an international scale in these billion-dollar markets of today and tomorrow. The employment potential of renewables represents a minimum of

15,000 new jobs this decade with nearly 120,000 the next decade.

It is imperative that this Senate support renewable energy technologies and be a partner to an energy future that addresses our economic needs in an environmentally acceptable manner. My state has done and will continue to do its part. I hope my colleagues in the Senate will look to the future and do their part in securing a safe and reliable energy future by supporting this amendment.

Again, I want to congratulate my distinguished colleague for his leadership on this most important matter.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I certainly thank my good friend from Delaware who has been out front on this issue for many years. I appreciate his efforts in this area.

The amendment that Senator ROTH and I desire to offer today is about priorities. I think we all agree that increased domestic energy production should be a priority. We agree that a lower balance of payments should be a priority. We agree that helping farmers, ranchers and rural communities is a priority. We agree that standing up for U.S. companies selling U.S. manufacturing energy technologies in overseas markets is a priority. We cheer the increased job markets in every State in this Nation. We support the small companies across the Nation that are working to capture the booming global energy market, and we would make it a priority to promote clean air. The bill does not do that in its present form.

The bill before us further whittles away our Nation's efforts to wean itself from foreign oil. It erodes our efforts to develop technology that increases domestic energy production. It ends commitments made to small energy companies that depend on Federal assistance to enter the giant global energy market. It reduces our efforts to make major advancements in energy development. It reduces our commitment to energy that is affordable, that is clean, and, most importantly, that is made in America.

The administration requested a 16-percent increase in renewable funding—from $384 million to $446 million. More than half of the Senate—54 Senators—signed a letter in support of this $62 million increase. The committee did not request an increase in the renewable budget. It did not even hold at a renewable budget level. The committee cut the budget by $13 million. There is a $92 million shortfall between the committee mark and the amount requested by more than one-half of the Senate.

A vote for this amendment is a vote for five things, if we are allowed to present it.

It is a vote for national security.

It is a vote for small businesses across the United States that produce clean, renewable energy.

It is a vote for farmers and ranchers in rural communities across America.

It is a vote to help American business grab onto a chunk of that rapidly growing export market for renewable products.

And a vote for this amendment is a vote for cleaner air for our children.

I am going to address each of these reasons why my colleagues should support this bill in turn.

First of all, we have charts that allow you to understand better what we are discussing.

This is a vote about national security. It is about making our Nation's future secure by securing our energy future.

The U.S. trade deficit has scored as its No. 1 contributor imported foreign oil, which has reached record levels.

Foreign oil imports constituted 55 percent of consumption early this year and is expected to reach more than 70 percent by the year 2020. At that time, most of the world's oil—over 64 percent—is expected to come from potentially unstable Persian Gulf nations. These imports account for over $60 billion, or 36 percent of the U.S. trade deficit. These are U.S. dollars being shipped overseas to the Middle East which could be put to better use at home.

The defense leaders of our Nation agree that increasing dependence on foreign oil has serious implications for our national and energy security. They agree that investing in renewable energy is an invaluable insurance policy to enhance our national and energy security.

Lee Butler agrees. He is the former commander of the Strategic Air Command and strategic air planner for Operation Desert Storm. Robert McFarlane agrees. Robert McFarlane was National Security Adviser under former President Ronald Reagan. Thomas Moorer agrees. Thomas Moorer is former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. James Woolsey agrees. James Woolsey is a former Director of the CIA. In a recent letter to Members of Congress, these national security leaders support the administration's budget request for renewable energy.

Reading from my first chart, the national security leader said:

> Current conflicts in the Middle East and the Balkans and our stressed defense capability only reinforce our earlier concerns that our increasing dependence on imported oil has serious implications for national and energy security. Wars and terrorism strongly highlight the benefits of obtaining domestic, dispersed renewable energy systems and efficiency. . . .
>
> Now is clearly the time to increase our coverage under this valuable insurance policy for our security—the availability of renewable resources and improvements in energy efficiency. Such a commitment will not only enhance national and energy security, but also bring with it global leadership, environmental and economic benefits, new industry and high quality jobs.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

I ask unanimous consent David Hunter of my staff be granted privilege of the floor during the pendency of the energy and water appropriations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, no crisis can stop the sun from shining, the wind from blowing, or the Earth from producing geothermal heat.

Let's review some alternatives we have and how they can be utilized. Geysers Geothermal Power Plant in California is an example of the sort of energy savings we can gain through ''made in America'' geothermal energy.

American soil holds a natural resource available throughout much of this country: Geysers produce the energy equivalent of over 250 million barrels of oil and currently provide electricity for over 1 million people. Geysers Geothermal Power Plant in California is an example.

The next chart shows renewable generation by each State, indicating how much renewable energy is produced in every State in the United States. I think all Senators ought to take that into consideration. We are hurting small businesses located in every State in the United States. Every Senator in the United States is a stakeholder in this debate. These States have a substantial energy generation capacity. Much is not utilized, and much more is available. It is very extensive, according to the chart.

The next chart shows the top 20 States for wind energy. There is a lot of wind around this place especially, but also around the rest of the country. This chart shows the top 20 States for wind energy potential. Although most of the wind potential generated today has occurred in California, many States have much greater wind potential. The top 20 States for wind energy potential are: North Dakota, Texas, Kansas, South Dakota, Montana, Nebraska, Wyoming, Oklahoma, Minnesota, Iowa, Colorado, New Mexico, Idaho, Michigan, New York, Illinois, California, Wisconsin, Maine, and Missouri. The American Midwest is the Saudi Arabia of wind energy. North Dakota alone can produce 36 percent of all U.S. electric power needs. New Mexico could produce 10 percent of U.S. electric power needs. The oil wells in Saudi Arabia will eventually run dry. The wind in North Dakota will supply indefinitely a steady source of power.

Next is a map of localities with geothermal energy. Like the sun shining on American soil and the wind blowing over it, geothermal energy is a great American resource. It is good for the environment, good for the country, and good for business. This chart shows bountiful geothermal energy supplies, especially on the west coast.

I have a series of pictures of renewable energy projects across the country. They demonstrate that a vote for renewable energy is a vote for ranchers, farmers, and small communities all across America.

This chart shows the North State Power Wind Farm in Minnesota. The

wind facility has pumped over $125 million into the local economy and provides an extra source of income for local farmers in Lake Benton, MN.

Farmers make money through royalty payments for the wind turbines on their lands. They continue to farm their lands and make additional money for the wind that blows above it. This shows municipal utility wind turbines in Traverse City, MI. Note the corn growing. This wind turbine provides clean, renewable, locally produced wind energy for the people of Traverse City, MI.

The next chart shows Culberson Wind Plant in Texas. This wind facility is the largest energy producer in Culberson County. It provides $400,000 annually in tax revenues to Culberson County hospitals and schools. That is 10 percent of the county's property tax base. It also provides $100,000 to the Texas public school fund.

It is not just wind energy that is helpful in small communities. Photovoltaic helps ranchers and farmers. This is a cattle rancher with a photovoltaic-powered well in Idaho. This Idaho rancher powers his home and pumps well water for his cattle under a photovoltaic program offered by Idaho Power Company.

This chart shows Kotzebue Electric Association Village Power Project in Kotzebue, AK. The projects will reduce emissions from diesel plants and reduce fuel transport and costs to the villagers.

Next is Ontario Hydro Village Power Project. There is a large market for export of U.S. wind turbines to northern communities in Alaska, Canada, and Russia. This turbine was built in Vermont and exported to Ontario, Canada. In the last 10 years, photovoltaic sales have more than quadrupled. In developing countries, demand has increased because it is attractive to isolated communities that are distant from the power plant and because they have small electric requirements.

Although America is still a leader in developing renewable energy technologies, this lead may slip if we lower our renewable research and development funding. Europe and Japan continue to subsidize their renewable industry, putting U.S.-based companies at a severe disadvantage.

For example, Japan, Germany, and Denmark use tied aid, offer financing, and provide export promotion for their domestic industries, and our industries have to compete with that. It is very difficult to do. But because of its success and the fact that we have advantages, they have been able to survive, with great difficulty, without having that assistance from loans. This is not the time to lose our lead or to cut funding out of this important industry.

There is one final reason why my colleagues should overwhelmingly support this amendment. A vote on this amendment is also a vote for the environment.

Consider this chart showing children playing in front of a windmill in Iowa's Spirit Lake district. The wind turbine generates power for the school. It is emission free, completely natural. Few us of us want to have our children play under smokestacks or near oil fields or uranium enrichment plants. Few of us want our children to fight wars in the Middle East over oil. But we are all happy to have our children playing in the wind and the sun.

Next is a geothermal powerplant in Dixie Valley, NV. This plant, which produces electricity for 100,000 people, produces no emissions and 1 to 5 percent as much SO_X and CO_2 as a coal-fired plant of the same size.

Mr. REID. Will the Senator yield?

It is a beautiful place, isn't it? It is very close to the Fallon Naval Air Training Center, which is the premier fighter training center for the Navy pilots. That is where they train to land on carriers. Some of their training can be watched from this powerplant.

Mr. JEFFORDS. We should have more of them. I wish the Senator would support my amendment, and we could really help the State.

Mr. REID. I also say to my friend, a number of the programs he has talked about are at places I have been, for example, the wind energy plant in California. These are places I have been. I watched these windmills. It is very exciting.

I finalize my question to the Senator. The Senator is aware that last year's bill we reported out of this subcommittee was less than what we reported out this year. Is the Senator aware of that? The bill we reported out of this subcommittee last year was less than what we reported out this year. I can assure the Senator that is accurate. It was only with the supplemental that this number came up larger than the number that we gave this year. The number, including the supplemental, was $12 million more than what we recommended this year, but about $50 million less than what the subcommittee approved last year.

Mr. JEFFORDS. I point out that it was because of my amendment, which was adopted last year. I appreciate the Senator being aware of that. I wish we would take the same approach this year and adopt this amendment, and then we will make sure we have a much better prospect for the future.

Mr. REID. As I said to the Senator when he first began, he has done excellent work here, and we appreciate it very much.

I will ask the Senator another question. We have had a number of Senators come to the floor. There are one or two Senators who want to speak on this. Would the Senator have any objection to having a final vote on this, and when it is over people can talk on this issue for as long as they desire?

Mr. JEFFORDS. A vote on my amendment? I have no problem with that.

Mr. REID. I am sorry; I did not hear the Senator.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Have a final vote on my amendment, yes, I would like that.

Mr. REID. Of course, the only thing in order is final passage, so the answer to my question is no.

Mr. JEFFORDS. If you are saying without my amendment being voted on? You are saying we will vote your amendment and then we can go to final vote? That would be fine with me.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont has the floor.

Mr. DOMENICI. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JEFFORDS. I am happy to yield.

Mr. DOMENICI. I am fully aware of the genuine interest the Senator has in this and his enthusiasm and his hard work. But I wonder if he might permit me to speak for 2 minutes and yield right back to him.

Mr. JEFFORDS. I will do that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. I just want to share with my fellow Senators the reality of what has happened to solar energy in this bill. First of all, in the Senate bill, for everything in this bill that is nondefense, there is a reduction of 7 percent. That means that for all of the things we do in water, in the Corps of Engineers, and all the other things, there is a 7 percent reduction. If we were to adopt this amendment, we would be taking this piece of the budget and increasing it 7 percent, thus giving it a 14 percent preferential treatment over the rest of the nondefense items in this bill.

All we are doing in this bill is reducing from $365.9 million, reducing it by $12 million, which is less than a 3 percent reduction, which means this is already favored by way of prioritizing by about 5 percent better than the other nondefense accounts here. So we can talk all afternoon and into the night about how great renewables are; we can all agree; but that is not the issue. The issue is, should we add $70 million when we have had to reduce everything else that is nondefense by the huge amounts I have just described? I do not think we need to.

