United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 104th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 142 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MAY 30, 1996 No. 77

Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, June 3, 1996, at 1:30 p.m.

House of Representatives

THURSDAY, MAY 30, 1996

The House met at 10 a.m.

The Reverend Brewster Y. Beach, vicar emeritus, St. Peter's Episcopal Church-Lithgow, Millbrook, NY, offered the following prayer:

O Lord our Governor, whose glory is in all the world, we commend to Thy merciful care the women, men, and children of every land whom Thou hast created, that seeking Thy guidance they may dwell secure in Thy peace. We pray especially this day for those to whom have been given the ordering of our common affairs in this our land. Fill them with the love of truth and righteousness and make them ever mindful of their calling to serve this people in Thy fear and devotion. In the time of prosperity, fill our hearts with thankfulness, and in the day of trouble, suffer not our trust in Thee to fail. All which we ask in Thy name and for Thy sake. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 325, nays 66, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 41, as follows:

[Roll No. 199]

YEAS—325

Ackerman
Allard
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Brewster
Browder
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooley
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis
Deal
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Evans
Ewing
Farr
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Flake
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Geren
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Green (TX)
Greenwood
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Lantos
Largent
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McCrery
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
McKinney
Meehan
Meek
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Montgomery
Moorhead
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Nadler
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Obey
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Riggs
Rivers
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roth
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Salmon
Sanders
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Schumer

☐ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., ☐ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

Scott	Stearns	Upton
Seastrand	Stenholm	Velazquez
Sensenbrenner	Stokes	Vucanovich
Serrano	Studds	Walker
Shadegg	Stump	Walsh
Shaw	Stupak	Wamp
Shays	Talent	Ward
Shuster	Tanner	Watt (NC)
Sisisky	Tate	Watts (OK)
Skaggs	Tauzin	Waxman
Skeen	Taylor (NC)	Weldon (FL)
Skelton	Thomas	Weldon (PA)
Smith (MI)	Thornberry	White
Smith (NJ)	Thornton	Wicker
Smith (WA)	Thurman	Wise
Solomon	Torres	Woolsey
Souder	Torricelli	Young (AK)
Spence	Towns	Young (FL)
Spratt	Traficant	Zeliff

NAYS—66

Abercrombie	Funderburk	Menendez
Becerra	Gephardt	Neal
Borski	Gillmor	Oberstar
Brown (CA)	Gutierrez	Pallone
Brown (FL)	Gutknecht	Pickett
Brown (OH)	Hefley	Roemer
Bunn	Hefner	Rush
Chapman	Heineman	Sabo
Chrysler	Hilleary	Schroeder
Clay	Hilliard	Slaughter
Clyburn	Hinchey	Stockman
Collins (IL)	Jacobs	Taylor (MS)
Costello	Johnson, E. B.	Thompson
DeFazio	LaFalce	Torkildsen
Dingell	Latham	Vento
Durbin	Levin	Visclosky
English	Lewis (GA)	Volkmer
Ensign	Longley	Weller
Everett	Maloney	Whitfield
Fazio	Martini	Wolf
Filner	McDermott	Yates
Fox	McNulty	Zimmer

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Harman

NOT VOTING—41

Beilenson	Gibbons	Nethercutt
Boucher	Gilchrest	Olver
Bryant (TX)	Greene (UT)	Peterson (FL)
Christensen	Hayes	Pomeroy
Coleman	Herger	Roukema
Cummings	Houghton	Smith (TX)
de la Garza	Jefferson	Stark
Dornan	Kennelly	Tejeda
Engel	Lincoln	Tiahrt
Eshoo	Livingston	Waters
Fattah	McDade	Williams
Fields (LA)	Molinari	Wilson
Foglietta	Mollohan	Wynn
Ford	Moran	

□ 1023

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, today, May 30, I was not present to record my votes on rollcall votes No. 199 and No. 200. I was unavoidably absent due to the arrival yesterday of my adopted son, Scott Kirby Pomeroy, from Korea.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON] come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mrs. CLAYTON led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

WELCOME TO THE REVEREND BREWSTER BEACH

(Mrs. KELLY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the U.S. House of Representatives, I am delighted to welcome Rev. Brewster Beach to the Halls of Congress and recognize him for delivering that inspirational opening prayer.

Reverend Beach has recently retired from St. Peter's Episcopal Church of Lithgow where his devotion and dedication helped the church grow considerably. Over the years, Reverend Beach started a Sunday School, formed a choir, expanded the church hall, and almost doubled the size of the parish. He is well known throughout the Hudson Valley and into New York City, not only as a minister but as a psychotherapist.

I would like to thank former Congressman Hamilton Fish for arranging to have Reverend Beach lead us in our opening prayer. We are all honored that he traveled all the way from Millbrook, NY, to join us today. Thank you again, Rev. Brewster Beach.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 30, 1996.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have the honor to transmit herewith a copy of the unofficial election returns received from the Honorable Phil Keisling, Secretary of State, State of Oregon, indicating that, according to the incomplete results of the Special Election held on May 21, 1996, the Honorable Earl Blumenauer was elected to the office of Representative in Congress, from the Third Congressional District, State of Oregon.

With warm regards,

ROBIN H. CARLE.

STATE OF OREGON,
Salem, OR, May 22, 1996.

Hon. ROBIN H. CARLE,
Clerk, House of Representatives, The Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR ROBIN: Pursuant to your request, I am faxing to you the unofficial returns for the Special Election for Representative in Congress in the Third Congressional District as obtained from the Multnomah and Clackamas County Elections. I must emphasize the fact that these returns cannot be considered official since, pursuant to Oregon law, the official returns are not due to the Secretary of States' Office, Elections Division until June 10, 1996. Also, the Elections Division has until June 20, 1996 to canvass the votes and certify the election results. This notification, therefore, cannot be construed as an official certification as required by ORS 254.545 of the Oregon Election Laws.

On May 21, 1996, a special election was held to elect a U.S. Representative to Oregon's Third Congressional District, for a term ending in January, 1997. The incomplete results, as of 12:00 noon May 22, as reported by Multnomah County and Clackamas County, were as follows: (see page 2)

Sincerely,

PHIL KEISLING,
Secretary of State.

U.S. REPRESENTATIVE, THIRD DISTRICT, ''INCOMPLETE RESULTS''

	Multnomah	Clackamas
Blumenauer, 50,125 equal	46,135	3,990
Brunelle, 17,085 equal	14,725	2,360
Keating, 2,916 equal	2,703	213
Guillebeau, 1,604 equal	1,501	103

Absentees still to be counted as of 12:00 noon, May 22, 1996:

Multnomah Co. estimated to count	22,500
Clackamas Co. estimated to count	4,000
Total	26,500

Final Certification of the election, as required under Oregon law, must occur no later than June 20, 1996.

SWEARING IN OF THE HONORABLE EARL BLUMENAUER, OF OREGON, AS A MEMBER OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oregon, Mr. EARL BLUMENAUER, be permitted to take the oath of office today. His certificate of election has not arrived, but there is no contest, and no question has been raised with regard to his election.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Will the Member-elect and the Oregon delegation present themselves.

Mr. BLUMENAUER appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office, as follows:

Do you solemnly swear that you will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that you will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that you take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion, and that you will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which you are about to enter. So help you God.

The SPEAKER. Congratulations, you are a Member of the Congress of the United States.

WELCOMING THE HONORABLE EARL BLUMENAUER TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

(Mr. DEFAZIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I would first yield to the Honorable RICHARD GEPHARDT, the minority leader.

Mr. GEPHARDT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to join all of my colleagues—Democrats and Republicans alike—as we welcome the newest Member of the U.S. House of Representatives, EARL BLUMENAUER of Portland, OR.

As we all know, EARL comes to Congress with big shoes to fill. He's following in the footsteps of our former colleague, RON WYDEN, now the junior Senator from Oregon. For 15 years, RON devoted himself to the people of Portland. His service and effectiveness will certainly be missed in the people's House.

But I think the people of the Third District of Oregon have chosen a remarkable replacement in EARL BLUMENAUER—for they have chosen a man who has spent his entire life building his community, and bringing Portland's common sense to Portland's problems.

EARL had a passion for public policy at a very young age, testifying before Congress while he was still a college student. And after finishing school and working briefly in education, EARL became the youngest person ever elected to the Oregon Legislature, at 23 years old.

After three terms in his State's legislature, two as county commissioner, and three more on Portland's City Council, EARL has shown that his dedication to local solutions could have a national impact.

He's already recognized as a leader on urban environment and transportation policies. He's been a champion of reasonable, thoughtful land use; aggressive recycling; and the kind of light rail that has worked so well throughout the Portland region.

No wonder EARL won the support of prominent Republicans as well as Democrats in his election bid.

So I'm delighted to welcome him to Congress—to serve the people of Portland, and all Americans. I expect that his vision and values will contribute a great deal to our debates, and to the Nation's problems.

□ 1030

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the minority leader, and I am very pleased myself to have the honor of welcoming the gentleman from Oregon, EARL BLUMENAUER, as the newest Member of the U.S. House of Representatives and the Oregon delegation.

I have to say, in all honesty, I cannot think of a more highly qualified person to represent Oregon as a new Member in this body. He has a lengthy history of public service: He served in the Oregon Legislature, the Oregon Community College Board; he was a Multnomah County Commissioner at the same time I was a Lane County Commissioner, a tremendous experience and training to become a Member of Congress, to bring that local orientation with him; and he was on the Portland City Council.

