

their management of scarce water resources.

Unfortunately, in recent years national investment has not kept pace with our level of economic and social expansion.

Public infrastructure investments including those for water resources infrastructure in 1960 amounted to 3.9 percent of the Gross Domestic Product.

Today the figure is more like 2.6 percent of the GDP.

That may not sound like much of a change, but let's look at the Army Corps during that period.

In the mid 1960s, the country was investing \$4.5 billion annually in new water infrastructure, today it is less than \$1.5 billion (measured in 1996 dollars).

Our water resources needs are no less today than they were 40 years ago. Yet we are investing one third as much.

One major impact of that reduction is the increasingly drawn out construction schedules forced by underfunding these projects.

These artificially lengthened schedules cause the loss of some \$5 billion in annual benefits and increase the cost of these projects by some \$500 million.

Failure to invest in maintenance, major rehabilitation, research and development, and new infrastructure has resulted in the gradual reduction in the value of our capital water resources stocks, and in turn the benefits we receive.

The value of the Army Corps' capital stock peaked in 1981 with a replacement value of \$150 billion. Today its estimated value has decreased to \$124 billion measured in 1995 dollars.

The Army Corps' estimates that their backlog for critical maintenance work is \$400 million and is projected to grow by \$100 million per year at current funding levels.

Our Nation's water infrastructure continues to perform as designed, but evidence of the need for reconstruction or modernization is becoming evident.

Some facilities have reached their capacity and some have reached the end of their design lives. New or shifting populations and growth have created unmet demands.

Finally, society's values are increasingly emphasizing sustainability and ecological considerations in water infrastructure management and development.

As you can see, I am one who firmly believes that investments in our nation's infrastructure more than pay for themselves through improved productivity and efficiency. To ignore these needs in the short term is going to cause us problems over the long haul.

Before I close today, I want to say some words of praise for the federal employees and contractors that populate the Departments, Agencies, and other organizations that are funded under this bill.

In the last year there has been a considerable amount of press and congressional attention surrounding issues

such as security lapses at our National Labs and criticism of processes and procedures at the Army Corps.

From time to time we summons the political leadership of these organizations to the Hill to criticize, chide, or impress upon them the wisdom of our thinking. Often, it can be a pretty warm seat that we put them on.

None of that is to suggest that the Members of this body are anything other than respectful and proud of the hard work and accomplishments of our federal workforce, including contractors, lab employees, and others that make these important organizations run.

We expect a lot of you and, with very few exceptions, you live up to all of the expectations and demands that we impose on you. You serve your nation with distinction and we appreciate it.

I thank the Chairman, and the subcommittee staff for all of their hard work in getting us to this point. His team of Clay Sell, David Gwaltney, and LaShawnda Smith have been great to work with. On the minority staff, I want to say a word of thanks to Roger Cockrell, who is on detail from the Army Corps of Engineers office in Vicksburg, Mississippi, and Liz Blevins of the subcommittee staff.

NATIONAL IGNITION FACILITY FUNDING

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise in support of the Brownback amendment.

The National Ignition Facility has become a shining example of how not to build large national facilities.

When this project was first proposed by the Department of Energy several years ago, DOE sold this project to me and other Members as a cornerstone of our nation's science-based Stockpile Stewardship program.

Leaders from DOE and the Lawrence Livermore National Lab came to me at a time when many Members of the Senate, including Chairman DOMENICI, were somewhat skeptical that NIF was actually needed.

They assured me that NIF was absolutely vital to national security and that it would be brought in on time and within budget.

Based on that, I came to bat for NIF and convinced many of my colleagues to support it.

I regret it. In my estimation, DOE lied to me. They sold me a bill of goods and I am not happy about it.

It is now several years later and the project is hundreds of millions of dollars over budget and years behind schedule.

The administration has undertaken a re-baselining activity in the last year that they believe will put this project back on a glidepath to completion.

Our subcommittee has provided (temporarily) \$74.5 million for the project. The administration wants another \$135 million this year and hundreds of millions of dollars more on top of the

original baseline per year over the next 7 years to get this thing done (3-5 years late).

That is what they say now. By the time we are actually done, it will be billions.

Enough is enough. There is plenty of skepticism in the scientific and national security community as to whether we will ever be able to get the information we need to certify our stockpile from NIF.

I believe there are other, cheaper ways to get this job done and I think it is time to go back to the drawing board and find a new path forward.

I cannot tell you how angry I am that DOE and all of the national labs consistently do this sort of thing to Congress:

They overpromise and under-deliver at a vastly inflated price.

I say, enough is enough. This is nothing personal against Livermore.

If the next big thing at Los Alamos or Sandia runs dramatically over-budget I will be down here again to express my outrage.

I have been a Member of Congress and the Senate too long to watch as administration after administration comes up here to whisper sweet nothings in my ear and then jack up the price a year or two later.

Let me clear about one thing: I have nothing but respect for the thousands of men and women who populate our nation's weapons labs.

The scientists of Lawrence Livermore, Sandia, and Los Alamos are amongst the most brilliant, dedicated, patriotic and creative people on Earth.

The contributions they have made to our nation's national security are too numerous to count.

In recent years, I have had two Fellows from Lawrence Livermore, Larry Ferderber and Bob Perret, serve in my personal office. They both did exceptional work for me, for Nevada, and for our nation. They both served me very well for many years.

It is a shame that the highest levels of leadership at DOE and at Livermore have not served their employees and the American people with equal distinction.

Mr. PRESIDENT, I yield the Floor. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. I ask to speak for 30 seconds.

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

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I thank Senator REID for his comments and his cooperation. We still have a few days to go. The picture presented with reference to the nondefense portion of this bill, in particular, is absolutely true. I cannot figure why the House and Senate in their overall scope of allocating money continue to underallocate for nondefense when Senators and House Members probably request more of us in the nondefense part of this bill than any bill, except perhaps the interior appropriations bill.

The Senator mentions 1,000 requests. Those have to do with projects or programs or activities for dams that are clearly within reason as things we should do. I am working hard and will continue to work hard to try to get additional allocation before we complete the conference. I hope we can. Obviously if we cannot, with what the House has appropriated this will be a bad overall result for the nondefense

part of the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation.

Mr. REID. I hope we can get a bill that we can send to the President, recognizing that it is a bill that he will sign. I hope we can do that. We have a commitment from the chairman of the full committee, Senator STEVENS, that he will work with us. Knowing his tenacity, I am confident we will be able to come up with something that is appropriate.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M.
TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in adjournment until 9:30 a.m., Wednesday, September 6, 2000.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 7:26 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, September 6, 2000, at 9:30 a.m.