Most of the things the Senator is discussing we will continue to do, and some that are in the pipeline ready to get done will get done because we are going to fund this at $353.9 million. That is not peanuts. Most of the solar things we want to do as a nation will get done.

As long as everybody knows, we are not trying to be arbitrary. We thought we were very fair in the treatment of renewables in this bill. It was not enough. We had to add $70 million more with an amendment that was out of order because it added to the amount we had to spend in our allocation, which means it breaks the budget.

I yield the floor.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont has the floor.

Mr. JEFFORDS. I yield for the purposes of debate, control of the floor, to my great friend from Colorado.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ALLARD. I thank the Senator from Vermont for yielding to me. I am not going to take a lot of time.

I want to recognize the leadership and fine work he has done in fighting to get this to the floor of the Senate. I am obviously disappointed, as he is, in the fact we are not going to have a vote on this. But I do have some charts and, like my colleague, will talk about the importance of renewable energy, particularly in the context of wind energy, geothermal, and solar energy.

The Senator's State, like the State of Colorado, has done a considerable amount in this area. It is important to the State of Colorado. In fact, we have a research laboratory in Colorado just to address things we are talking about on the floor.

I just wanted to recognize in a public way the Senator's contribution and effort in trying to move forward with renewable energy. It has been a pleasure to be associated with my colleague on this amendment.

I thank my colleague, the Senator from Vermont, for once again standing firm in his commitment to renewable energy. I concur with the Senator from Vermont and would like to share my thoughts on the importance of funding the Department of Energy's renewables budget.

While the record clearly shows that I am a dedicated fiscal conservative, I also see the importance of spending a little now, to save a lot more later. By investing in the research and development of these energy sources today, we are saving taxpayers billions of dollars tomorrow in costs associated with much more than energy. Mr. President, it is not an exaggeration to say that our future as a nation and a community depends in part on the decisions we make today when it comes to energy matters. In this modern day of technological boom, energy literally runs the world in which we live. From the cars we drive to the homes we live in, without affordable, accessible sources of energy, we open ourselves up to dangers that we simply cannot allow to happen.

In their paper titled The New Petroleum from the January/February 1999 issue of the publication Foreign Affairs, my colleague from Indiana, Senator LUGAR, and former CIA Director James Woolsey argue the importance of increasing our use of alternative energy sources, in this case, biofuels. They appropriately note that, ''New demand for oil will be filled largely by the Middle East, meaning a transfer of more than $1 trillion over the next 15 years to the unstable states of the Persian Gulf alone—on top of the $90 billion they received in 1996.'' As a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, and Select Committee on Intelligence, I hear first-hand about foreign nations that are working to use energy sources to neutralize. I would hope that the rest of my colleagues share my concerns about sending $1 trillion over the next 15 years to rogue nations in the Middle East who are developing weapons of mass destruction as we speak, with an intent to harm American interests. We must be firm in our decision to develop accessible, affordable and dependable sources of energy here at home—our security may depend on it.

The environmental benefits of renewable energy are also well noted and do not need too much repeating. Not only are renewable sources of energy beneficial to our national security, but they reduce, and in fact help to eliminate harmful greenhouse gas emissions. Wind, solar, geothermal, biomass, photovoltaic and other renewable energies have few if any harmful by-products. It is simply good policy to do all we can to effectively harness and utilize the natural, clean, re-usable sources of energy that are abundantly all around us.

I would like to illustrate a few Colorado-specific points if I may.

The Solar Energy Research Facility at the Department of Energy's National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL) in Golden, Colorado houses over 200 scientists and engineers. This building was designed to use energy efficient and renewable energy technologies—like the photovoltaic panels seen here—and reduce costs by 30% from the federal standard. Much of the Department's funding that was cut by the Committee goes to this vital facility in my state.

NREL is on the cutting edge in bringing renewable energy technologies out of the laboratory and into the mainstream of American business and society. Recognizing that America has rivals in many Asian and European nations in investing in the development of these technologies, NREL deserves credit for many wonderful accomplishments.

Wind power use in Colorado is becoming increasingly popular. If you've ever spent any time along the foothills of the Rocky Mountains, you know that the wind can whip down from the mountains quite fast. That wind can be easily harnessed for energy. Public Service Company of Colorado operates several wind powering facilities, one of which is in Northern Colorado on the Wyoming border in Ponnequin. Expansions of many wind facilities in Colorado are taking place as we speak. In many Northern Colorado communities, demand for wind energy has risen so dramatically that the Platte River Power Authority of Ft. Collins is planning to more than triple the installed capacity of its wind farm just across the border in Medicine Bow, Wyoming. Residents in this area can look forward to making a positive contribution to the environment.

The current levelized cost of wind energy is between 4 and 6 cents per kilowatt-hour, with a goal approaching 2.5 cents by 2010. According to NREL, the cost of this technology has already decreased by more than 80% since the early 1980's due to continued cost-shared R&D partnerships between industry and DOE.

The developable, windy land in just 5 western states could produce electricity equivalent to the annual demand of the contiguous 48 states. Total worldwide wind energy generating capacity now exceeding the 10,000 megawatt point with expectations of 100,000 megawatts by 2020. Thanks to continued research and development, the industry has grown from being California-based to having wind sites in 18 states.

Photovoltaic water pumping systems are being used on hundreds of ranches and farms across the U.S. to bring power to remote locations—like in some parts of Colorado—that would otherwise cost tens of thousands of dollars in extending existing power lines. In locations where solar resources are not bountiful, other renewable technologies, like wind energy, can be used in a similar fashion.

This is an application of renewable energy that interests me greatly. For those farmers who live in remote areas, renwable energy systems also offer distinct advantages in agricultural applications where power lines are subject to failure due to flooding, icing or other seasonal changes. These energy technologies also make sense where electrical needs are relatively small or are seasonal.

In conclusion, I want to reiterate my belief that investing in research and development of renewable energies is a win-win solution in every sense. Jobs are created, taxpayer money is saved, our national security is enhanced and the environment is protected. The future of our security and prosperity depends on the commitments we make today.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, renewable energy is a win-win. Renewable technologies such as wind, solar, geothermal, and biomass are domestic and clean. Many renewable applications are especially suited to remote rural locations where construction of electric transmission facilities are prohibitively expensive. The federal government has had a very successful program installing 122 photovoltaic systems in place of diesel generators at remote locations of the National Park Service, Forest Service and BLM. (Chart) These systems produce electric power without any noise or emissions. Photovoltaics are also well-suited for use on remote areas of Indian Reservations.

Collaboration between the National Labs and U.S. industry has made huge strides in photovoltaic efficiency and cost-competitiveness. The cost of photovoltaic systems have declined 10 fold since 1980. Ongoing work in system reliability and long-term performance is crucial to continued development of U.S. leadership in this area. The Department of Energy's proposed budget is barely 40% of what Japan and half of what Germany spend on photovoltaic research.

Another important technology is concentrating solar power, where the sun's energy is first converted to heat then used to generate electricity in a conventional generator. The federal research program, centered at Sandia, has been a true success. Further work in advanced trough technology and dish based systems, which can be dispatched into the electricity grid, promise to dramatically lower costs. Based on World Bank estimates of capacity installation for these technologies, up to $12 billion in sales of U.S.-manufactured products and up to 13,000 new jobs could be created by U.S. industry by 2010.

Since the 1980's the cost of wind power has declined 80% (from 25 cents to 4.5 cents per kilowatt hour.) With the necessary support, the cost of wind will be down to 3 cents per kilowatt hour or lower within five years. This amendment will fund U.S.-based turbine certification, international consensus standards, wind mapping to assist in targeting key areas, and support to industry on solving near term problems. The export opportunities for U.S. industry are large, but the U.S. must compete against the highly subsidized European manufacturers.

The opportunities for economic development of geothermal power in the U.S. west are vast. The Department of Energy has an initiative underway to cut the cost of drilling for geothermal resources by 25% within the next two years. Geothermal, especially using non-drinking water sources and treated wastewater, can become an important energy source for arid states. This research with commercial development could result in development of 30,000 jobs in the U.S. and open up significant international marketing opportunities for U.S. manufacturers.

The research programs funded by this amendment are making important contributions to the ongoing restructuring of the electric utility industry. For example, many experts believe the future of electric power generation will be in the form of small, so-called ''distributed'' generation technologies. Smaller power plants offer advantages in terms of improved efficiency and reliability as well as reduced environmental impacts. Solar, wind, geothermal, biomass and other generating technologies such as fuel cells and microturbines are all likely approaches to distributed generation. The Energy Committee will hold an oversight hearing on distributed generation next week. Finally, research in this bill is also helping assure the continued security and reliability of the nation's high-tension transmission grid. Sandia Labs in New Mexico is a key partner in DOE's transmission research program.

I think it is critical to maintain our momentum in renewable energy research. The proposed budget cuts in the bill are unfortunate and unnecessary. I am pleased to support the amendment and I thank Senator JEFFORDS for his efforts.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I have the pleasure of joining Senator JEFFORDS to rise in support of the renewable energy programs within the Energy and Water Appropriations bill. First, let me thank Senators DOMENICI and REID for their hard work to put together a balanced appropriations bill under very difficult budget constraints. I know both of these Senators support the renewable energy programs at Department of Energy and would have liked to come closer to the President's requested funding level. However, as with all the appropriations bills, this year has forced all of us to make difficult choices.

I am supporting the Jeffords amendment because I firmly believe that developing new solar and renewable energy sources is absolutely critical to reducing our reliance on imported fossil fuels and addressing climate change. Anyone who had the pleasure of spending some of this spring in the Northeast will tell you that although we all appreciated the glorious 85 degree days, it was unusual. After about a week, Vermonters really began to wonder about the strange weather. This is only a harbinger of things to come if we do not aggressively address the greenhouse gases that contribute to climate change.

The solar and renewable energy programs will help our nation find alternative energy sources and help our states and industry start using them. We need to invest more funding to develop renewable energy technology and to bring this technology into the mainstream. Coming from Vermont, I have already seen how this technology can be used. During the nuclear freeze movement of the 1980s, Vermonters adopted a saying: ''As Vermont goes, so goes the nation.'' I hope that our state can provide similar leadership to set the nation on a path in the new millennium to promote the development and use of renewable energy.

From the Green Mountain Power wind farm in Searsburg to the McNeil biomass gasifier in Burlington, Vermont is developing and using renewable energy sources. These large projects are being looked at as models for how public-private partnerships can spur growth in our renewable energy sectors. Vermont is also leading the nation in developed small, community-based renewable energy projects. Many Vermont communities have shifted away from fossil energy sources to biomass, building small wood-fired systems. Biomass is now being used in Vermont schools, low-income housing projects, state office buildings and mills.

Vermont is also taking this technology overseas. I am proud to say that several Vermont renewable energy businesses have created niche markets for their technology all around the world. Just a few weeks ago, Prime Minister Tony Blair turned on the lights at a school that had just installed a small wind turbine built by a Vermont company. Another Vermont company has developed solar panels that are being used by individual homes in many developing countries where there is no central energy source.

When Vermont and the nation consider what the next millennium will look like the most important question to be asked is what do we want to pass on to the next generation?

I want my grandson to be able to hike through the Green Mountains and see the same majestic forests and mountain peaks as I did. I want him to be able to fish in Lake Champlain without having to worry about what heavy metals are in it. If my grandchildren are going to enjoy these experiences, our nation has to reduce our reliance on fossil fuels and increase our use of renewable energy. The Jeffords amendment will ensure that the successes of the solar and renewable energy programs at Department of Energy are replicated to help our nation meet this goal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont has the floor.

Mr. WELLSTONE addressed the Chair.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, let me first ask unanimous consent to add 13 additional original cosponsors to my amendment. These are: Mr. ALLARD, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. GRASSLEY, Ms. COLLINS, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. CLELAND, Mr. ROTH, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. KERRY, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. BRYAN, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. HAGEL, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. CHAFEE, and Mr. WELLSTONE.