Throughout his 24 years of elected office, perhaps the thing he is best known for is he is a worker, a hard worker. In each position that he has held of public trust he has not only done the job that has been asked of him, he as taken on a leadership role, rolled up his sleeves and helped develop creative and workable solutions to problems at every level of government. He has not risen through the ranks of government by resting on his laurels on his past record; he is constantly working, learning, serving, and doing better.

I know he will continue that commitment here in Congress, and I look forward to having his skill, knowledge, and energy to call upon and utilize as we work to do the people's business for the citizens of Oregon and our Nation.

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEFAZIO. I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Speaker, I, too, am extraordinarily excited and happy that we are being joined by a great new Member from Oregon.

I think I would just like to say that to me the gentleman from Oregon, EARL BLUMENAUER, has the perfect background for being a Member of Congress, because he has been an activist. He has been an activist in our community and he has been a public servant. And it seems to me there is not a part of Oregon that does not in some way have that gentleman's fingerprints upon it. Whether it is the livability of our cities, whether it is recycling or transportation, he has been there and he has done the hard work.

He has shaped, I think, the present of the most livable city in this country, Portland, OR, and has shaped the future of that city, and I know that he will work to shape the future for not just Oregon but for the United States as he works with us in this prestigious body, and I welcome him to this delegation and to this House, the people's House.

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for their kind words. I am honored to be able to join my colleagues and looking forward to working with them in advancing the tradition of the House.

I am greatly appreciative of the help of Representative DEFAZIO, Representative FURSE, Senator HATFIELD, and Senator WYDEN, and others from the Oregon delegation in terms of making the transaction work for me, and I am looking forward to working with all my colleagues to protect the environment and leave this country a little better for our children.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CHAMBLISS). There will be 10 1-minutes on each side.

THE PRESIDENT ON WELFARE REFORM

(Mr. CHABOT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, here is a quote from Tuesday's Washington Times editorial on welfare reform:

> Knowing the salience that welfare reform has with the electorate, the President desperately wants to be seen as leading the reform effort that he has actually been sabotaging.

The Times is right. Bill Clinton campaigned on a promise to, remember, end welfare as we know it. Of course he vetoed welfare reform twice. Bill Clinton has also dragged his feet on granting waivers to the States that would allow them to fix the welfare mess in those States. The White House has denied waivers to Illinois and Massachusetts and Wyoming. Those States waited up to 20 months to be notified of their denial. Just ridiculous.

The States should not have to crawl to Washington on bended knee to get permission to do the right thing for their own people.

When it comes to reforming welfare, despite talk about the end of the era of big government, Bill Clinton apparently still believes that big government knows best.

SENIORS, BEWARE OF PROPOSED CHANGES IN HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, the Republican leadership budget is being negotiated now between the two houses and we may have a motion to go to conference within the next day or so. I just wanted to point out once again that this budget essentially cuts Medicare and Medicaid in order to provide tax breaks for the wealthiest of Americans.

It is the same old thing that we had last year in 1995. Once again Medicare and Medicaid are on the chopping block and seniors are going to be given less choices and they will be pushed into managed care, which means they will not have the choice of doctors or in many cases even the choice of hospitals. And once again they are going to have to pay more, because the balanced billing provisions, the protections that exist right now that do not allow doctors to charge more or significantly more than 15 percent to their Medicare patients will be out the window.

If you stay in the traditional fee-for-service system where you have your own choice of doctor or your own choice of hospital, you could be charged extra, really unlimited amounts, under the provisions that the Republican leadership have placed into this budget.

Also, what they are doing with the medical savings accounts is they are making it so that seniors who opt for a medical savings account, which is a catastrophic policy essentially, will

not have the guarantee of most of the Medicare benefits. For the first time in the history of the Medicare program, some senior citizens will have the guarantee of all their Medicare benefits and others will not because they opt for catastrophic coverage and will not necessarily know what they are getting into.

So beware, seniors, of what the Republicans are doing in this budget.

NOW TO ACHIEVE GENUINE WELFARE REFORM

(Mr. HAYWORTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, some things are totally predictable in this Chamber and nationwide. Just as the swallows return to Capistrano and the buzzards go back to Hinckley, so, too, does my good friend from New Jersey come to the well day after day with what I will diplomatically call deliberate disinformation, what the media has called Mediscare.

Here we have it once again. We have gotten the same thing from the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue. Again, the President says he want to end welfare as we know it. Well, perhaps the President and some of my friends on this side of the aisle need to have a little refresher course because, Mr. Speaker, we live in the United States of America, not the centralized bureaucracy of America.

The first meaningful step toward genuine welfare reform is to give the States the true flexibility to solve problems, not with Washington having the States coming on bended knee to ask for waivers, not with a centralized bureaucracy. Mr. Speaker, it is time to replace the counterfeit compassion of Uncle Sam and big brother with a genuine compassion of local people solving local problems.

REPUBLICAN CUTS IN MEDICARE AND MEDICAID WILL CLOSE HOSPITALS

(Mr. VOLKMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, the radical right of the Republicans under Speaker GINGRICH are at it again. Last year the Democrats and the minority brought to the attention of the people of this country that the radical Republicans under Speaker GINGRICH were going to cut, under their budget and under their Balanced Budget Act, Medicare and Medicaid. They were going to make senior citizens pay more for it. They were going to close hospitals before that bill ended this 4, 5, 6, and 7 years, hospitals all across this Nation.

Well, we, as the minority, along with the President, by vetoing the legislation, we stopped that. Well, guess what, folks? Look at this year's budget by the Republicans again. They are at it again.

I will have, if that comes true, I will have at least four hospitals in my district that will have to be closed. That ends medical care not only for the elderly but for everybody else. I will have senior citizens that have to pay more.

I want to tell the gentleman from Arizona that spoke before, why does he want to cut Medicare and Medicaid?

PRESIDENT CLINTON HAS BECOME THE ''MAYBE MAN''

(Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, President Clinton has become the maybe man. Maybe he will end welfare as we know it, and maybe he will not. Maybe he will sign the waiver for Wisconsin's welfare reforms and maybe he will not.

Should we trust what Clinton says or should we judge Clinton by what he does: Delay, waffle, and when inaction is not an option, veto.

The President has vetoed national welfare reform not once but twice. Congress has introduced new welfare reforms based on the unanimous recommendations of the National Governors' Association. These reforms have tough work requirements, have real time limits and end Washington's grip on the power, money and influence to block innovative reforms by the States.

Considering welfare reform and President Clinton, will the third time prove the charm or will the President strike out?

REPUBLICANS STILL RELYING ON MEDICARE CUTS TO PAY FOR TAX BREAKS

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Republican majority is still relying on Medicare cuts to pay for its tax breaks and its special deals for its friends. They have wisely come down from their demands of last year in cutting Medicare $270 billion and last year they offered a $245 billion tax break.

Their plan now for the next 6 years still contains Medicare cuts. These cuts would allow health care plans to charge seniors substantially more and reduce the seniors' choice of health care plans by pushing more seniors into managed care. Costs for seniors in the traditional Medicare would increase.

We need to reform Medicare but the Republicans take too much bite out of the apple. We need to reform the program by investing more into the waste, fraud and abuse investigations. Nearly $40 million has been recouped by the Medicare trust fund because of actions of this administration.

We need to fully fund waste, fraud and abuse investigations and reform the trust fund along the lines recommended by the trustees. We do not need to cut Medicare just to pay for tax breaks.

TRIBUTE TO CHARLOTTE FULLER CLONTS

(Mr. BARR of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, one of the most wonderful things about our community is that so many of its citizens give to the community despite their own challenges. Charlotte Fuller Clonts is one of those special citizens. Though she faces tough personal battles, Charlotte constantly and selflessly gives of herself to her community.

Charlotte resides in the Ridge Road community with her loving husband of 45 years and is well-known throughout Paulding County for her tireless efforts for the Veterans Memorial.

Since July 1995, Charlotte has served as publicity chairwoman for the memorial fund. Working bedridden much of the time, gathering information and writing during countless sleepless nights, Charlotte has helped to raise over $50,000 to construct the memorial in record time.

She was recognized for her hard work just a few years ago when she was named ''Citizen of the Year.'' Charlotte has been involved in many other organizations as well, including: the Paulding County Chamber of Commerce, the Paulding County Planning Commission, the Paulding County Division March of Dimes, and many others. On behalf of Paulding County and the entire seventh district, I thank Charlotte for her loyalty to our community and to our country, and commend her to us all as an outstanding community citizen.

GINGRICH-LED CONGRESS STILL DESIROUS OF CUTTING MEDICARE TO FUND TAX BREAKS

(Mr. DOGGETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, our fellow citizens know this Gingrich Congress by its deeds, and first among these is its continuing desire to cut Medicare in order to fund the tax breaks for our most wealthy citizens.

We saw a great deal of that last year as they proposed cuts of $270 billion in a pay more, get less Medicare plan. And this year they have not given up on that determination, as the Speaker says, to let Medicare wither on the vine. They have just regrouped and are coming at it from another angle.

□ 1045

They have taken it step by step. Since it is an election year, they want to provide the tax break this year, hand out candy before the election, and next year come back with the full dimension of the Medicare cuts that will be necessary to pay for these election eve political tax breaks for the wealthy. The good indication that they still have their plan to cut Medicare on track is the budget resolution we have up tomorrow as they propose to have seniors pay for bills that they get from doctors above what Medicare pays.

THE PRESIDENT AND WELFARE

(Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, you will remember that during his Presidential campaign, Bill Clinton promised to end welfare as we know it. But when he was elected, he vetoed welfare reform twice.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans take a different view. We do not view welfare as a political football. We want to give the States greater flexibility. We want tough work requirements. We want a 5-year limit on benefits. We want to lift people out of poverty and despair.

There is a huge difference between Bill Clinton's view on welfare reform and the Republican view of welfare reform. Bill Clinton wants to demagog. He wants to protect Washington bureaucracy and Washington spending.

Republicans want to actually keep our promises and actually do something to make a difference in the lives of those caught in the grasp of the welfare state.

Mr. Speaker, we can only hope that Bill Clinton will honor his word and help us reform welfare.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CHAMBLISS). The Chair would remind the Member not to refer to the President in personal terms.

IMPACT ON AGRICULTURE OF UNION PACIFIC-SOUTHERN PACIFIC MERGER

(Mr. STENHOLM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker. I rise to express my deep concern regarding the proposed merger between the Union Pacific and Southern Pacific Railroads which is under consideration by the Surface Transportation Board.

If approved, this merger would be the largest rail merger in the history of the United States. It will result in only two railroads controlling the entire western half of the Nation. This massive consolidation of rail transportation could hurt competition in the rail industry, and ultimately, hurt farmers, ranchers, and shippers in the agriculture industry.

It is no secret that rail service is critical to the economic well-being of this Nation's agricultural and rural economies. Nearly half of all grain produced in the United States moves to market by rail. In fact, in 1995, grain, grain mill products, and other farm products accounted for more than 2.14 million rail loadings.

The very survival of farmers and ranchers depends on their ability to ship commodities at a competitive price and in a timely fashion. Access to reliable, cost-effective rail transportation is the only way they can remain competitive in markets here and overseas. With this proposed merger, they may not have that critical access.

With this merger, competition for rail transportation of agricultural products will be eliminated in some areas. With reduced competitive transportation options, agricultural shippers could be faced with higher rates and prices for rail services.

Farmers and local shippers in many rural areas will become captive customers, totally dependent on only one carrier to supply grain cars and ship to distant markets.

The proposed merger seems to be on a dangerous fast track. As the Surface Transportation Board considers this merger, we must urge them to consider all alternatives to monopoly and duoploy.

CHILDREN NEED PARENTS, NOT GOVERNMENT EXPERTS

(Mr. LARGENT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LARGENT. Mr. Speaker, in the next few days, we will be hearing a lot about the plight of children. The Stand for Children rally, scheduled for Saturday, will urge government to do more for children. The best protectors of children, the event organizers claim, are government bureaucrats and children's advocates.

I disagree. The best advocates for children today—and the most unappreciated—are moms and dads standing together for their children. The best thing we could do as a society and for children is not pour more money into marginal programs, but affirm and support families and parents.

H.R. 1946, the Parental Rights and Responsibilities Act, promotes the idea that family is key to providing for children. Parents are in the best position to protect and provide for their children. And the PRRA protects families from the harmful actions of government bureaucrats.

If the actions of the East Stroudsburg, PA, school officials who conducted genital exams on 11-year-old girls, without informing the girls or receiving explicit parental approval, is any indication of what it means to stand for children, Congress should quickly vote on and pass the PRRA. Because when it comes to children, what they need are moms and dads—not government experts.

TEENAGE PREGNANCY PREVENTION MONTH

(Mrs. CLAYTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, both President Clinton and Governor Hunt of my State have declared May as Teenager Pregnancy Prevention Month.

Many are observing National Teen Pregnancy Prevention Month because it has been shown that many more teenagers become pregnant during May than in any other month.

This is attributed to the many special events that occur in May such as proms, graduations, field trips, and other social outings.

The goal of teen pregnancy prevention efforts should be to assist teens to achieve social responsibility and long-term economic self-sufficiency.

To achieve this goal we must have a combined effort between the public and the private sectors.

Teen Pregnancy Prevention Month provides an opportunity to recognize existing teen pregnancy prevention programs.

Over the days and weeks to follow, I will share with our colleagues information about a variety of teenage pregnancy prevention programs that are underway.

It is time for all of us to join in this effort.

SPENDING ON CHILD CARE

(Ms. DUNN of Washington asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DUNN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, last week the White House rapid response team got another one wrong. Clinton adviser George Stephanopolous actually said that the administration opposed the Republican bill in Congress because it cuts too deeply into child care. ''We've been willing to have flexibility,'' he said, ''but we cannot agree to cuts in child care.''

Mr. Speaker, are Republicans cutting child care? Well, to borrow a phrase from John McLaughlin: wrong. Let us talk reality. The current Republican welfare plan based on the bipartisan Governors' proposal calls for $4.5 billion more in mandatory and discretionary child care spending than the Clinton plan.

Here is the bottom line, Mr. Speaker: Republicans provide more funding for child care in our welfare plan than does the President in his, and making up excuses to oppose welfare reform does not help a single child escape the welfare

trap and does not provide a single mother the help she needs to find a job.

President Clinton is in dire need of sensitivity training for hiring a pollster who also is employed by an accused rapist.

Mr. Speaker, while we are signing up Clinton administration officials in classes, someone should enroll George in remedial math.

WELFARE REFORM PLAN IS NOT BIPARTISAN

(Mr. CARDIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, let me point out that the statement of the last speaker is just wrong. This is not a bipartisan proposal that is being brought up on Medicaid and welfare. The Democratic Governors have pointed out, although they worked very hard with Republican Governors to come out with a fair compromise on the subject of Medicaid and welfare, the proposal that the Republicans are bringing forward is not that compromise.

Mr. Speaker, once again we find the Republicans trying to bring out a Presidential veto rather than getting anything done. At least we had the Democratic Governors and the Republican Governors working together, a lesson that we should learn here of working together. But instead, the Republican leadership is bringing out their bill, not the bipartisan bill.

Mr. Speaker, I regret that, because I think we had an opportunity to get something done. But, obviously, the Republican leadership does not want that to happen.

CHANGE WELFARE AS WE KNOW IT

(Mr. SMITH of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, look, most of the American people know that our welfare programs are not working. They have been successful in transferring money, and in the process they have taken away the self-respect, in many cases they have taken away the eagerness for those individuals to get up every morning and go to work and be a contributor to society.

Mr. Speaker, can we imagine any American family going to their young teenage daughter and saying, ''I want to talk to you about individual responsibility and pregnancy''; and then they say, ''If you get pregnant, we are going to increase your allowance by $500 a month, give you a separate place to live, and give you a food allowance''?

We would never do that as individual families, yet our society does that. It has got to change. My Governor, John Engler, has come to this administration for waivers. Governor Thompson of Wisconsin has come in for waivers. Let us change welfare as we know it.

SENIORS TARGETED BY REPUBLICAN MEDICARE PLAN

(Ms MCKINNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, Medicare protections against the extra-billing of seniors are the latest target of Republican leaders. As it stands now, health care providers are not allowed to extra-bill seniors for services paid for by Medicare. Under the Republicans' latest Medicare proposal, however, seniors would become sitting ducks for unscrupulous providers who want to make a fast buck by extra-billing the sick elderly.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, Republican leaders are perfectly happy to let gluttonous defense contractors overbill the American taxpayer. Rather than clamping down on military contractors' overbilling the U.S. taxpayer, they will get an extra $12.4 billion, thanks to the Republicans.

Under a Republican-controlled Congress, defense contractors and the health care industry have free reign to give our seniors and taxpayers a B–2-sized wedgie with NEWT's blessing.

WELFARE SYSTEM NEEDS GREATER FLEXIBILITY

(Mr. KINGSTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, let me tell my colleagues about Sue and Sally Jones; real people, fake names, Sue is 18 years old. She has a baby. Her sister, Sally, is 15 years old. She does not have any children. She is in the 8th grade; should be in the 10th grade. Sue is a 10th grader who should be a senior.

Mr. Speaker, they do not live with their biological dad, because he was killed when they were toddlers. They live their biological mother's common-law husband, but the biological mother does not live at home anymore because she is a crack addict. One day she threw ash in her live-in husband's eyes, and he is disabled and cannot work.

They have a brother but not by the same biological father. He is in jail. This is a real family, but the caseworker in Savannah tells me that he thinks he can get both of these ladies off of the Government's welfare system and into the socioeconomic mainstream; but he needs flexibility.

Mr. Speaker, right now in our rigid, Washington-dictated welfare system one person has to work on their child care needs, one on the food needs, and one on the health care needs. Somebody else has to work on transportation, someone else on education.

Mr. Speaker, I tell my colleagues, these girls cannot get out of the poverty trap with a system like this. They need flexibility. The caseworker needs flexibility, and that is why we need to support Medicaid and welfare State grants.

CONGRESS SHOULD CELEBRATE OLDER AMERICANS MONTH

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, shame on us. This is the end of Older Americans Month, and here we are again, throwing them to the wolves.

First of all, we are telling many of our older Americans who live in rural communities that with the Republican extreme Medicare plan, they are going to see some of their more familiar hospital sites closed.