I yield, reserving my right to the floor, to the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the names will be added as cosponsors.

The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, it is my understanding the unanimous consent request applies to the amendment that has been withdrawn; is that right?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Vermont desire to withdraw the amendment?

Mr. REID. It has already been withdrawn. The unanimous consent request to add cosponsors applies to the amendment that has been withdrawn.

Mr. JEFFORDS. It applies to the amendment I had pending on the list. I guess that is the best way to describe it.

Mr. REID. The amendment has been withdrawn; is that right?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct, the amendment has been withdrawn.

Mr. REID. I have no objection to the cosponsors being added to the amendment that has been withdrawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the cosponsors will be added, and, without objection, the Senator may yield the floor to the Senator from Minnesota, as he reserves his right to the floor.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, rather than having to put it in the form of a question, I appreciate the way my colleague made the UC request.

I come to the floor in complete support of what Senator JEFFORDS is trying to do. One can look at it in a couple of different ways. One can look at it in terms of the numbers in the here and now, but, frankly, as I look at this picture over a period of time, I do not think we have done near what we should by way of investment in renewable energy. That is what my colleague from Vermont is saying.

I come from a cold weather State at the other end of the pipeline, and when we import barrels of oil and Mcfs of natural gas, we export dollars and yet we are rich in resources—wind, solar, safe energy.

My colleague is right on the mark. I thank him for his leadership. We should be making much more of an investment in this area. It is on sound ground from the point of view of the environment. It leads us down the path of smaller business economic development, technologies that are more compatible with communities, more homegrown economies, more capital investment locally. I thank my colleague for his work and tell him what he has been trying to do is important. He is right on the mark, and I add my support to his effort.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont has the floor.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I will continue with my presentation of the merits of this amendment. I have no intention of holding up this body any longer than necessary; necessary meaning this preemptive strike is designed to make us accomplish our goals.

The next chart is the Westinghouse power connection's biomass gasification facility in Hawaii. This demonstrates the potential to convert agricultural waste—sugarcane in this case—into electricity.

I have another chart to demonstrate the power of all of these generating plants. This one is at BC International Corporation, biomass ethanol plant in Jennings, LA. This plant will be retrofitted to produce ethanol from sugarcane bagasse and rice waste.

That completes my charts. I hope my colleagues have been impressed with what we could have done if we were not prohibited.

Let me conclude by reminding everyone we are proposing to add $70 million through our amendment to the Department of Energy's solar, wind, and renewable budget. Federal support for renewable energy research and development has been a major success story in the United States. Costs have declined, reliability has improved, and a growing domestic industry has been born. More work still needs to be done in applied research and development to bring down the cost of the production even further.

This is a tremendous opportunity for this Nation which will help us reduce our trade deficits. The need for renewable R&D is not a partisan issue:

> We must encourage environmentally responsible development of all U.S. energy resources, including renewable energy. Renewable energy does reduce demand upon our other finite natural resources. It enhances our energy security, and clearly, it protects the environment.

This was President Bush, September 1991.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. President, I move to recommit the bill to the Appropriations Committee, and further, that the committee report the bill forthwith, with the following amendment. Mr. President, I send the amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

> The Senator from Vermont [Mr. JEFFORDS] moves to recommit the bill S. 1186 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report back forthwith, with an amendment numbered 682.

The amendment is as follows:

> On page 20, strike lines 21 through 24 and insert ''$791,233,000, of which $821,000 shall be derived by transfer from the Geothermal Resources Development Fund and $5,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from the United States Enrichment Corporation Fund, and of which $75,000,000 shall be derived from accounts for which this Act makes funds available for Department of Energy contractor travel expenses (of which not less than $4,450,000 shall be available for solar building technology research, not less than $82,135,000 shall be available for photovoltaic energy systems, not less than $17,600,000 shall be available for concentrating solar systems, not less than $37,700,000 shall be available for power systems in biomass/biofuels energy systems, not less than $48,000,000 shall be available for transportation in biomased biofuels energy systems (of which not less than $1,500,000 shall be available for the Consortium for Plant Biotechnology Research), not less than $42,265,000 shall be available for wind energy systems, not less than $4,000,000 shall be available for the renewable energy production incentive program, not less than $7,600,000 shall be available for support of solar programs, not less than $5,100,000 shall be available for the international solar energy program, not less than $5,000,000 shall be available for the National Renewable Energy Laboratory, not less than $27,850,000 shall be available for geothermal technology development, not less than $27,700,000 shall be available for hydrogen research, not less than $6,400,000 shall be available for hydropower research, not less than $32,000,000 shall be available for high temperature superconducting research and development, not less than $3,000,000 shall be available for energy storage systems, and not less than $18,500,000 shall be available for direction of programs).''.

Mr. REID. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada objects.

Mr. REID. I object and call for the regular——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada has objected. Under the unanimous consent agreement, the only amendments in order are those that have been filed.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I do not believe that the order includes a motion to recommit with an amendment. I ask for clarification in that respect.

Mr. REID. I submit to the Chair that it includes all amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is advised that the instructions that all amendments must be filed applies even to amendments that would be included within a motion with instructions to recommit.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I appeal the ruling of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The appeal is debatable. Is there debate on the appeal?

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I hope Members understand that this amendment would be perfectly appropriate to make this bill a more useful document. I understand the strong desires of some not to have this amendment apply, but it is an amendment which has over 50 cosponsors. It is only appropriate that this body have the right to exercise their will on a vote which will let them modify this bill in a manner which they think will make it more appropriate.

I urge all Members, especially the 50 cosponsors, to join with me on appealing the ruling of the Chair to allow this amendment to be placed upon the bill. It is only appropriate considering that the only problem we had was the one word ''unnecessary'' which made it subject to a point of order because the CBO ruled that the word ''unnecessary'' would prevent the funding and, therefore, would not be appropriate.

I believe very strongly we ought to have an opportunity for the majority of this Senate to express their will on this bill. Therefore, I am appealing the ruling of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada is recognized.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, first of all, I reiterate what the chairman of the subcommittee has said, the manager of this bill. It is not as if we have not done everything we can to make sure that solar renewables are taken care of. There has been a 3-percent cut in solar and renewables. Others had a 9-percent cut. We have treated this, in effect, more fairly than anything else.

I also say to my friends, when this bill left this body last year, it had less money in it than the bill has this year. It was only because of what took place in the so-called summit after the committees completed all their work, the negotiation with the President, that the bill was plused up to $365 million. This is not chicken feed. This is $354 million for solar renewables.

Also, we in Nevada understand solar energy. At the Nevada Test Site, which we hear so much about in this Chamber, there could be enough energy produced by Sun at the Nevada Test Site to take care of all the energy needs of this country. The fact is, it is very difficult to get from here to there.

We are spending huge amounts of money—not enough; and I recognize that. Everybody wants to come and

spend more money. I would like to spend more money. My friend from Vermont voted for the budget. I did not vote for the budget. I wish we had more money here. I think the budget we are being asked to work under is ridiculous. We cannot do what needs to be done for this country. My friend from Vermont voted for the budget. I did not.

So I say that we have to understand that if this goes back to the committee, we are going to have significant difficulties getting to the point where we are today. If we are going to move these bills along, it would seem to me the majority should help us move them along. This is one of the easier bills, some say. Based on this, I am not too sure.

I am a supporter of alternate energy sources. We have a solar energy program in the State of Nevada that we are very proud of. It is one of the best in the country. I have been to the one at Barstow. It produces 200 megawatts of electricity. It is by far the largest plant in the world. It is 100 times larger than the second largest plant, which is a small plant. Technology is allowing us to move forward but not very rapidly.

In this bill for solar building technology research there is $2 million; for photovoltaic energy systems there is $64 million; for biomass/biofuels transportation there is $38 million. For wind energy systems there is $34 million in this bill.

In the bill there is money for solar program support, the renewable energy production incentive, international solar programs, national renewable energy laboratory construction, and geothermal funding.

The State of Nevada has more geothermal potential than any State in this Union. It would be very beneficial for us to have more money. It would help the State of Nevada. We cut solar renewables 3 percent. We cut other nondefense programs almost 10 percent. We have been more fair to this entity than any of the others.

So I move to table the appeal and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

Mr. REID. I withhold.

Mr. DOMENICI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. I ask unanimous consent to speak for 2 minutes.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I did not hear the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator requested to speak for 2 minutes.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Fine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. Thank you.

Fellow Senators, I suggest to you, the Chair has ruled that what the Senator seeks to do is out of order. We did establish right after we started this bill that amendments had to be filed at the desk so everybody could look at them. As you look at that sequence of things, a motion to send this back to committee with instructions was out of order; so those who want the Senator to win could not have won anyway. Now he wants to just send it back to committee. The Chair has once again ruled that is out of order.

How far do we have to go? As a matter of fact, we have already taken care of renewables better than almost any other nondomestic piece of this budget. We have reduced, by 24 percent, items such as cleanup, nondefense cleanup, in this country because we do not have enough money this year. We are $600 million short. We have only reduced this function by 2.8 percent. We reduce the Corps of Engineers by 8 percent, the Bureau of Reclamation by 3 percent. The total nondefense has been reduced by 7 percent.

We have prioritized well. As a matter of fact, if this amendment passes, we will be giving renewables a 14-percent priority over the rest of the nondefense programs of this country which, on average, have been cut 7 percent, because this would ask to increase it by 7. I believe it should be tabled. I hope we will do that expeditiously. I thank Senator REID for his attentiveness and his stick-to-itiveness on this. I believe we have treated renewables fairly.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's motion to table has been withheld to this point.

Mr. REID. I move to table the appeal and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to table the appeal of the ruling of the Chair. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) would vote ''no.''

The result was announced—yeas 60, nays 39, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 171 Leg.]

YEAS—60

Abraham	Enzi	Mack
Allard	Frist	McCain
Ashcroft	Gorton	McConnell
Baucus	Graham	Mikulski
Bennett	Gramm	Moynihan
Bond	Hatch	Murkowski
Breaux	Helms	Nickles
Bunning	Hollings	Reid
Burns	Hutchinson	Robb
Byrd	Hutchison	Roberts
Campbell	Inhofe	Santorum
Cochran	Inouye	Sarbanes
Coverdell	Kerrey	Sessions
Craig	Kohl	Shelby
Crapo	Kyl	Smith (NH)
Daschle	Landrieu	Specter
DeWine	Lautenberg	Stevens
Domenici	Lincoln	Thomas
Edwards	Lott	Thompson
		Thurmond
		Torricelli
		Voinovich

NAYS—39

Akaka	Durbin	Levin
Bayh	Feingold	Lieberman
Biden	Feinstein	Lugar
Bingaman	Fitzgerald	Murray
Boxer	Grams	Reed
Brownback	Grassley	Rockefeller
Bryan	Gregg	Roth
Chafee	Hagel	Schumer
Cleland	Jeffords	Smith (OR)
Collins	Johnson	Snowe
Conrad	Kennedy	Warner
Dodd	Kerry	Wellstone
Dorgan	Leahy	Wyden

NOT VOTING—1

Harkin

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The decision of the Chair stands.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. DOMENICI. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I regret that I cannot support S. 1186, the FY 2000 Energy and Water Appropriations bill. I cannot support this bill because its funding for renewable energy falls far short of what we need in this country as we head into the 21st Century. The funding level provided in this bill, $353.9 million, doesn't come close to meeting the Administration's budget request. S. 1186 has $92 million less for renewables than the Administration requested. This represents a cut from last year's final appropriated level of about $12 million.

This is a very difficult vote for me because S. 1186 includes funding for some very important projects and programs. There are two projects that I believe are particularly important, the Marshall Flood Control Project and the Stillwater Levee. The Marshall Flood Control Project has been under consideration since the early 1970s and was authorized under the 1986 and 1988 Water Resources Development Act (WRDA). The FY 1999 Energy and Water Appropriations bill included $1.5 million for this project, and the Army Corps was able to reprogram an additional $700,000. FY 2000 funding will make it possible for a significant portion of the Stage Two work to be completed during this year's construction season.