Oh, yes, Mr. Speaker, I received a letter from those individuals who would suggest that we do not have the facts. I am saddened to say that that individual who wrote a letter to my office did not have the courage to write a return address for us to be able to reply with the facts.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, rural hospitals will close under the extremist Republican Medicare plan. And, yes, many of our seniors who have gotten familiar with their own physicians, have a relationship with them, will be pushed into managed care.

Mr. Speaker, do my colleagues know about managed care? That is the kind of care that says we can only have 15 minutes with our doctor. That is the kind of care that says: I do not know if I can refer to you a specialist; it may cost too much.

We need to be able to say to the Republicans that we believe in older Americans because they have believed in America. We should not give to the wealthy Americans the crown jewel of tax reduction while we short-change our senior citizens. I am going to celebrate Older Americans Month.

REPUBLICANS' MEDICAID PROPOSALS WILL ALLOW EXTRA CHARGES TO RECIPIENTS

(Ms. DELAURO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, last week, in a room off the floor, House Republicans could take a minute out of their day and have their picture taken with a senior citizen and a sign that read something like this: ''I am friendly to seniors.''

It was a staged photo opportunity and, in fact, it was and is phony. Since taking control of the Congress, the Republicans have waged an all-out assault against seniors. Their new budget cuts $169 billion from Medicare in order to finance tax breaks for the wealthy.

Today's Washington Post says the current Medicaid proposal from the GOP would ''turn Medicaid over to the

States. It would allow States to levy copayments and other charges on certain Medicaid recipients.''

In other words, Mr. Speaker, seniors could be forced to pay for services that they receive now. And it means extra bills for many who are on fixed incomes.

Republicans have consistently targeted seniors for budget cutbacks while setting aside hefty tax breaks for the wealthy. With a track record like that, it is no wonder that the Republicans have had to stage photo ops. Better to hide behind a Kodak moment than to face how your policies have affected this Nation's seniors.

□ 1100

TRAVELGATE DOCUMENTS

(Mr. CLINGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I want to announce to the Members of the House that the White House has, within the last half hour, turned over a box of documents to my committee, the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, regarding our investigation into the Travelgate firing matter, together with a comprehensive privileged log detailing those documents which are being withheld from examination by my committee under a claim of executive privilege.

We are clearly making some progress, I think, in this matter. As a result of that, I have requested and asked the leadership of the majority to hold back, to pull back the contempt citation which was scheduled to be considered either today or tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, I would consider this the beginning of a victory for the House because we are reasserting the rights of the House to have access to documents. We had been told by the administration that they would never give us a privileged log; today they did. I think that is enough reason to hold back on any further proceedings on the contempt citation.

We need to examine the documents which the White House has turned over to us. We need to consider the claims of executive privilege that have been exerted with regard to, I would point out, a very large number of documents. About 11 pages are being withheld, 11 pages listing the documents being withheld. We have to consider the validity, the viability of the claims of executive privilege. So we want to spend some time carefully reviewing the offered documents and understand clearly why they are withholding others and whether that has any validity. Only then I think, Mr. Speaker, can a new judgment be made as to whether we need to press ahead or complete our investigations with the missing documents that the White House is claiming must be withheld without looking at those for whatever reasons they are withholding it.

So, Mr. Speaker, with that, as I indicated, I have requested our leadership to pull the contempt citation from consideration from the floor today.

PERMISSION FOR SUNDRY COMMITTEES AND THEIR SUBCOMMITTEES TO SIT TODAY DURING THE 5-MINUTE RULE

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following committees and their subcommittees be permitted to sit today while the House is meeting in the Committee of the Whole under the 5-minute rule:

Committee on Agricultre; Committee on Commerce; Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities; Committee on Government Reform and Oversight; Committee on International Relations; Committee on the Judiciary; Committee on Resources; Committee on Small Business; Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure; Committee on Veterans' Affairs; and Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the minority has been consulted and that there is no objection to these requests.

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

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3517, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1997

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 442 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 442

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3517) making appropriations for military construction, family housing, and base realignment and closure for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. Points of order against consideration of the bill for failure to comply with clause 7 of rule XXI are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five minute rule. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 or 6 of rule XXI are waived. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 6 of rule XXIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may reduce to not less than five minutes the time for voting by electronic device on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote by electronic device without intervening business, provided that the time for voting by electronic device on the first in any series of questions shall be not less than fifteen minutes. After the reading of the final lines of the bill, a motion that the Committee of the Whole rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted shall, if offered by the majority leader or a designee, have precedence over a motion to amend. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

(Mr. QUILLEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 442 is an open rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 3517, the military construction appropriations bill for fiscal year 1997. The rule provides 1 hour of general debate, and waives the 3-day requirement for availability of printed hearings and the committee report. In this case, the committee report has been available for the required amount of time but the complete set of hearings has not.

The rule also waives the prohibition against unauthorized appropriations and legislation in general appropriations bills. This is primarily necessary because the Defense authorization bill has not yet been signed into law. Additionally, the rule waives the prohibition on transfers of unobligated funds, which was included at the request of the Appropriations Committee.

The rule allows for priority in recognition to Members who have preprinted their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD prior to their consideration, and it provides the usual motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, there are two provisions in this rule which deviate from the typical rule on a general appropriations bill. First, the rule provides the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole the authority to postpone and cluster votes on amendments.

While this has been done before in rules, it has usually been done by unanimous consent on appropriations bills. This provision was included at the request of Chairman LIVINGSTON.

The second new feature of this rule is really a clarification of an existing House rule regarding the privileged motion to rise and report the bill to the House at the end of the regular amendment process.

Clause 2(d) of House Rule 21 provides that after a general appropriations bill has been read for amendment and all regular amendments have been considered, a privileged motion may be offered by the majority leader or a designee that the Committee rise and report the bill back to the House with such amendments as have been adopted.

According to that rule, this motion shall have precedence over motions to further amend the bill. If the motion is rejected, then it is in order to consider limitation amendments, but the motion can be renewed after the disposition of any limitation amendment.

The intent of the rule when it was first adopted in 1983 was to allow for the disposal of all regular amendments at the end of the reading of the bill for amendment before entertaining any limitation amendments. Once the limitation amendment process was underway, the motion to rise and report would be privileged at any time.

However, the Parliamentarian's office informs us that from a practical viewpoint, even if no regular amendments are pending or offered at the time the reading of the bill for such amendments is completed, and even if a limitation amendment has been offered and disposed of, a regular amendment could still be offered at that point, and it would have precedence over the majority leader's motion to rise and report.

This sets up the possibility of jumping back and forth between limitation amendments and regular amendments—thereby preempting the privileged motion to rise and report.

The language included in this rule before us today makes clear that line of distinction by making the motion to rise and report in order only after the final lines of the bill are read by the Clerk.

Prior to that, the Chair would inquire of the Committee of the Whole whether there are any further amendments not precluded by clauses 2(a) or 2(c). If none are offered at that point, the Chair would direct the Clerk to read the final lines of the bill. At any point thereafter, the majority leader or his designee may offer the privileged motion to rise and report.

In summary, the purpose of this language is to draw a clear line between the regular amendment process and the limitation amendment process at the end of the reading of the bill for amendment.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3517 is the first of the 13 appropriations bills to be considered for fiscal year 1997. The Quality of Life Task Force, chaired by former Secretary of the Army, Jack Marsh, has produced a report concluding that 62 percent of troop housing spaces and 64 percent of family housing units are currently unsuitable. I am especially pleased to see that this bill provides sufficient funds to construct and improve housing units for our troops and their families.

We have an obligation to provide adequate housing and other facilities for those who have volunteered to risk their lives to defend our country. Given the limited funds available, the appropriators have done an outstanding job in addressing this critical issue.

I would particularly like to commend the chair of the Military Construction Subcommittee, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, and ranking minority member, Mr. HEFNER, for their bipartisan spirit and hard work on this bill.

This is an excellent piece of legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the following information:

THE AMENDMENT PROCESS UNDER SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE,[1] 103RD CONGRESS V. 104TH CONGRESS

[As of May 29, 1996]

Rule type	103d Congress		104th Congress	
	Number of rules	Percent of total	Number of rules	Percent of total
Open/Modified-open [2]	46	44	70	59
Modified Closed [3]	49	47	31	26
Closed [4]	9	9	17	15
Total	104	100	118	100

[1] This table applies only to rules which provide for the original consideration of bills, joint resolutions or budget resolutions and which provide for an amendment process. It does not apply to special rules which only waive points of order against appropriations bills which are already privileged and are considered under an open amendment process under House rules.

[2] An open rule is one under which any Member may offer a germane amendment under the five-minute rule. A modified open rule is one under which any Member may offer a germane amendment under the five-minute rule subject only to an overall time limit on the amendment process and/or a requirement that the amendment be preprinted in the Congressional Record.

[3] A modified closed rule is one under which the Rules Committee limits the amendments that may be offered only to those amendments designated in the special rule or the Rules Committee report to accompany it, or which preclude amendments to a particular portion of a bill, even though the rest of the bill may be completely open to amendment.

[4] A closed rule is one under which no amendments may be offered (other than amendments recommended by the committee in reporting the bill).

SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE, 104TH CONGRESS

[As of May 29, 1996]

H. Res. No. (Date rept.)	Rule type	Bill No.	Subject	Disposition of rule
H. Res. 38 (1/18/95)	O	H.R. 5	Unfunded Mandate Reform	A: 350–71 (1/19/95).
H. Res. 44 (1/24/95)	MC	H. Con. Res. 17	Social Security	A: 255–172 (1/25/95).
		H.J. Res. 1	Balanced Budget Amdt	
H. Res. 51 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 101	Land Transfer, Taos Pueblo Indians	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 52 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 400	Land Exchange, Arctic Nat'l. Park and Preserve	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 53 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 440	Land Conveyance, Butte County, Calif	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 55 (2/1/95)	O	H.R. 2	Line Item Veto	A: voice vote (2/2/95).
H. Res. 60 (2/6/95)	O	H.R. 665	Victim Restitution	A: voice vote (2/7/95).
H. Res. 61 (2/6/95)	O	H.R. 666	Exclusionary Rule Reform	A: voice vote (2/7/95).
H. Res. 63 (2/8/95)	MO	H.R. 667	Violent Criminal Incarceration	A: voice vote (2/9/95).
H. Res. 69 (2/9/95)	O	H.R. 668	Criminal Alien Deportation	A: voice vote (2/10/95).
H. Res. 79 (2/10/95)	MO	H.R. 728	Law Enforcement Block Grants	A: voice vote (2/13/95).
H. Res. 83 (2/13/95)	MO	H.R. 7	National Security Revitalization	PQ: 229–100; A: 227–127 (2/15/95).
H. Res. 88 (2/16/95)	MC	H.R. 831	Health Insurance Deductibility	PQ: 230–191; A: 229–188 (2/21/95).
H. Res. 91 (2/21/95)	O	H.R. 830	Paperwork Reduction Act	A: voice vote (2/22/95).
H. Res. 92 (2/21/95)	MC	H.R. 889	Defense Supplemental	A: 282–144 (2/22/95).
H. Res. 93 (2/22/95)	MO	H.R. 450	Regulatory Transition Act	A: 252–175 (2/23/95).
H. Res. 96 (2/24/95)	MO	H.R. 1022	Risk Assessment	A: 253–165 (2/27/95).
H. Res. 100 (2/27/95)	O	H.R. 926	Regulatory Reform and Relief Act	A: voice vote (2/28/95).
H. Res. 101 (2/28/95)	MO	H.R. 925	Private Property Protection Act	A: 271–151 (3/2/95).
H. Res. 103 (3/3/95)	MO	H.R. 1058	Securities Litigation Reform	
H. Res. 104 (3/3/95)	MO	H.R. 988	Attorney Accountability Act	A: voice vote (3/6/95).
H. Res. 105 (3/6/95)	MO			A: 257–155 (3/7/95).
H. Res. 108 (3/7/95)	Debate	H.R. 956	Product Liability Reform	A: voice vote (3/8/95).
H. Res. 109 (3/8/95)	MC			PQ: 234–191 A: 247–181 (3/9/95).
H. Res. 115 (3/14/95)	MO	H.R. 1159	Making Emergency Supp. Approps	A: 242–190 (3/15/95).
H. Res. 116 (3/15/95)	MC	H.J. Res. 73	Term Limits Const. Amdt	A: voice vote (3/28/95).
H. Res. 117 (3/16/95)	Debate	H.R. 4	Personal Responsibility Act of 1995	A: voice vote (3/21/95).
H. Res. 119 (3/21/95)	MC			A: 217–211 (3/22/95).
H. Res. 125 (4/3/95)	O	H.R. 1271	Family Privacy Protection Act	A: 423–1 (4/4/95).
H. Res. 126 (4/3/95)	O	H.R. 660	Older Persons Housing Act	A: voice vote (4/6/95).
H. Res. 128 (4/4/95)	MC	H.R. 1215	Contract With America Tax Relief Act of 1995	A: 228–204 (4/5/95).
H. Res. 130 (4/5/95)	MC	H.R. 483	Medicare Select Expansion	A: 253–172 (4/6/95).

SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE, 104TH CONGRESS—Continued

[As of May 29, 1996]