The Stillwater Levee is another worthy project funded in this bill. Although the levee survived last year's high waters, it is in urgent need of repairs. The levee will protect downtown Stillwater, which includes over 60 sites on the National Register of Historic Sites.

It is especially unfortunate that we failed to take advantage of the opportunity we had to improve this bill. Senator JEFFORDS proposed an amendment that would have increased funding for solar and geothermal energy by $70 million, and we did not even get an up-or-down vote on his amendment. I think it was an important amendment, and I was proud to be an original cosponsor. I very much appreciate the

leadership of my friend from Vermont on this issue.

As we near the millenium, I believe we need a far stronger commitment to a renewable energy future, not the $12 million cut for renewable energy in this bill. For too long, we have allowed our economy to remain hostage to oil, much of it imported. We should all recognize that our addiction to fossil fuels is not sustainable. We fight wars in part over oil, which we then use to pollute our skies, while providing tax breaks to large oil companies. Petroleum has helped us to achieve a very high standard of living in the western world, and oil will continue to be a major part of our economy. Indeed, oil is the central nervous system of the western world's economy. But we have been in need of surgery for years now.

In the past, we have risen to the challenge when faced with a visible crisis and rising prices. Can we do it again without long gas lines and with stable prices? I say we can. Indeed, while many see only a future of constraints, I see a future with opportunities.

After all, what will it take to stop overloading Mother Nature? Higher efficiency and more reliance on cleaner fuels. And what will that lead to? Manufacturing enterprises with the lowest operating costs in the world. Households that generate electricity from rooftop solar arrays. Farmers who harvest an additional ''crop''—the winds that blow over their fields. City streets inhabited by quiet and pollution-free electric vehicles.

That is a future the American people surely can rally behind. Now is the time to rally all Americans behind that vision of the future. But unfortunately, this bill fails to do that. In fact, I believe it is a step in the wrong direction, and for that reason I am voting against it.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, included in the manager's package is an amendment designed to insert the United States Congress into the Bonneville Power Administration's rate setting process. I believe it is unnecessary and potentially counterproductive. Thus, I do not support it and will work to see it stricken in conference.

The BPA next month hopes to initiate the rate case to establish the cost of BPA power and set parameters for funding salmon recovery on the Columbia and Snake Rivers. As currently formulated, the rates established will fund projected fish and wildlife costs through customer rates. The process is working and this amendment could potentially jeopardize it.

I, along with other Democratic members of the Northwest delegation, recently sent a letter to Vice President GORE to reiterate our support for the so-called ''fish funding principles'' agreed to by the Administration and BPA. We sent this letter in response to a staff memo initiated by the National Marine FIsheries Service and the Environmental Protection Agency, recommending BPA charge its customers higher rates so it could establish a ''slush fund'' to pay the enormous cost of removing or breeching the four lower Snake River dams. As my colleagues know, there has been no decision that these dams should be removed and therefore there is no need to begin saving for such a controversial plan. Our letter firmly opposed collecting money from ratepayers for costs that may or may not be incurred in the future. Specifically, we opposed ''prepayment of speculative future costs, particularly if those costs are contingent upon congressional action.''

There is no movement afoot by the Administration or BPA to establish such a slush fund. So, there is not a problem to solve regarding slush funds for dam removal.

However, we do have a problem to solve: saving our wild salmon. We are committed as a region and as a nation to doing so. These skirmishes over staff memos and rumors simply divide us and divert our attention from the real problems we must solve; the real creative solutions we must fund; the real consensus we must forge. I fear an unintended consequence of this amendment may be to reduce our region's ability to solve this problem on its own.

So, Mr. President, this amendment is not helpful. That said, I know I do not have the votes to prevent its inclusion in this bill and thus have worked with Senator GORTON to modify it to make it more acceptable. The amendment now will apply only to this fiscal year, instead of continuing in perpetuity. In addition, the BPA Administration now must set rates with the ''fish funding principles'' agreed to by the Administration and BPA in mind.

Let me conclude by reiterating that we have a process working to set rates for BPA customers, which I firmly believe will achieve the vital goal of helping us save fish, and will allow full public and stakeholder involvement. This amendment is unnecessary and diversionary. I look forward to working with Senator GORTON and the Administration to get this language dropped from the bill in conference committee.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, no large group of citizens should be required to pay in advance for a project that they oppose, that will have an adverse impact on their lives and livelihoods, and that will almost certainly never be authorized. But that is exactly what has recently been proposed by certain officials of the Clinton Administration.

A discussion paper was recently published by these officials suggesting that the Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) add significantly to its power charges to its customers in its impending rate case. The purpose of these added charges is to provide a slush fund for the removal of four Federal dams from the Snake River, if that removal is ever authorized or ordered. It is only fair to add that the Clinton Administration has stated that the paper does not now reflect Administration policy, but it has nevertheless raised fears that the Administration might some day try to order such a removal without asking Congress either for the authority or the money to do so.

This amendment will prevent such an end run. It does not prevent BPA from including fish recovery costs in its rate structure for the next five years, even in greater amounts than the $435 million per year current limit. It will, however, prevent an additional surcharge for possible dam removal. That project, if it should be proposed, should require Congressional authorization, and a debate over funding sources, only as and when this or any later Administration makes such a recommendation.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President I would like to engage the Chairman in a colloquy. First, let me thank the Senator from New Mexico for his diligence in balancing funding for the wide variety of programs within the Energy and Water Appropriations bill under very difficult budget constraints. Under these constraints, you were able to fund the biomass programs at $72 million. However, one very important program to the Northeast has not been funded. The Northeast Regional Biomass Program has helped my State make significant steps to develop and market the use of wood as an energy source. It is now being used in Vermont schools, low-income housing projects, State office buildings and mills. Without support from the Northeast Regional Biomass Program, Vermont will not be able to build on these successes. Although funding is not included in the Senate bill for this program, the Department of Energy should be given the flexibility to continue support for some of these projects.

Mr. DOMENICI. As you mentioned, this appropriations bill was allocated $439 million less than the Fiscal Year 1999 enacted level. Although there are many programs I would have liked to continue, this funding level cannot accommodate all of them. However, I recognize the good projects being undertaken by the regional biomass programs and would encourage the Department of Energy its support for those programs within the overall biomass budget.

Mr. LEAHY. I thank the Chairman and look forward to working with him and the Department of Energy to support state efforts to expand the use of small biomass projects that promote the use of wood energy as a renewable resource.

Mr. President, I would like to engage the Chairman in a colloquy. As more and more states deregulate their own energy industries, environmentally preferable electric power is one of the markets developing first. One sector that has garnered specific questions about its impact on the environment is hydropower. Consumers need a credible means to determine which hydropower facilities are environmentally preferable. Mr. Chairman, you have partially addressed this situation already

by including funding within the Department of Energy's hydropower account to develop ''fish friendly'' turbines. I believe facilities that use this and other new technology should receive recognition for their efforts. Hydropower facilities that are operated to avoid and reduce their environmental impact should also receive recognition.

Mr. DOMENICI. I agree with the Senator and encourage the Department of Energy to support a voluntary certification program that will distinguish low impact hydropower from other hydropower. Such a certification program would also help develop new markets for ''green power.''

Mr. LEAHY. I thank the Chairman and look forward to working with him and the Department of Energy to support this type of certification program.

HEMISPHERIC CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL TECHNOLOGY (HCET)

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, I want to engage the distinguished Senator from new Mexico and the distinguished Senator from Nevada, managers of the pending bill, in a colloquy.

Mr. DOMENICI. I will be pleased to respond to the distinguished Senator from Florida, Senator MACK.

Mr. REID. I echo the sentiments of my colleague, Senator DOMENICI, and will be happy to respond to the distinguished Senator from Florida.

Mr. MACK. I thank the Senator.

Florida International University in my State of Florida has done a truly remarkable job of working with the Department of Energy in carrying out critically important environmental research and development of deactivation and decommissioning environmental technologies. More specifically, FIU's Hemispheric Center for Environmental Technology (HCET) has a proud history of partnering with DOE through its Environmental Management program to form a true 'center of excellence' in these areas and the President's fiscal year 2000 budget request for the EM program assumes full funding for continuation of this impressive partnership.

Mr. GRAHAM. Will the senator yield?

Mr. MACK. I yield to my colleague from Florida.

Senator GRAHAM. I echo the comments of the Senator from Florida about the FIU Hemispheric Center for Environmental Technology and reinforce the importance of the FIU Center in assisting the Department of Energy in deactivation and decommissioning of some of the most strategically important DOE sites in the Nation, including Fernald, Chicago, Albuquerque, Richland, and Oak Ridge facilities. I am proud of the role that HCET plays in these efforts.

Mr. MACK. I thank my colleague from Florida. It is my understanding that the President's budget contains sufficient funding ($5,000,000) to fully fund the current working agreement between Florida International University and the Department of Energy. Is that the Chairman's understanding?

Mr. DOMENICI. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MACK. I thank the Chairman. I specifically request that, as the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico and the chairman of the Energy and Water Development Subcommittee continues to shepherd this legislation through the Senate and conference with the House, he would make every possible effort to provide the full budget request for the DOE's Environmental Management program and protect the full funding contained therein for the DOE-Florida International University partnership.

Mr. GRAHAM. I strongly endorse the recommendation of my colleague from Florida and hope that the distinguished Chairman and Ranking Member of the Subcommittee, Senator REID, will approve the full budget request in the final bill that is sent to the White House for approval. This is a program that is important to us and to our State.

Mr. REID. I thank both Senators from Florida, and you have my commitment that I will do whatever I can to include sufficient funding for the Environmental Management program at DOE to allow for the full $5,000,000 for the Florida International University-DOE initiative.

Mr. DOMENICI. I offer my commitment as well that I will work with Senator REID and the other members of the Subcommittee to do whatever I can to include sufficient funding for the Environmental Management program at DOE to allow for the full $5,000,000 for the Florida International University-DOE initiative.

Mr. MACK. I thank the distinguished Senators from New Mexico and Nevada for their commitment and leadership on this important legislation.

Mr. GRAHAM. I, too, thank the distinguished Senators from New Mexico and Nevada for their support in this most important matter.

INTERNATIONAL RADIOECOLOGY LABORATORY

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I bring to the attention of the chairman, other members of the Appropriations Committee, and the Senate—the International Radioecology Laboratory, commonly referred to as IRL, in Slavutych, Ukraine—which was dedicated last month by the U.S. Department of Energy. The IRL was established in July, 1998 by an agreement between the governments of the United States and the Ukraine to facilitate the critical research being conducted near the Chernobyl nuclear site on the long-term health and environmental effects of the world's worst nuclear accident. Construction of the IRL will be completed by fall, 1999. The IRL is managed by the Savannah River Ecology Laboratory, also known as SREL, of the University of Georgia and funded through cooperative agreements by the Department of Energy.

Led by Dr. Ron Chesser of SREL, highly integrated research scientists from the University of Georgia, Texas Tech, Texas A & M, the Illinois State Museum, Purdue University, Colorado State University, Ukraine and Russia have been involved in cooperative research in the Chernobyl region since 1992. These efforts have significant importance regarding the long-term risks in the Chernobyl area itself, but also for predicting the environmental consequences of future radioactive releases.

The new IRL will serve as the primary facility from which radioecology research activities are directed and will be the central point for collaboration among scientists worldwide concerned with the effects of environmental radiation.

The Savannah River Ecology Laboratory has proposed a new 5-year research initiative at the IRL to be administered through the Office of International Nuclear Safety Cooperation Program at the Department of Energy. This ambitious research project would carry out the goals of the United States-Ukraine 1998 agreement to: (1) understand the effects of the pollution from the Chernobyl disaster on forms of life; (2) provide data needed to make wise decisions concerning environmental and human health risks and the effectiveness of clean-up activities; and (3) develop strategic plans for the potential of future radiation releases. I am disappointed that this new initiative was not specifically funded in the FY 2000 Energy and Water Appropriations bill approved by the Committee and I would urge the Chairman to do all he can to find the necessary funds for this important project when the FY 2000 Energy and Water Appropriations bill goes to conference.

Mr. DOMENICI. I appreciate the concern of the Senior Senator from Georgia. I share his point of view regarding the importance of this new joint United States-Ukraine facility and the vital research being conducted on the aftermath of the Chernobyl accident. While you know how tight our budget is, I assure you that when this bill goes to conference we will make every effort to locate additional funds within DOE to allocate for programs like this and will attempt to find additional funding for DOE programs.

NAME CHANGE FOR TERMINATION COSTS PROGRAM

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I rise to engage in a colloquy with my colleague from New Mexico, the bill manager, regarding the need to change the name of one of the programs in the Department of Energy's appropriations. Within the Energy Supply account, there is an account called ''Nuclear Energy.'' Within the nuclear energy account, there is a program called ''Termination Costs.''

For some time, the name ''Termination Costs'' has caused considerable confusion. In fact, in the past the Department of Energy has submitted its budget request for this program using a different name. They called it the ''Facilities'' program and the Senate last year even appropriated funding using

the name ''Facilities'' but the name change was dropped in conference.

The name ''Termination Costs'' is not an accurate depiction of the activities occurring under this program. I will quote from the Department of Energy's fiscal year 2000 budget request. The following items are listed as the program mission for the Termination Costs Program. (1) Ensuring the cost-effective, environmentally-compliant operation of Office of Nuclear Energy, Science and Technology sites and facilities; (2) Maintaining the physical and technical infrastructure necessary to support research and technology development by U.S. and overseas researchers; (3) Demonstrating the acceptability of electrometallurgical technology for preparing DOE spent nuclear fuel for ultimate disposal; and (4) Placing unneeded facilities in industrially safe and environmentally compliant conditions for low-cost, long-term surveillance.

With the possible exception of the last item, No. 4, these important mission priorities do not fit the heading of ''termination.''

Again, quoting from the Department of Energy's budget submittal, the stated program goal for the Termination Costs Program is, ''To contribute to the nation's nuclear science and technology infrastructure through the development of innovative technologies for spent fuel storage and disposal and the effective management of active and surplus nuclear research facilities.'' I think this is an enduring mission for DOE and therefore the moniker ''Termination Costs'' is misleading.

Mr. DOMENICI. Will my colleague from Idaho yield?

Mr. CRAIG. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, listening to the statements of the Senator from Idaho, I share his conviction that the name ''Termination Costs'' appears to be inadequate to describe the activities carried out under this program. This is consistent with the position the Senate took last year. I commit to work with my colleague to see that the name is changed to ''Facilities'' as requested by both my colleague and by DOE in the past.

Mr. CRAIG. I thank my colleague from New Mexico for his assistance in this matter.

DOE CLEAN-UP AT FERNALD

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, the Fernald site in Cincinnati, OH, has done a truly remarkable job of working with the Department of Energy in carrying out critically important environmental clean-up and restoration missions. More specifically, the clean-up at Fernald has garnered broad-based stakeholder support and is moving along ahead of schedule. More important, the Fernald site has pioneered the accelerated 10 year clean-up plan, which will save taxpayers several billion dollars. All of this has been accomplished while managing the site at or below the Department's appropriated budget for the project. I see the distinguished Chairman of the Energy and Water Subcommittee on the floor and wanted to be sure he is aware of the efforts underway at Fernald.

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank the Senator from Ohio for his comments. I am aware and certainly do appreciate the efficiency and budget-wise efforts of the clean-up achievements at the Fernald site.

Mr. DEWINE. I thank the Chairman of the Subcommittee. Does the Chairman agree that to further the proceedings, the Department of Energy should support the accelerated clean-up plan in place?

Mr. DOMENICI. I agree with the Senator from Ohio. The subcommittee recognizes the support of the Cincinnati community and regulators. The Department of Energy should take all steps necessary to keep the accelerated cleanup at Fernald on schedule, and the Subcommittee will continue to work with the senior Senator from Ohio to monitor this effort.

Mr. DEWINE. I thank my friend and distinguished colleague from New Mexico for his leadership on this important issue to the citizens of Cincinnati.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION DAM SAFETY RESEARCH

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, Utah has at least 30 dams that currently do not meet current safety standards. Most of these dams were built more than 30 years ago by either the Bureau of Reclamation, the Soil Conservation Service or the state for a variety of purposes such as flood control, irrigation or municipal purposes or for wildlife enhancement. As these dams have aged, safety concerns have increased. We now find ourselves facing tremendous and expensive safety issues.

Earlier this year, I requested additional funding for research related to monitoring and manipulating subsurface flows which affect Bureau dams. It is my hope that this research could be utilized to help address dam safety across the West. Unfortunately, given the committee allocation, it was not possible to provide increased funding this year.

I know that the Bureau is seeking to conduct more extensive research to determine the possibility of manipulating subsurface flows and the effects on dam safety. Utah State University's Water Research Lab has been identified as a leader in this effort. I also requested funding to be directed toward the Dam Breach Modeling program which would research additional modeling of dam failure scenarios. This research would include water tracking technologies to monitor internal movement of water through dams, and allow the Bureau to explore applying this technology to specific Western dams.

The technology would provide the Dam Safety program with additional tools to gather information on internal conditions and analyze dam integrity and make predictions on possible impacts from floods, earthquakes and similar events. It is anticipated that after a testing period, assistance could be made available to federal and state dam safety officials in assessment programs.

Utah, New Mexico, Idaho and almost all western states have potentially serious dam safety problems. New technologies could provide information to identify high risk areas and define the critical flows and leaks that threaten a structure.

As a member of the subcommittee, I certainly understand the pressures on the chairman because of the budget limitations and personally know that he has done everything he can to meet the enormous and competing demands. I hope that should additional funds become available down the road, the Committee would consider these requests at some funding level.

Mr. DOMENICI. I concur with the Senator on the importance of developing and testing dam safety technologies. However, since funding levels for the Bureau are $95 million below the budget request, there are numerous projects of merit which must go unfunded this year. I wish this were not the case, but I would be happy to work with the Senator should additional resources become available and conference conditions allow the Committee to consider this matter.

MAINTENANCE DREDGING PROJECTS

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I rise to clarify points regarding the Army Corps of Engineers maintenance dredging projects in the State of New Hampshire.

Maintenance dredging of Little Harbor, in Portsmouth, remains a top priority for the State of New Hampshire and is important to regional and recreational commercial boating users who continue to operate with navigational safety hazards. Environmental mitigation matters associated with the federal project have been addressed by an interagency task force. Proposed dredging, dredged material disposal, and mitigation arrangements are currently being addressed by the Army Corps of Engineers in an Environmental Assessment.

Piscataqua River shoaling remains a top priority for the State of New Hampshire. Shoaling has occurred in the major shipping lane at Portsmouth Harbor. Last year 6 million tons of cargo, mostly petroleum products, passed through the Piscataqua River. It is imperative for navigational and environmental safety that the shipping lane be cleared at the earliest possible opportunity. The Army Corps of Engineers is currently developing an Environmental Impact Study.

Sagamore Creek is also a priority for the State of New Hampshire. Maintenance dredging of Sagamore Creek is important to the New Hampshire Commercial Fishing Industry as it functions as a transit channel and is the back channel to Little Harbor. Appropriated funds would allow the Army Corps of Engineers to conduct required hydrographic and material testing to

initiative project. Sagamore Creek is being abandoned by the New Hampshire Commercial Fishing Fleet due to lack of clearance and navigational safety concerns.

I respectfully ask the distinguished chairman to consider the importance of these projects as this bill develops and to help the Corps in addressing these pressing priorities which are so important in my state.

Mr. DOMENICI. I appreciate the Senator from New Hampshire bringing these important projects to my attention. I understand, from recent communications with the Army Corps of Engineers, that work may being on these projects as soon as possible, consistent with necessary approvals and funding. I look forward to working together to identify ways in conference by which we might be able to advance these projects.

BROOKHAVEN NATIONAL LABORATORY

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, with the threat of a permanent shutdown of the High Flux Beam Reactor at Brookhaven National Laboratory, the employees who operate the reactor have asked to be reinstated under The Department of Energy Worker and Community Transition Program. This office provides funding for separation benefits, outplacement assistance, and training. Brookhaven and Argonne National Labs in Idaho were removed from the program in 1997, making their employees ineligible for those benefits.

I thank Senator REID for committing to pursue adding this provision during the conference committee negotiations on Energy and Water Appropriations for Fiscal Year 2000. This program is crucial to ensure future employment of the workforce at Brookhaven National Laboratory.

Mr. REID. I am pleased to help the Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. I thank the Chair.

GEORGIA ENERGY AND WATER PROJECTS

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, as the chairman knows, several projects from the great state of Georgia found funding in the Committee's appropriations report now before us. I applaud the attention and support provided by the Subcommittee to fund these important activities. In particular, I speak of the funding for Brunswick and Savannah Harbor maintenance and the Army Corps of Engineers' investigations of Brunswick Harbor and the Savannah Harbor Expansion. The Brunswick and Savannah Harbor expansion projects found earlier authorization in the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (WRDA) which recently passed the Senate.

Mr. DOMENICI. The subcommittee understands the importance of harbor maintenance and deepening to Savannah and Brunswick. I also appreciate the work of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. COVERDELL. In addition, the subcommittee's continued funding of other worthy projects in Georgia, the New Savannah Bluff Lock and Dam, is appreciated. I look forward to working with you and the Subcommittee on other Georgia priorities.

Mr. DOMENICI. The subcommittee agrees that these projects after undergoing the intense scrutiny of the Congressional process for a number of years continue to prove their worth. I look forward to continuing to work on behalf of these and other priorities for Georgia.

Mr. COVERDELL. I thank the Senator for the opportunity to engage in this colloquy and for your support of these very worthwhile projects.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I submit for the RECORD the official Budget Committee scoring of the pending bill—S. 1168, the Energy and Water Development Appropriations bill for FY 2000.

The scoring of the bill reflects an amendment I offered at the beginning of this debate to correct an inadvertent error in the bill as reported to the Senate. With this correction of a clerical error, the bill provides $21.3 billion in new budget authority (BA) and $13.3 billion in new outlays to support the programs of the Department of Energy, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and the Bureau of Reclamation, and related federal agencies. The bill provides the bulk of funding for the Department of Energy, including Atomic Energy Defense Activities and civilian energy research and development (R&D) other than fossil energy R&D and energy conservation programs.

When outlays from prior-year budget authority and other completed actions are taken into account, the pending bill totals $21.3 billion in BA and $20.9 billion in outlays for FY 2000. The bill is $2 million in BA below the Subcommittee's 302(b) allocation, and at the 302(b) allocation for outlays.

The Senate bill is $0.1 billion in BA and $0.5 billion in outlays above the 1999 level. The bill is $0.3 billion in both BA and outlays below the President's budget request for FY 2000.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table displaying the Budget Committee scoring of the FY 2000 Energy and Water Development Appropriations bill be printed in the RECORD.