H. Res. No. (Date rept.)	Rule type	Bill No.	Subject	Disposition of rule
H. Res. 136 (5/1/95)	O	H.R. 655	Hydrogen Future Act of 1995	A: voice vote (5/2/95).
H. Res. 139 (5/3/95)	O	H.R. 1361	Coast Guard Auth. FY 1996	A: voice vote (5/9/95).
H. Res. 140 (5/9/95)	O	H.R. 961	Clean Water Amendments	A: 414–4 (5/10/95).
H. Res. 144 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 535	Fish Hatchery—Arkansas	A: voice vote (5/15/95).
H. Res. 145 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 584	Fish Hatchery—Iowa	A: voice vote (5/15/95).
H. Res. 146 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 614	Fish Hatchery—Minnesota	A: voice vote (5/15/95).
H. Res. 149 (5/16/95)	MC	H. Con. Res. 67	Budget Resolution FY 1996	PQ: 252–170 A: 255–168 (5/17/95).
H. Res. 155 (5/22/95)	MO	H.R. 1561	American Overseas Interests Act	A: 233–176 (5/23/95).
H. Res. 164 (6/8/95)	MC	H.R. 1530	Nat. Defense Auth. FY 1996	PQ: 225–191 A: 233–183 (6/13/95).
H. Res. 167 (6/15/95)	O	H.R. 1817	MilCon Appropriations FY 1996	PQ: 223–180 A: 245–155 (6/16/95).
H. Res. 169 (6/19/95)	MC	H.R. 1854	Leg. Branch Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 232–196 A: 236–191 (6/20/95).
H. Res. 170 (6/20/95)	O	H.R. 1868	For. Ops. Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 221–178 A: 217–175 (6/22/95).
H. Res. 171 (6/22/95)	O	H.R. 1905	Energy & Water Approps. FY 1996	A: voice vote (7/12/95).
H. Res. 173 (6/27/95)	C	H.J. Res. 79	Flag Constitutional Amendment	PQ: 258–170 A: 271–152 (6/28/95).
H. Res. 176 (6/28/95)	MC	H.R. 1944	Emer. Supp. Approps	PQ: 236–194 A: 234–192 (6/29/95).
H. Res. 185 (7/11/95)	O	H.R. 1977	Interior Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 235–193 D: 192–238 (7/12/95).
H. Res. 187 (7/12/95)	O	H.R. 1977	Interior Approps. FY 1996 #2	PQ: 230–194 A: 229–195 (7/13/95).
H. Res. 188 (7/12/95)	O	H.R. 1976	Agriculture Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 242–185 A: voice vote (7/18/95).
H. Res. 190 (7/17/95)	O	H.R. 2020	Treasury/Postal Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 232–192 A: voice vote (7/18/95).
H. Res. 193 (7/19/95)	C	H.J. Res. 96	Disapproval of MFN to China	A: voice vote (7/20/95).
H. Res. 194 (7/19/95)	O	H.R. 2002	Transportation Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 217–202 (7/21/95).
H. Res. 197 (7/21/95)	O	H.R. 70	Exports of Alaskan Crude Oil	A: voice vote (7/24/95).
H. Res. 198 (7/21/95)	O	H.R. 2076	Commerce, State Approps. FY 1996	A: voice vote (7/25/95).
H. Res. 201 (7/25/95)	O	H.R. 2099	VA/HUD Approps. FY 1996	A: 230–189 (7/25/95).
H. Res. 204 (7/28/95)	MC	S. 21	Terminating U.S. Arms Embargo on Bosnia	A: voice vote (8/1/95).
H. Res. 205 (7/28/95)	O	H.R. 2126	Defense Approps. FY 1996	A: 409–1 (7/31/95).
H. Res. 207 (8/1/95)	MC	H.R. 1555	Communications Act of 1995	A: 255–156 (8/2/95).
H. Res. 208 (8/1/95)	O	H.R. 2127	Labor, HHS Approps. FY 1996	A: 323–104 (8/2/95).
H. Res. 215 (9/7/95)	O	H.R. 1594	Economically Targeted Investments	A: voice vote (9/12/95).
H. Res. 216 (9/7/95)	MO	H.R. 1655	Intelligence Authorization FY 1996	A: voice vote (9/12/95).
H. Res. 218 (9/12/95)	O	H.R. 1162	Deficit Reduction Lockbox	A: voice vote (9/13/95).
H. Res. 219 (9/12/95)	O	H.R. 1670	Federal Acquisition Reform Act	A: 414–0 (9/13/95).
H. Res. 222 (9/18/95)	O	H.R. 1617	CAREERS Act	A: 388–2 (9/19/95).
H. Res. 224 (9/19/95)	O	H.R. 2274	Natl. Highway System	PQ: 241–173 A: 375–39–1 (9/20/95).
H. Res. 225 (9/19/95)	MC	H.R. 927	Cuban Liberty & Dem. Solidarity	A: 304–118 (9/20/95).
H. Res. 226 (9/21/95)	O	H.R. 743	Team Act	A: 344–66–1 (9/27/95).
H. Res. 227 (9/21/95)	O	H.R. 1170	3-Judge Court	A: voice vote (9/28/95).
H. Res. 228 (9/21/95)	O	H.R. 1601	Internatl. Space Station	A: voice vote (9/27/95).
H. Res. 230 (9/27/95)	C	H.J. Res. 108	Continuing Resolution FY 1996	A: voice vote (9/28/95).
H. Res. 234 (9/29/95)	O	H.R. 2405	Omnibus Science Auth	A: voice vote (10/11/95).
H. Res. 237 (10/17/95)	MC	H.R. 2259	Disapprove Sentencing Guidelines	A: voice vote (10/18/95).
H. Res. 238 (10/18/95)	MC	H.R. 2425	Medicare Preservation Act	PQ: 231–194 A: 227–192 (10/19/95).
H. Res. 239 (10/19/95)	C	H.R. 2492	Leg. Branch Approps	PQ: 235–184 A: voice vote (10/31/95).
H. Res. 245 (10/25/95)	MC	H. Con. Res. 109	Social Security Earnings Reform	PQ: 228–191 A: 235–185 (10/26/95).
		H.R. 2491	Seven-Year Balanced Budget	
H. Res. 251 (10/31/95)	C	H.R. 1833	Partial Birth Abortion Ban	A: 237–190 (11/1/95).
H. Res. 252 (10/31/95)	MO	H.R. 2546	D.C. Approps.	A: 241–181 (11/1/95).
H. Res. 257 (11/7/95)	C	H.J. Res. 115	Cont. Res. FY 1996	A: 216–210 (11/8/95).
H. Res. 258 (11/8/95)	MC	H.R. 2586	Debt Limit	A: 220–200 (11/10/95).
H. Res. 259 (11/9/95)	O	H.R. 2539	ICC Termination Act	A: voice vote (11/14/95).
H. Res. 261 (11/9/95)	C	H.J. Res. 115	Cont. Resolution	A: 223–182 (11/10/95).
H. Res. 262 (11/9/95)	C	H.R. 2586	Increase Debt Limit	A: 220–185 (11/10/95).
H. Res. 269 (11/15/95)	O	H.R. 2564	Lobbying Reform	A: voice vote (11/16/95).
H. Res. 270 (11/15/95)	C	H.J. Res. 122	Further Cont. Resolution	A: 229–176 (11/15/95).
H. Res. 273 (11/16/95)	MC	H.R. 2606	Prohibition on Funds for Bosnia	A: 239–181 (11/17/95).
H. Res. 284 (11/29/95)	O	H.R. 1788	Amtrak Reform	A: voice vote (11/30/95).
H. Res. 287 (11/30/95)	O	H.R. 1350	Maritime Security Act	A: voice vote (12/6/95).
H. Res. 293 (12/7/95)	C	H.R. 2621	Protect Federal Trust Funds	PQ: 223–183 A: 228–184 (12/14/95).
H. Res. 303 (12/13/95)	O	H.R. 1745	Utah Public Lands.	
H. Res. 309 (12/18/95)	C	H.Con. Res. 122	Budget Res. W/President	PQ: 230–188 A: 229–189 (12/19/95).
H. Res. 313 (12/19/95)	O	H.R. 558	Texas Low-Level Radioactive	A: voice vote (12/20/95).
H. Res. 323 (12/21/95)	C	H.R. 2677	Natl. Parks & Wildlife Refuge	Tabled (2/28/96).
H. Res. 366 (2/27/96)	MC	H.R. 2854	Farm Bill	PQ: 228–182 A: 244–168 (2/28/96).
H. Res. 368 (2/28/96)	O	H.R. 994	Small Business Growth	
H. Res. 371 (3/6/96)	C	H.R. 3021	Debt Limit Increase	A: voice vote (3/7/96).
H. Res. 372 (3/6/96)	MC	H.R. 3019	Cont. Approps. FY 1996	PQ: voice vote A: 235–175 (3/7/96).
H. Res. 380 (3/12/96)	MC	H.R. 2703	Effective Death Penalty	A: 251–157 (3/13/96).
H. Res. 384 (3/14/96)	MC	H.R. 2202	Immigration	PQ: 233–152 A: voice vote (3/21/96).
H. Res. 386 (3/20/96)	C	H.J. Res. 165	Further Cont. Approps	PQ: 234–187 A: 237–183 (3/21/96).
H. Res. 388 (3/20/96)	C	H.R. 125	Gun Crime Enforcement	A: 244–166 (3/22/96).
H. Res. 391 (3/27/96)	C	H.R. 3136	Contract w/America Advancement	PQ: 232–180 A: 232–177, (3/28/96).
H. Res. 392 (3/27/96)	MC	H.R. 3103	Health Coverage Affordability	PQ: 229–186 A: Voice Vote (3/29/96).
H. Res. 395 (3/29/96)	MC	H.J. Res. 159	Tax Limitation Const. Amdmt.	PQ: 232–168 A: 234–162 (4/15/96).
H. Res. 396 (3/29/96)	O	H.R. 842	Truth in Budgeting Act	A: voice vote (4/17/96).
H. Res. 409 (4/23/96)	O	H.R. 2715	Paperwork Elimination Act	A: voice vote (4/24/96).
H. Res. 410 (4/23/96)	O	H.R. 1675	Natl. Wildlife Refuge	A: voice vote (4/24/96).
H. Res. 411 (4/23/96)	O	H.J. Res. 175	Further Cont. Approps. FY 1996	A: voice vote (4/24/96).
H. Res. 418 (4/30/96)	O	H.R. 2641	U.S. Marshals Service	PQ: 219–203 A: voice vote (5/1/96).
H. Res. 419 (4/30/96)	O	H.R. 2149	Ocean Shipping Reform	A: 422–0 (5/1/96).
H. Res. 421 (5/2/96)	O	H.R. 2974	Crimes Against Children & Elderly	A: voice vote (5/7/96).
H. Res. 422 (5/2/96)	O	H.R. 3120	Witness & Jury Tampering	A: voice vote (5/7/96).
H. Res. 426 (5/7/96)	O	H.R. 2406	U.S. Housing Act of 1996	PQ: 218–208 A: voice vote (5/8/96).
H. Res. 427 (5/7/96)	O	H.R. 3322	Omnibus Civilian Science Auth	A: voice vote (5/9/96).
H. Res. 428 (5/7/96)	MC	H.R. 3286	Adoption Promotion & Stability	A: voice vote (5/9/96).
H. Res. 430 (5/9/96)	S H.R. 3230	DoD Auth. FY 1997	A: 235–149 (5/10/96)..	
H. Res. 435 (5/15/96)	MC	H. Con. Res. 178	Con. Res. on the Budget, 1997	PQ: 227–196 A: voice vote (5/16/96).
H. Res. 436 (5/16/96)	C	H.R. 3415	Repeal $43 cent fuel tax	PQ: 221–181 A: voice vote (5/21/96).
H. Res. 437 (5/16/96)	MO	H.R. 3259	Intell. Auth. FY 1997	A: voice vote (5/21/96).
H. Res. 438 (5/16/96)	MC	H.R. 3144	Defend America Act	
H. Res. 440 (5/21/96)	MC	H.R. 3448	Small Bus. Job Protection	A: 219–211 (5/22/96).
H. Res. 442 (5/29/96)	O	H.R. 3517	Mil. Const. Approps. FY 1997	

Codes: O-open rule; MO-modified open rule; MC-modified closed rule; C-closed rule; A-adoption vote; D-defeated; PQ-previous question vote. Source: Notices of Action Taken, Committee on Rules, 104th Congress.

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. HALL of Ohio asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend my colleague from Tennessee, Mr. QUILLEN, as well as my colleagues on the other side of the aisle for bringing this resolution to the floor.

House Resolution 442 is an open rule which will allow full and fair debate on H.R. 3517, the military construction appropriations bill for fiscal 1997.

As my colleague from Tennessee described, this rule provides 1 hour of general debate, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Under this rule, germane amendments will be allowed under the 5-minute rule, the normal amending process in the House. All Members, on both sides of the aisle, will have the opportunity to offer amendments. I am

pleased that the Rules Committee was able to report this rule without opposition in a voice vote, and I plan to support it.

This bill appropriates $10 billion for military construction, family housing, and base closure construction projects. Though the bill is $900 million greater than the administration request, it still represents a reduction of $1.1 billion, or 10 percent, below last year's level of funding.

The bill funds necessary capital improvements to our Nation's military facilities. Continuing the trend of recent years, the Appropriations Committee paid special attention to facilities that improve the quality of life for our service men and women. This is a wise decision because people are our most important resource.

The bill contains four projects in the Dayton, OH, area, which I am proud to represent. One project will improve 52 units of housing at Page Manor, a neighborhood of homes for junior officers and enlisted personnel at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base.

Another project will upgrade an administrative building on Gentile Air Force Station, in Kettering, OH. This will be used by the Defense Finance and Accounting Service, which is consolidating some of its activities at Gentile.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is important to our national defense. I urge adoption of this open rule which will permit full debate on this bill and allow Members to make additional attempts to amend it.

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

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WICKER].

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Tennessee for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to rise at this point and voice my support for the rule and, as a member of the Subcommittee on Military Construction, also for the bill as it has been reported by the committee on a bipartisan basis. This has certainly been an area in which Republicans and Democrats have worked together in a bipartisan fashion.

□ 1115

We are talking today about quality of life for our service members, an area which arguably some years ago was neglected while the military budget was increased. Those quality-of-life issues were perhaps not addressed as fully as they should have been. As a result, last year the Congress increased the military construction budget by some 28 percent over the 1995 appropriation. This year, from that higher appropriation level of 1996, we have cut it back some 10 percent, but still that is much more, almost a billion dollars more, than the administration has requested. We are dealing in this bill with such quality-of-life issues as family housing, as barracks for our single enlisted troops, military medical facilities and child care. Seventy four percent of this bill comes in that area of quality of life. Because of that fact, I would hope that we would adopt the rule and also that we would leave the bill as it is, as it has been reported by the subcommittee.