I urge the adoption of the bill.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1168, ENERGY AND WATER APPROPRIATIONS, 2000, SPENDING COMPARISON—SENATE-REPORTED BILL

[Fiscal year 2000, in millions of dollars]

	General purposes	Crime	Mandatory	Total
SENATE-REPORTED BILL: [1]				
Budget authority	21,278	.....	.....	21,278
Outlays	20,868	.....	.....	20,868
Senate 302(b) allocation:				
Budget authority	21,280	.....	.....	21,280
Outlays	20,868	.....	.....	20,868
1999 Level:				
Budget authority	21,177	.....	.....	21,177
Outlays	20,366	.....	.....	20,366
President's request:				
Budget authority	21,557	.....	.....	21,557
Outlays	21,172	.....	.....	21,172
House-passed bill:				
Budget authority	.....	.....	.....	.....
Outlays	.....	.....	.....	.....
SENATE-REPORTED BILL COMPARED TO:				
Senate 302(b) allocation:				
Budget authority	(2)	.....	.....	(2)
Outlays	.....	.....	.....	.....
1999 Level:				
Budget authority	101	.....	.....	101
Outlays	502	.....	.....	502
President's request:				
Budget authority	(279)	.....	.....	(279)
Outlays	(304)	.....	.....	(304)
House-passed bill:				
Budget authority	21,278	.....	.....	21,278
Outlays	20,868	.....	.....	20,868

[1] Reflects floor amendment on SEPA reducing BA by $11 million and outlays by $9 million.

Note: Details may not add to totals due to rounding. Totals adjusted for consistency with scorekeeping conventions.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I rise to discuss an amendment specifically focused on encouraging small business partnership interactions with the Department of Energy's national laboratories and other facilities associated with Defense Activities.

Congress has frequently encouraged the national laboratories and facilities of the Department of Energy to craft partnerships that are supportive of their mission interests. Congress has emphasized that all program funding at these institutions can be used for mission-supportive partnerships.

Through industrial interactions, the best practices from industry, from improved technologies to improved operations, can be infused into Department missions. These interactions also provide opportunities for U.S. industry to benefit from technologies developed in support of the Department's mission areas, with a corresponding impact on the competitive position of our nation.

In past years, Congress has identified large amounts of funding, over $200 million per year, to encourage formation of these partnerships. There is less need for these funds for industrial interactions today, since the labs and facilities should have learned how to optimally use these partnerships. However, the reduction in funding for industrial interactions does not imply that Congress is less supportive of them, it only indicates the expectations that the Department's programs should be able to continue to use these partnerships without line item funding.

One specific class of industrial interactions, however, requires continued attention and specific funding from Congress. This involves interactions with small businesses. Small businesses are a primary engine of U.S. economy. They frequently represent the greatest degree of innovation in their approaches. Their focus on innovation makes them a particularly important partner for the labs and facilities, yet their small size and less developed business operations make interactions with the large Departmental facilities difficult.

In addition, each of the labs and facilities needs a supportive small business community surrounding them, one

that can provide needed technical services as well as provide an economic climate that assists in recruitment and retention of the specialized personnel required at these facilities.

For these reasons, we need a focused small business initiative to encourage interactions with this vital community. These partnership interactions can take many forms, from very formal cooperative research and development agreements to less formal technology assistance. They should be justified either on a mission relevance or regional economic development basis.

Four these reasons, Mr. President, this amendment creates a Small Business Initiative within Defense Activities for $10 million. With this Initiative, this vital class of interactions will be encouraged.

Mr. President, I also wish to speak about an amendment to add $10 million for a specific area of civilian research and development. This area involves assessment of accelerator transmutation of waste technology that may be able to significantly reduce the radioactivity and radio-toxicity of certain isotopes found in spent nuclear fuel.

Accelerator transmutation of waste or ATW may enable the nation to consider alternative strategies for spent nuclear fuel at some future point in time. Our present plan involves no options, it involves only the disposition of spent fuel in a permanent underground geologic repository. Yet that spent fuel still has most of its energy potential.

Depending on future generation's needs for energy, the availability of cost effective technologies for generation of electricity, and whatever limitations on power plant emissions may be in place, the nation may want to reexamine the advisability of continuing the current path for spent fuel. Transmutation technologies could enable energy recovery, along with significant reduction in the toxicity of the resulting final waste. However, while transmutation is technically feasible, much research and development will be required to determine its economic implications.

There is intense international interest in transmutation—from France, Japan, and Russia as examples. This is an excellent subject for international collaboration, and may lead to additional cooperation in the entire area of spent fuel management. The U.S. needs to have a sufficiently strong program to participate in such an international program, and ideally to exert a degree of leadership on the directions of international spent fuel programs.

For these reasons, Mr. President, this amendment adds $10 million to the civilian research and development funding line within the nuclear energy programs.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, the bill we are considering today, the energy and water appropriations bill, is fundamental to our nation's energy and defense related activities, and takes care of vitally important water resources infrastructure needs. Unfortunately, this bill diverts from its intended purpose by including a multitude of additional, unrequested earmarks to the tune of $531 million.

This amount is substantially less than the earmarks included in the FY'99 appropriations bill and I commend my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee for their hard work in putting this bill together. In fact, this year's recommendation is about 60 percent lower than the earmarks included in last year's appropriation bill. My optimism was raised upon reading the committee report which states that the Committee is ''reducing the number of projects with lower priority benefits.'' Unfortunately, while the Committee attempts to be more fiscally responsible, there is a continuing focus on parochial, special interest concerns.

Funding is provided in this bill for projects where it is very difficult to ascertain their overall importance to the security and infrastructure of our nation.

Let me highlight a few examples:

$3,000,000 is provided for an ethanol pilot plant at Southern Illinois University;

$300,000 is provided to the Vermont Agriculture Methane project;

$400,000 is included for aquatic weed control at Lake Champlain in Vermont, and,

$100,000 in additional funding for mosquito control activities in North Dakota.

How are these activities connected to the vital energy and water resource needs of our nation? Why are these projects higher in priority than other flood control, water conservation or renewable energy projects? These are the type of funding improprieties that make a mockery of our budget process.

Various projects are provided with additional funding at levels higher than requested by the Administration. The stated reasons include the desire to finish some projects in a reasonable timeframe. Unfortunately, other projects are put on hold or on a slower track. The inconsistency between the Administration's request, which is responsible for carrying out these projects, and the views of the Appropriators on just how much funding should be dedicated to a project, is troubling. As a result, various other projects that may be equally deserving or higher in priority do not receive an appropriate amount of funding, or none at all. Many of my objections are based on these types of inconsistencies and nebulous spending practices.

Another $92 million above the budget request is earmarked in additional funding for regional power authorities. I fail to understand why we continue to spend millions of federal dollars at a time when power authorities are increasingly operating independent of federal assistance. Even the Bonneville Power Administration, one of these power entities, is self-financed and operates without substantial federal assistance.

We must stop this practice of wasteful spending. It is unconscionable to repeatedly ask the taxpayers to foot the bill for these biased actions. We must work harder to focus our limited resources on those areas of greatest need nationwide, not political clout.

I remind my colleagues that I object to these earmarks on the basis of their circumvention of our established process, which is to properly consider, authorize and fund projects based on merit and need. Indeed, I commend my colleagues for not including any projects which are unauthorized. However, there are still too many cases of erroneous earmarks for projects that we have no way of knowing whether, at best, all or part of this $531 million should have been spent on different projects with greater need or, at worst, should not have been spent at all.

I will support passage of this bill, but let me state for the RECORD that this is not the honorable way to carry out our fiscal responsibilities.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this list of objectionable provisions in S. 1186 and its accompanying Senate report be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OBJECTIONABLE PROVISIONS IN S. 1186 FISCAL YEAR 2000 ENERGY AND WATER APPROPRIATIONS BILL

BILL LANGUAGE

Department of Defense, Army Corps of Engineers

General investigations

Earmark of $226,000 for the Great Egg Harbor Inlet to Townsend's Inlet, New Jersey

General construction

Earmark of $2,200,000 to Norco Bluffs, California

Earmark of $3,000,000 to Indianapolis Central Waterfront, Indiana

Earmark of $1,000,000 to Ohio River Flood Protection, Indiana

Earmark of $800,000 to Jackson County, Mississippi

Earmark of $17,000,000 to Virginia Beach, Virginia (Hurricane Protection)

An additional $4,400,000 to Upper Mingo County (including Mingo County tributaries),

Lower Mingo County (Kermit), Wayne County, and McDowell County, elements of the Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River project in West Virginia

Earmark of $2,000,000 to be used by the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to construct bluff stabilization measures at authorized locations for Natchez Bluff, Mississippi

Earmark of $200,000 to be used by the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, to initiate a Detailed Project Report for the Dickenson County, Virginia elements of the Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River West Virginia, Virginia and Kentucky, project

An additional $35,630,000 above the budget request to flood control, Mississippi River and Tributaries, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, and Tennessee

POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS

$39,594,000 restored to the Southeastern Power Administration above the budget request.

An additional $60,000 above budget request for operation and maintenance at Southwestern Power Administration.

INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

An additional $5,000,000 above the budget request is provided for the Appalachian Regional Commission

An amount of $25,000,000 above the budget request is provided for the Denali Commission

General provisions

Language which stipulates all equipment and products purchased with funds made available in this Act should be American-made.

REPORT LANGUAGE

Department of Defense, Army Corps of Engineers

General Investigations

Earmark of $100,000 to the Barrow Coastal Storm Damage Reduction, AK.

Earmark of $100,000 to Chandalrr River Watershed, AK.

Earmark of $100,000 to Gastineau Channel, Juneau, AK.

Earmark of $100,000 to Skagway Harbor, AK.

Earmark of $150,000 to Rio De Flag, Flagstaff, AZ.

Earmark of $250,000 to North Little Rock, Dark Hollow, AR.

Earmark of $250,000 to Llagas Creek, CA.

An additional $450,000 to Tule River, CA.

An additional $450,000 to Yuba River Basin, CA.

Earmark of $250,000 to Bethany Beach, South Bethany, DE.

Earmark of $100,000 to Lake Worth Inlet, Palm Beach County, FL.

Earmark of $100,000 to Mile Point, Jacksonville, FL.

An additional $170,000 to Metro Atlanta Watershed, GA.

Earmark of $100,000 to Kawaihae Deep Draft Harbor, HI.

Earmark of $100,000 to Kootenai River at Bonners Ferry, ID.

Earmark of $100,000 to Little Wood River, ID.

Earmark of $100,000 to Mississinewa River, Marion, IN.

Earmark of $100,000 to Calcasieu River Basin, LA.

Earmark of $500,000 to Louisiana Coastal Area, LA.

Earmark of $100,000 to St. Bernard Parish, LA.

Earmark of $100,000 to Detroit River Environmental Dredging, MI.

Earmark of $400,000 to Sault Ste. Marie, MI.

An additional $400,000 to Lower Las Vegas Wash Wetlands, NV.

An additional $75,000 to Truckee Meadows, NV.

Earmark of $200,000 to North Las Cruces, NM.

Earmark of $100,000 to Lower Roanoke River, NC and VA.

Earmark of $300,000 to Corpus Christi Ship Channel, Laquinta Channel, TX.

Earmark of $200,000 to Gulf Intracoastal Waterway Modification, TX.

Earmark of $100,000 to John H. Kerr, VA and NC.

Earmark of $100,000 to Lower Rappahannock River Basin, VA.

Earmark of $500,000 to Lower Mud River, WV.

Earmark of $400,000 to Island Creek, Logan, WV.

Earmark of $100,000 to Wheeling Waterfront, WV.

Language which directs the Corps of Engineers' to work with the city of Laurel, MT to provide appropriate assistance to ensure reliability in the city's Yellowstone River water source.

Construction

An additional $1,200,000 to Cook Inlet, AK.

An additional $900,000 to St. Paul Harbor, AK.

An additional $13,000,000 to Montgomery Point Lock and Dam, AR.

An additional $8,000,000 to Los Angeles County Drainage Area, CA.

Earmark of $500,000 to Fort Pierce Beach, FL.

Earmark of $500,000 to Lake Worth Sand Transfer Plant, FL.

An additional $2,000,000 to Chicago Shoreline, IL.

An additional $10,000,000 to Olmstead Locks and Dam, Ohio River, IL and KY.

An additional $2,000,000 to Kentucky Lock and Dam, Tennessee River, KY.

An additional $2,000,000 to Inner Harbor Navigation Canal Lock, LA.

An additional $5,000,000 to Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity, LA.

An additional $1,000,000 to West Bank Vicinity of New Orleans, LA.

An additional $2,500,000 to Poplar Island, MD.

Earmark of $250,000 to Clinton River, MI Spillway.

Earmark of $100,000 to Lake Michigan Center.

Earmark of $1,100,000 to St. Croix River, Stillwater, MN.

An additional $5,000,000 to Blue River Channel, Kansas City, MO.

An additional $1,000,000 to Missouri National Recreational River, NE and SD.

An additional $8,900,000 to Tropicana and Flamingo Washes, NV.

Earmark of $250,000 to Passaic River, Minish Waterfront Park, NJ.

Earmark of $750,000 to New York Harbor Collection and Removal of Drift, NY & NJ.

An additional $4,000,000 to West Columbus, OH.

An additional $90,000 to the Lower Columbia River Basin Bank Protection, OR and WA.

An additional $10,000,000 to Locks and Dams 2, 3 and 4, Monongahela River, PA.

An additional $1,000,000 to Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe, Lower Brule Sioux, SD.

Earmark of $1,000,000 to James River Restoration, SD.

Earmark of $1,000,000 to Black Fox, Murfree Springs, and Oakland Wetlands, TN.

Earmark of $1,000,000 to Tennessee River, Hamilton County, TN.

Earmark of $800,000 to Greenbrier River Basin, WV.

Earmark of $1,000,000 to Lafarge Lake, Kickapoo River, WI.

Earmark of $400,000 for aquatic weed control at Lake Champlain in Vermont.

An additional $960,000 for various earmarks under Section 107, Small Navigation Projects.

An additional $5,675,000 for various earmarks under Section 205, Small flood control projects.

An additional $1,760,000 for various earmarks under Section 206, Aquatic ecosystem restoration.

An additional $1,500,000 for various earmarks under Section 1135, Projects Modifications for improvement of the environment.

An additional $12,500,000 for the Mississippi River Levees, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri and Tennessee.

An additional $500,000 to St. Francis Basin, Arkansas and Missouri.

An additional $2,000,000 for the Louisiana State Penitentiary Levee, Louisiana.

An additional $500,000 for Backwater Pump, Mississippi.

An additional $585,000 for the Big Sunflower River, Mississippi.

An additional $5,000,000 for Demonstration Erosion Control, Mississippi.

An additional $2,000,000 for the St. Johns Bayou and New Madrid Floodway, Missouri.

An additional $2,764,000 for the Mississippi River Levees, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, and Tennessee.

An additional $1,500,000 for the St. Francis River Basin, Arkansas and Missouri.

An additional $2,250,000 for the Atchafalaya Basin, Louisiana.

An additional $1,000,000 for Arkabutla Lake, Missouri.

An additional $1,000,000 for End Lake, Missouri.

An additional $1,000,000 for Grenada Lake, Mississippi.

An additional $1,000,000 for Sardis Lake, Mississippi.

An additional $31,000 for Tributaries, Mississippi.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

An additional $2,000,000 for Mobile Harbor, Alabama.

Earmark of $1,000,000 for Lowell Creek Tunnel (Seward), Arkansas.

An additional $1,500,000 for Mississippi River between Missouri River and Minneapolis, Illinois, Indiana, Minnesota, Missouri.

An additional $525,000 for John Redmond Dam and Reservoir, Kansas.

An additional $2,000,000 for Red River Waterway, Mississippi River to Shreveport, Louisiana.

Earmark of $250,000 for Missouri National River.

An additional $35,000 for Little River Harbor, New Hampshire.

Earmark of $20,000 for Portsmouth Harbor, Piscataqua River, New Hampshire.

An additional $1,500,000 for Delaware River, Philadelphia to the Sea, New Jersey, Pennsylvania and Delaware.

Earmark of $800,000 for Upper Rio Grande Water Operations Model.

An additional $100,000 for Garrison Dam, Lake Sakakawea, North Dakota.

An additional $500,000 for Oologah Lake, Oklahoma.

An additional $2,300,000 for Columbia and Lower Willamette River Below Vancouver, Washington and Portland.

An additional $50,000 for Port Orford, Oregon.

Earmark $400,000 for Corpus Christi Ship Channel, Barge Lanes, Texas.

An additional $1,140,000 for Burlington Harbor Breakwater, Vermont.

An additional $3,000,000 for Grays Harbor and Chehalis River, Washington.

Language which directs the Army Corps of Engineers to address maintenance at Humboldt; Harbor, CA; additional maintenance dredging of the Intracoastal Waterway in South Carolina; from Georgetown to Little River, and from Port Royal to Little River; dredging at the entrance; channel at Murrells Inlet, SC; additional dredging for the Lower Winyah Bay and Gorge in Georgetown Harbor, SC.

Bureau of Reclamation—Water and related resources

Earmark of $5,000,000 for Headgate Rock Hydroelectric Project.

An additional $1,500,000 for Central Valley Project: Sacramento River Division.

Earmark of $250,000 for Fort Hall Indian Reservation.

Earmark of $4,000,000 for Fort Peck Rural Water System, Montana.

Earmark of $2,000,000 for Lake Mead and Las Vegas Wash.

Earmark of $1,500,000 for Newlands Water Right Fund.

Earmark of $800,000 for Truckee River Operation Agreement.

Earmark of $400,000 for Walker River Basin Project.

An additional $2,000,000 for Middle Rio Grande Project.

Earmark of $300,000 for Navajo-Gallup Water Supply Project.

Earmark of $750,000 for Santa Fe Water Reclamation and Reuse.

Earmark of $250,000 for Ute Reservoir Pipeline Project.

An additional $2,000,000 for Garrison Diversion Unit, P–SMBP.

Earmark of $400,000 for Tumalo Irrigation District, Bend Feed Canal, Oregon.

An additional $2,000,000 for Mid-Dakota Rural Water Project.

Earmark of $600,000 for Tooele Wastewater Reuse Project.

Department of Energy

Earmark of $1,000,000 is for the continuation of biomass research at the Energy and Environmental Research Center.

Earmark of $5,000,000 for the McNeil biomass plant in Burlington, Vermont.

Earmark of $300,000 for the Vermont Agriculture Methane project.

Earmark of $2,000,000 for the continued research in environmental and renewable resource technologies by the Michigan Biotechnology Institute.

Earmark of $500,000 for the University of Louisville to research the commercial viability of refinery construction for the production of P-series fuels.

No less than $3,000,000 for the ethanol pilot plant at Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville.

Earmark of $250,000 for the investigation of simultaneous production of carbon dioxide and hydrogen at the natural gas reforming facility in Nevada.

Earmark of $350,000 for the Montana Trade Port Authority in Billings, Montana.

Earmark of $250,000 for the gasification of Iowa switchgrass and its use in fuel cells.

Earmark of $1,000,000 to complete the 4 megawatt Sitka, Alaska project.

Earmark of $1,700,000 for the Power Creek hydroelectric project.

Earmark of $1,000,000 for the Kotzebue wind project.

Earmark of $300,000 for the Old Harbor hydroelectric project.

Earmark of $1,000,000 for a demonstration associated with the planned upgrade of the Nevada Test Site power substations of distributed power generation technologies.

Earmark of $3,000,000 for the University of Nevada at Reno Earthquake Engineering Facility.

An additional $35,000,000 to initiate a new strategy (which includes $5,000,000 for activities at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, $10,000,000 for Los Alamos National Laboratory, and $20,000,000 for work at Sandia National Laboratory).

An addition $15,0000,000 for the Nevada Test Site.

An addition $15,000,000 for future requirements at the Kansas City Plant compatible with the Advanced Development and Production Technologies [ADAPT] program and Enhanced Surveillance program.

An additional $10,000,000 for core stockpile management weapon activities to support work load requirements at the Pantex plant in Amarillo, Texas.

An additional $10,000,000 to address funding shortfalls in meeting environmental restoration Tri-Party Agreement compliance deadlines, and to accelerate interim safe storage of reactors along the Columbia River.

An additional $10,000,000 for spent fuel activities related to the Idaho Settlement Agreement with the Department of Energy.

An additional $30,000,000 for tank cleanup activities at the Hanford Site, WA.

An additional $20,000,000 to Rocky Flats site, CO.

Total amounts of earmarks: $531,124,000.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I rise to explain my amendment to S. 1186, a bill making appropriations for certain Department of Energy programs. Among these programs is the radioactive waste management program which is responsible for developing a nuclear waste repository at Yucca Mountain, in Nevada.

This repository will, if successfully completed, one day hold the spent nuclear fuel from all of this country's commercial nuclear power plants, in addition to defense high-level radioactive waste left-over from the development of nuclear weapons.

It has been 12 years since passage of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act Amendments of 1987, and I believe the Department of Energy's Yucca Mountain program is in serious trouble. In 1983, the Department of Energy signed contracts with every one of this country's nuclear power generators saying that the government would start taking their spent fuel for disposal in January of 1998.

Because of the Government's failure to meet that deadline, a number of utility companies, in conjunction with many State governments, are suing the Federal Government for failure to fulfill its contractual commitments. Many of these utilities are being forced, because of the Government's failure, to construct additional storage capacity at their sites. Many of these companies are seeking monetary damages from the Government.

Inheriting this situation from his predecessors at the Department of Energy, Secretary Richardson laid a proposal before the nuclear utilities last year. Secretary Richardson told the utilities that if they would agree to drop all future claims against the government, the Department of Energy would be willing to pay the utilities for their on site storage costs and that DOE would ''take title''—meaning DOE would take over ownership and all liability—for the spent nuclear fuel and store it at the nuclear power plants for an indefinite period of time.

It is safe to say—since this administration opposes my interim storage legislation—that we can expect spent nuclear fuel under their scenario to be stored at reactors until at least the year 2015, because that is when the repository is expected to open—at the earliest.

The amendment I offer today speaks to the heart of this issue. To be blunt, I think it is irresponsible to create some 80 new federal interim storage sites for spent fuel scattered around this country. And I think the Administration compounds their neglect of this crisis by depleting the funds collected for development of the permanent solution—the Nuclear Waste Fund, created by law in 1982—by dispersing these funds back out to the same utilities who paid them in the first place, only now they are being used as a ''band-aid'' to pay to store fuel at reactors.

Very simply put, my amendment prohibits the Department of Energy from using funds appropriated from the Nuclear Waste Fund for the purpose of settling lawsuits or paying judgments arising out of the failure of the federal government to accept spent nuclear fuel from commercial utilities.

Money in the Nuclear Waste Fund has been collected to pay for a permanent solution to our nuclear waste problem. Mr. President, I don't think we should be squandering these funds on band-aid schemes. My amendment prohibits this from happening.

Mr. DOMENICI. Will my colleague from Idaho yield for a question?

Mr. CRAIG. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I share the concerns of the Senator from Idaho. However, it is not clear to me that the Department of Energy currently has the authority to use appropriated funds from the Nuclear Waste Fund for the purpose—on site storage at nuclear power plants—that is of concern to the Senator from Idaho. As I interpret current law, there exists no statutory provision allowing the Department of Energy to fund on-site storage. If that were the case, would my colleague from Idaho still feel the need to offer his amendment?

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, with my colleague's comment regarding the lack of current Department of Energy authority to use the Nuclear Waste Fund in the way I am concerned, I will reconsider offering my amendment at this time. I thank the Chair and my colleague from New Mexico.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I wanted to make a few remarks with regard to the FY 2000 Energy and Water Appropriations legislation. First, let me state that I am pleased that this bill takes strides to significantly reduce, in the name of fiscal soundness, appropriations for two programs about which I have been concerned for quite some time—the non-power programs of the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) and the Animas La-Plata project by the Bureau of Reclamation. I intend to support this appropriations bill this year.