Now I also want to take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to alert my colleagues that there may be an amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Oregon [Ms. FURSE] which I will oppose and which I hope the Members of this body will oppose because, in an attempt to get into the burden sharing issue which is not really a part of this bill, it would attempt to cut some $17 million from two barracks in Manneheim, Germany.

These are barracks that are run down, they are overcrowded, they are very, very old; frankly, they smell bad, Mr. Speaker, and these barracks represent a quality-of-life issue for our troops in Germany. They do not need to wait until some time in 1997 for us to start talking about replacing those barracks. We need to do it now.

Mr. Speaker, I would simply suggest to my colleagues, vote for the rule, vote for the bill, and resist the Furse amendment if the gentlewoman offers it. Let us not take this $17 million out of the quality-of-life funding for our troops in Europe.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCDADE].

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

Mr. MCDADE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman of the committee for yielding to me just a few brief moments. I have to be out of the Chamber at 11:30, and about that time we will be considering the military construction appropriations bill.

I want to pay tribute to the distinguished chairwoman of that subcommittee, the honorable gentlewoman from the State of Nevada, BARBARA VUCANOVICH. She has done an extraordinary job running this committee, and this is her last trip, so to speak, in this House.

I remember when I approached her about taking this assignment as a member of the Committee on Appropriations. She was very reluctant to undertake it, not because she did not like the subject matter, but because she had so much she wanted to do in the field of health, in education, in the environment, care of younger people, the problems of crime in the country, but she agreed to do the job, and I wanted her to do it because I knew that her personality was such that she would be the kind of person who would have an unyielding concern for the welfare of our young men and women who serve this great Nation of ours. That concern showed through in every bill she brought to the floor.

I congratulate her for yeoman service in the House, and I wish her well in retirement.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to take much time. I also want to praise the gentlewoman from Nevada, BARBARA VUCANOVICH, for the outstanding job that she has done during her entire career in this body and to commend the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. HEFNER, her ranking member, for the job they have done on this particular bill.

Vote for the rule; vote for the bill when it comes up.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from Tennessee, the chairman emeritus of the committee, Mr. QUILLEN, for yielding to me. I simply want to take a brief moment to follow up on his excellent explanation of this open rule. As he pointed out, there are two new features in this rule that were not in the appropriations rules we granted last year.

First, the rule gives the chairman of the Committee of the Whole the authority to postpone and cluster votes on amendments. While we have done this before in special rules, it has usually been done by unanimous consent on appropriations bills. At Chairman LIVINGSTON's request, we are including this provision in the rule. However, as I mentioned in the Rules Committee last night, we will watch its use closely to ensure that it is used judiciously and sparingly.

We would not expect votes to be postponed on amendments beyond the reading of a title for amendment—only within a title. In this rule, that is not a problem since there is only one title. And we would expect the bill manager to consult with the minority manager on any postponement and clustering of votes to the maximum extent possible.

The second feature of this rule is really a clarification of an existing House rule regarding the privileged motion to rise and report at the end of the regular amendment process.

Clause 2(d) of House Rule 21 provides that after a general appropriations bill has been read for amendment and all regular amendments have been considered, a privileged motion may be offered by the majority leader, or a designee, that the Committee rise and report the bill back to the House with such amendments as have been adopted.

According to the House rule, this motion shall have precedence over motions to further amend the bill. If the motion is rejected, then it is in order to consider limitation amendments, but the motion can be renewed after the disposition of any limitation amendment. The problem is that in practice, the rule is unworkable if someone wants to offer a regular cutting amendment after we thought we had completed that process.

According to the Parliamentarian's Office, such a regular amendment could still be offered at that point, and would have precedence over the majority leader's motion to rise and report. This sets up the possibility of jumping back and forth between limitation

amendments and regular amendments, thereby preempting the privileged motion to rise and report.

That was never the intent of the rule when it was first adopted at the beginning of the 98th Congress in 1983. The idea was to dispose of all regular amendments at the end of the reading of the bill for amendment before entertaining any limitation amendments. Once the limitation amendment process was underway, the motion to rise and report would be privileged at any time.

The language in the rule we have before us draws a clear line of demarcation by making the motion to rise and report in order after the last few lines of the bill are read by the Clerk.

Prior to the reading of the last few lines, the Chair would inquire of the Committee of the Whole whether there were any further amendments not precluded by clauses 2(a) or 2(c). If none are offered at that point, the Chair would direct the Clerk to read the last few lines of the bill.

At any point thereafter, the majority leader or a designee may offer the privileged motion to rise and report. That motion would take precedence over any pending limitation amendment or any regular amendment as well.

In summary, the purpose of this language is to draw a bright line between the regular amendment process and the limitation amendment process at the end of the reading of the bill for amendment. The only change made in clause 2(d) at the beginning of this Congress was to ensure that the motion to rise and report would be controlled by the majority leadership and not just the Appropriations Committee chairman acting alone.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the rule and the bill. I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and that I may include extraneous and tabular material on the consideration of H.R. 3517.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Nevada?

There was no objection.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1997

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 442 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 3517.

□ 1121

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3517) making appropriations for military construction, family housing, and base realignment and closure for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes, with Mr. LATOURETTE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Under the rule, the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH] and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER] each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH].

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. It is my pleasure to present to the House the recommendations for the military construction appropriations bill for fiscal year 1997. The funding contained in H.R. 3517 totals $10 billion, is within the subcommittee's 602(b) allocation, and represents a $1.2 billion, or 10 percent, decrease from last year.

Mr. Chairman, from the outset, we have worked closely with the National Security Subcommittee on Military Installations and Facilities and are supporting only those items contained in the House-passed authorization bill.

Public attention has recently focused on the problems our subcommittee has been citing for several years: the quality of military housing for unaccompanied personnel and those with families, the necessity for support facilities, and the importance of providing an adequate working environment to improve productivity and readiness. The committee has heard testimony from many different individuals and organizations regarding these problems, and we continue to feel strongly that the funds in this bill significantly contribute to the readiness and retention of our military personnel.

The recommendations before the House today deal with the critical problem of underfunding in these areas. The budget request of $9.1 billion represents a decrease of over $2 billion, or 18 percent, from current spending. While there are many aspects of the request that are commendable, there are areas of concern, particularly in the unaccompanied personnel and family housing arenas. For example, the report on the Quality of Life Task Force, chaired by former Secretary of the Army Jack Marsh, cites that 62 percent of the barrack spaces and 64 percent of family housing units are unsuitable. Yet, while the Department has committed itself to a serious barracks revitalization program, the request for barracks construction is $65 million, or 10 percent below last year. And, family housing construction and operation and maintenance accounts are reduced by $405 million.

Mr. Chairman, these reductions are not acceptable to this committee and, therefore, we are recommending an additional $900 million above the budget request. Of these additional funds, roughly $680 million, or 75 percent, has been devoted to barracks, family housing and child development centers.

Of the total $10 billion recommendations, $4.3 billion, or 43 percent, is for construction and operations and maintenance of family housing. It is imperative that a sustained overall commitment to funding levels be maintained that will reduce deficits and increase the quality of living conditions. The recommendations in this bill signify congressional commitment to meet that goal.

Thirty-one percent, or $3.2 billion, is devoted to military construction for facilities that support our service members and their families and improve productivity and readiness. Included under these accounts is $776 million to address the substandard housing troops must live in; $313 million for hospital and medical facilities; $132 million for chemical weapons demilitarization; $88 million for environmental compliance; and $34 million for child development centers.

In addition, a significant portion of this appropriation, $2.5 billion, is to continue the ongoing downsizing of DOD's infrastructure through the base realignment and closure program. The implementation of base closures requires large upfront costs to ensure eventual savings, and this funding will keep closures ongoing and on schedule.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the members of the subcommittee for their help in bringing this bill to the floor. We have worked in a bipartisan manner to produce a bill which addresses the needs of today's military. I want to express my deep appreciation to Mr. HEFNER for his commitment to this subcommittee. He has worked hard for many years to provide the badly needed improvements for the men and women who serve in our Armed Forces. His dedication to this process is invaluable.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, this $10 billion is only 4 percent of the total defense budget and a $1.2 billion decrease from last year's appropriation. But, this $10 billion directly supports the men and women in our Armed Forces; it increases productivity, readiness and recruitment, all very vital to a strong national defense. I ask my colleagues to join us in passing this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I include for the RECORD the following data:

FY 1997 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 3517)