For the past few Congresses, I have argued that the non-power programs of the TVA should be seriously scrutinized and reduced appropriately. I have introduced legislation which would put TVA on a glidepath toward eliminating federal funding for the non-power programs. The former Senator from Alabama (Mr. HEFLIN) and I personally met with TVA to discuss this legislation and the appropriate length of time for a federal fund phase-out. In the last two appropriations cycles, I have written to the appropriations committee

asking them to reduce TVA non-power appropriations, and in the FY99 appropriations bill the funds for TVA were reduced significantly to a third of the more than $150 million that TVA received when I began raising this issue in the 104th Congress. My voice in the Senate on this issue is echoed by a number of members of the House Appropriations Committee who zeroed out funds for TVA non-power programs in the House-version of the FY99 Energy and Water Appropriations legislation.

I am pleased that this resounding call for scrutiny of these programs is leading to real results. In FY99 the TVA received $50 million dollars, with $7 million of that total specifically for the Land Between the Lakes (LBL) Recreation Area. This appropriations legislation virtually eliminates appropriations for TVA non-power programs, retaining only $7 million in flat funding for LBL. The TVA non-power activities for which we have previously provided funds include providing recreational programs, making economic development grants to communities, and promoting public use of TVA land and water resources. I understand the Committee's concerns that the management of the LBL is a federal responsibility. I believe that the Committee has acted appropriately in this matter. In fulfilling this function, which is federal, the Committee has provided resources specifically for LBL but not for the other non-power programs. In the future, Congress needs to evaluate whether other federal land management agencies, such as the Interior Department, might be able to manage this area, but this is the right step at this time.

I believe it is appropriate for the Senate to significantly reduce funds for TVA's appropriated programs because there are lingering concerns, brought to light in a 1993 Congressional Budget Office (CBO) report, that non-power program funds subsidize activities that should be paid for by non-federal interests. In its 1993 report, CBO focused on two programs: the TVA Stewardship Program and the Environmental Research Center, which no longer receives federal funds. Stewardship activities historically received the largest share of TVA's appropriated funds. The funds are used for dam repair and maintenance activities. According to 1995 testimony provided by TVA before the House Subcommittee on Energy and Water Appropriations, when TVA repairs a dam it pays 70%, on average, of repair costs with appropriated dollars and covers the remaining 30% with funds collected from electricity ratepayers. This practice of charging a portion of dam repair costs to the taxpayer, CBO highlighted, amounts to a significant subsidy. If TVA were a private utility, and it made modifications to a dam or performed routine dredging, the ratepayers would pay for all of the costs associated with that activity. I think that removing appropriations for this program largely ends concerns about taxpayer subsidization of the dam repair and maintenance program.

I am also pleased that this legislation contains a $1 million reduction from the Budget Request for the Animas La-Plata project. In this bill, the project receives a total of $2 million for FY 2000. As my colleagues know, I have long been active in raising Senate awareness about the financial costs of moving forward with development and construction of the full-scale version of the Animas-La Plata project. I do not want the federal government to proceed with construction of the full-scale project while the Department of the Interior continues its discussion about alternatives to that project.

As my colleagues will recall from the debate on an amendment I offered to the FY 98 Energy and Water Appropriations legislation on this matter, the currently authorized Animas-La Plata project is a $754 million dollar water development project planned for southwest Colorado and northwest New Mexico, with federal taxpayers slated to pay more than 65% of the costs. I am glad that we are not proceeding on this project full steam ahead, and I am pleased to see that the Appropriators recognize that on-going alternatives discussions can proceed without a large infusion of new resources.

Despite these gains in reducing funds for some questionable programs, the bill contains some shifts in program funding about which I am concerned. Particularly troubling is the reduction in the President's proposed increase in the renewable energy budget. The bill provides $261 million more for the DOE defense activities than requested by the Administration, but reduces the request for solar and renewable energy programs by $92.1 million. I believe that it is important for the federal government to make appropriate investment in solar and renewable technology, particularly in light of our efforts to restructure the electricity system and meet our overall energy efficiency goals. I would hope that we could find a way to shift resources within this legislation to make it possible to fulfill the Administration's request.

Overall, Mr. President, I am pleased that this bill can meet our requirements under the budget caps by reducing unnecessary spending. I yield the floor.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, as in recent years, the energy and water Appropriation bill has been faced with dilemmas about funding the diverse activities within its jurisdiction. For example, last year, the budget request for the Corps of Engineers was significantly decreased and in this subcommittee we had the challenge of keeping the Corps of Engineers viable and focused. Clearly this year's appropriation bill was just as dramatic—since for the first time in over twenty years the Corps of Engineers funding is reduced below the enacted bill's level. Despite the problems, there are many positives to this particular appropriation which the Chairman and I pointed out in opening statements.

Additionally, we have worked hard to find ways to accommodate our colleagues with their amendments. I believe that the responsibility of a Senator is not simply to listen to the bureaucrats who plan ways to spend the appropriations, but to request those amendments the Senator sees as necessary for his or her constituents. While Members may not be satisfied with every aspect or the resolution of every request, the chairman and I have made a conscientious effort to work with those amendments.

I recommend this bill to my colleagues for the vital functions across the nation that are funded through these appropriations. I recognize the difficult work done by the subcommittee staff and their efforts in preparing this bill and responding to the members of the Senate. So I commend the diligence of Alex Flint, David Gwaltney, Gregory Daines, Lashawnda Leftwich, Elizabeth Blevins, Sue Fry, a detail from the Corps of Engineers, and Bob Perret, a congressional fellow, in my office.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, we are ready to go to final passage. We need 2 minutes, and then we will call for third reading. Senator HUTCHISON wanted 2 minutes. I ask that she be granted 2 minutes, and then we will proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SESSIONS). The Senator from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New Mexico for allowing me 2 minutes. I was introducing a judicial candidate and was not able to come earlier.

I thank the Senator from New Mexico, the chairman of the committee, for the great help he has given to many of us who particularly have strong water needs in our States.

I particularly want to mention the Port of Houston. The Port of Houston is the second largest port in the Nation, and it is the largest in foreign tonnage. It is the largest container port. We have the largest petrochemical complex in the entire world.

It is very important that our port be competitive. This bill will fully fund the dredging of that port, which is the last port in America that has not gone under 40 feet. This will take us to 45.

It is a very important bill.

I think both Senator DOMENICI and Senator LEAHY have done a great job on this bill, but particularly I appreciate the support for this great Port of Houston and the efforts that were made to continue this dredging project that will help us in trade and help us remain competitive in the world market.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask for the third reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. DOMENICI. I ask for the yeas and nays on final passage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass? On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator form Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) would vote ''aye.''

The result was announced—yeas 97, nays 2, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 172 Leg.]

YEAS—97

Abraham	Enzi	Mack
Akaka	Feingold	McCain
Allard	Feinstein	McConnell
Ashcroft	Fitzgerald	Mikulski
Baucus	Frist	Moynihan
Bayh	Gorton	Murkowski
Bennett	Graham	Murray
Biden	Gramm	Nickles
Bingaman	Grams	Reed
Bond	Grassley	Reid
Boxer	Gregg	Robb
Breaux	Hagel	Roberts
Brownback	Hatch	Rockefeller
Bryan	Helms	Roth
Bunning	Hollings	Santorum
Burns	Hutchinson	Sarbanes
Byrd	Hutchison	Schumer
Campbell	Inhofe	Sessions
Chafee	Inouye	Shelby
Cleland	Johnson	Smith (NH)
Cochran	Kennedy	Smith (OR)
Collins	Kerrey	Snowe
Conrad	Kerry	Specter
Coverdell	Kohl	Stevens
Craig	Kyl	Thomas
Crapo	Landrieu	Thompson
Daschle	Lautenberg	Thurmond
DeWine	Leahy	Torricelli
Dodd	Levin	Voinovich
Domenici	Lieberman	Warner
Dorgan	Lincoln	Wyden
Durbin	Lott	
Edwards	Lugar	

NAYS—2

Jeffords Wellstone

NOT VOTING—1

Harkin

(The bill will be printed in a future edition of the RECORD.)

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed, and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES—S. 1059

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate, having received S. 1059, disagrees with the House amendment, requests a conference with the House, and the Chair appoints the following conferees.

The Presiding Officer (Mr. SESSIONS) appointed Mr. WARNER, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. SANTORUM, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. BYRD, Mr. ROBB, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. CLELAND, Ms. LANDRIEU, and Mr. REED conferees on the part of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—S. 1206

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate considers S. 1206, the legislative branch appropriations bill, immediately following the reporting of the bill by the clerk, I be recognized to offer a managers' amendment, and the time on the amendment and the bill be limited to 20 minutes equally divided, with no amendments in order to the managers' amendment.

I further ask unanimous consent that following the adoption of the managers' amendment, the bill be immediately advanced to third reading, and the Senate proceed to the House companion bill.

I further ask unanimous consent that H.R. 1905 be amended as follows: On page 2, after line 1, insert the text of S. 1206, as amended, beginning on page 2, line 2, over to and including line 7 on page 10; beginning on page 11, line 13, over to and including line 18 on page 18 be struck and the text of S. 1206, as amended, beginning on page 10, line 8, over to and including line 22 on page 16 be inserted in lieu thereof; and beginning on page 18, line 23, over to and including line 6 on page 40 be struck and the text of S. 1206, as amended, beginning on line 23, page 16 over to and including line 23 on page 38 be inserted in lieu thereof.

I further ask unanimous consent that upon passage of the House bill, S. 1206, be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I now call up S. 1206.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1206) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I understand that the senior Senator from California, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, is on her way to the floor. I will wait until she is here to express to the entire Senate my appreciation for her assistance as the ranking member of the Legislative Branch Subcommittee of Appropriations.

I have been delighted to have the opportunity to work with her on this legislation and I will make that clear when she arrives. I understand she is in another committee meeting, and in the pattern of the Senate, finds herself torn between two equally important responsibilities. That is a situation with which we are all familiar.

I will, for the information of Senators, point out that the legislative branch bill provides $1.68 billion in budget authority, exclusive of House items, for fiscal year 2000. This is $114 million or 6.4 percent less than the fiscal 1999 level. It represents $105 million or a 5.9-percent decrease from the President's budget request. So in this time of difficulty, we are coming in below last year's spending and below where the President recommended.

There are increases in the bill, of course. There always will be in an appropriations bill. You cut some places, and you increase others. The majority of the increases in the bill account for cost-of-living adjustments only, and they are estimated at 4.4 percent across the board.

The Senate portion of the bill increases funding for the Senate by only 3 percent above the fiscal 1999 level, which is less than the 4.4-percent COLA adjustment. So while the Senate portion of the bill is going up, it is going up less than the mandatory COLA that is required by law.

The bill funds 79 percent of the budget request of the Architect of the Capitol. Of the funds provided, 73 percent will fund operations, with the other 27 percent to fund Capitol projects.

I have always been one who has insisted on funding Capitol projects. As a businessman, I know that sometimes the most expensive savings you can achieve are savings that you take in the name of maintenance deferral. As things begin to deteriorate around the Capitol, it is tempting to say we can put it off for another year and look good in the short term. All you do when you do that is raise your costs in the long term. So throughout my tenure on the Legislative Branch Subcommittee and particularly my tenure as the chairman of that subcommittee, I have always been a champion of funding the Capitol projects and funding the maintenance projects to their fullest level, believing that in the long run that saves money.

Why then am I standing here today and saying that we are not going to do that in this bill, and we are not giving the Architect of the Capitol the funds that were requested? Well, there are several reasons for that. I think it is worth an explanation.

The subcommittee did not fund the Architect's request for $28 million for Capitol dome renovations. I have been in the Capitol dome with the Architect of the Capitol, and I have seen firsthand how desperately in need of renovation it is. However, the full scope of the project will be determined during the paint removal process which is currently underway. The paint removal process is not expected to be completed