	FY 1996 Enacted	FY 1997 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
Military construction, Army	633,814,000	434,723,000	603,584,000	-30,230,000	+168,861,000
Rescission	-6,385,000			+6,385,000	
Total, Military construction, Army (net)	627,429,000	434,723,000	603,584,000	-23,845,000	+168,861,000
Military construction, Navy	554,636,000	525,346,000	724,476,000	+169,840,000	+199,130,000
Rescissions	-6,385,000		-12,000,000	-5,615,000	-12,000,000
Total, Military construction, Navy (net)	548,251,000	525,346,000	712,476,000	+164,225,000	+187,130,000
Military construction, Air Force	587,234,000	603,059,000	678,914,000	+91,680,000	+75,855,000
Rescissions	-15,150,000			+15,150,000	
Total, Military construction, Air Force (net)	572,084,000	603,059,000	678,914,000	+106,830,000	+75,855,000
Military construction, Defense-wide	640,357,000	812,945,000	772,345,000	+131,988,000	-40,600,000
Rescissions	-41,866,000			+41,866,000	
Total, Military construction, Defense-wide (net)	598,491,000	812,945,000	772,345,000	+173,854,000	-40,600,000
Total, Active components	2,346,255,000	2,376,073,000	2,767,319,000	+421,064,000	+391,246,000
Department of Defense Military Unaccompanied Housing Improvement Fund			10,000,000	+10,000,000	+10,000,000
Military construction, Army National Guard	137,110,000	7,600,000	41,316,000	-95,794,000	+33,716,000
Military construction, Air National Guard	171,272,000	75,394,000	118,394,000	-52,878,000	+43,000,000
Rescission	-6,700,000			+6,700,000	
Total, Military construction, Air National Guard (net)	164,572,000	75,394,000	118,394,000	-46,178,000	+43,000,000
Military construction, Army Reserve	72,728,000	48,459,000	50,159,000	-22,569,000	+1,700,000
Military construction, Naval Reserve	19,055,000	10,983,000	33,169,000	+14,114,000	+22,186,000
Military construction, Air Force Reserve	36,482,000	51,655,000	51,655,000	+15,173,000	
Total, Reserve components	429,947,000	194,091,000	294,693,000	-135,254,000	+100,602,000
Total, Military construction	2,776,202,000	2,570,164,000	3,072,012,000	+295,810,000	+501,848,000
Appropriations	(2,852,688,000)	(2,570,164,000)	(3,084,012,000)	(+231,324,000)	(+513,848,000)
Rescissions	(-76,486,000)		(-12,000,000)	(+64,486,000)	(-12,000,000)
NATO Security Investment Program	161,000,000	197,000,000	177,000,000	+16,000,000	-20,000,000
Supplemental appropriation	37,500,000			-37,500,000	
Total, NATO	198,500,000	197,000,000	177,000,000	-21,500,000	-20,000,000
Family housing, Army:					
Construction	116,656,000	75,013,000	176,603,000	+59,947,000	+101,590,000
Operation and Maintenance	1,335,596,000	1,212,466,000	1,257,466,000	-78,130,000	+45,000,000
Total, Family housing, Army	1,452,252,000	1,287,479,000	1,434,069,000	-18,183,000	+146,590,000
Family housing, Navy and Marine Corps:					
Construction	525,058,000	403,726,000	532,456,000	+7,398,000	+128,730,000
Operation and Maintenance	1,048,329,000	1,014,241,000	1,058,241,000	+9,912,000	+44,000,000
Total, Family housing, Navy	1,573,387,000	1,417,967,000	1,590,697,000	+17,310,000	+172,730,000
Family housing, Air Force:					
Construction	297,738,000	231,236,000	304,068,000	+6,330,000	+72,832,000
Operation and Maintenance	849,213,000	829,474,000	840,474,000	-8,739,000	+11,000,000
Total, Family housing, Air Force	1,146,951,000	1,060,710,000	1,144,542,000	-2,409,000	+83,832,000
Family housing, Defense-wide:					
Construction	3,772,000	4,371,000	4,371,000	+599,000	
Operation and Maintenance	30,467,000	30,963,000	30,963,000	+496,000	
Total, Family housing, Defense-wide	34,239,000	35,334,000	35,334,000	+1,095,000	
Department of Defense Family Housing Improvement Fund	22,000,000	20,000,000	35,000,000	+13,000,000	+15,000,000
Homeowners Assistance Fund, Defense	75,586,000	36,181,000	36,181,000	-39,405,000	
Total, Family housing	4,304,415,000	3,857,671,000	4,275,823,000	-28,592,000	+418,152,000
Construction	(943,224,000)	(714,346,000)	(1,017,498,000)	(+74,274,000)	(+303,152,000)
Operation and Maintenance	(3,263,605,000)	(3,087,144,000)	(3,187,144,000)	(-76,461,000)	(+100,000,000)
Family Housing Improvement Fund	(22,000,000)	(20,000,000)	(35,000,000)	(+13,000,000)	(+15,000,000)
Homeowners Assistance Fund	(75,586,000)	(36,181,000)	(36,181,000)	(-39,405,000)	

FY 1997 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 3517)—Continued

	FY 1996 Enacted	FY 1997 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
Base realignment and closure accounts:					
Part II	964,843,000	352,800,000	352,800,000	-612,043,000	.....
Part III	2,148,480,000	971,925,000	971,925,000	-1,176,555,000	.....
Part IV	784,569,000	1,182,749,000	1,182,749,000	+398,180,000	.....
Total, Base realignment and closure accounts	3,897,892,000	2,507,474,000	2,507,474,000	-1,390,418,000	.....
Grand total:					
New budget (obligational) authority	11,177,009,000	9,132,309,000	10,032,309,000	-1,144,700,000	+900,000,000
Appropriations	(11,253,495,000)	(9,132,309,000)	(10,044,309,000)	(-1,209,186,000)	(+912,000,000)
Rescissions	(-76,486,000)	.....	(-12,000,000)	(+64,486,000)	(-12,000,000)

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

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

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the fiscal year 1997 military construction bill, and I want to compliment the distinguished chairwoman of the military construction subcommittee for her work. The gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH] has worked hard to produce a good bill that responds to the highest priorities needs of our service men and women, and she has done so in a bipartisan way.

As chairman of this subcommittee, I have in the past emphasized the importance of providing adequate funding for quality of life projects. It is easy to pay lip service to the importance of addressing our needs for military family housing and barracks, and we on the subcommittee understand providing our men and women in the military with a decent place to live is a key to military readiness and retention, and with this bill we continue to make important progress on this issue.

The bill contains $10 billion in total funding and is consistent with a 602(b) allocation. All the projects are included in the authorization bill as passed by the House. There is $4.3 billion in the bill for family housing, and $777 million for new barracks, all very important projects. Recognizing the importance of family housing, barracks and child development centers, the bill includes $545 billion beyond the President's request for badly needed facilities. I believe that is $545 million; it is not that much of an increase. I think it is a typographical error.

At Fort Bragg and Pope Air Force bases, several important projects are being funded, including significant improvements for family housing and medical facilities as well as acquisition of additional and needed funding for Fort Bragg.

□ 1130

Mr. Chairman, with all the various interation of base closures, bottom-up reviews, and 5-year plans, there has been a lot of pressure for significant reductions in funds for family housing. I am very pleased that this bill continues our bipartisan effort to address the quality-of-life issues for both enlisted personnel and families of military members. It may not seem that glamorous to fund barracks, family housing, and child care centers, but if Members have any exposure to the military way of life, they know that providing a decent place to live is an important factor in military readiness.

This bill also takes care of many other critical needs of the Department, including the base closure and construction and cleanup requirements, critically needed medical facilities, major new homeporting facilities, and other operational upgrades.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I just want to joint that chorus of folks that have complimented the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH] for doing an excellent job in a very, what I like to refer to as a nonpartisan way. This is probably the most nonpartisan committee on the Hill, and if we had more cooperation in other committees such as we have in this committee, we probably could get a lot more things done than we do around here. I wish her very well and the very best in her retirement, and I hope that she gets to play all the golf that she wants to play.

As a very dear friend of mine, and I mentioned this in the Committee on Rules today, who has passed on now, has said in all of his closing speeches, talking about individuals, he always said: ''I hope you live as long as you want and never want as long as you live,'' and I hope that for you. I hope the gentlewoman has a long and happy retirement and I hope we see her from time to time in Washington, if we are all fortunate enough to be back here.

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

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's kind words.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], who also serves as a member of our Subcommittee on Military Construction of the Committee on Appropriations.

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my friend, the gentlewoman from Nevada, for yielding time to me.

I also wanted to thank the distinguished ranking minority member and former chairman of the subcommittee for his remarks and for his support for the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in vigorous support of the bill, but I also rise in tribute to the distinguished chairwoman of the subcommittee. She has done an outstanding job over these many years, and she has brought a great bill to the floor at this time.

The President, of course, has asked for $12 billion less in the overall defense budget than what we appropriated last year. In this particular subcommittee, he asked for about $2 billion less than we appropriated last year. Under the leadership of the gentlewoman from Nevada, the chairwoman of this subcommittee, we struck a compromise between what the President wanted and what we appropriated last year, and we are providing $10 billion for such things as family housing units privatization, barracks privatization, child development centers, hospital and medical facilities, environmental compliance, and demolition of dilapidated, excess facilities. So there is a lot of good in here, and I think it is reflective of the character of all of the members of the subcommittee, and especially its chairman, the gentlewoman from Nevada, BARBARA VUCANOVICH.

If I may, I would like to just take a minute to point out that she has been in Congress a number of years, having not held elective office before she came, but she has represented the people of Nevada in exemplary fashion. She currently serves as the Republican Conference secretary. She gave up her position on the Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources, where she had tremendous interest in trying to take care of the needs of her State and involving herself in issues of great interest, such as revision of the mining laws and other things affecting western lands and western States, in order to take this chairmanship, and she just ran with it; and she has really done tremendous work in trying to meet the needs of the young people in uniform and providing for their assistance, their living standards, where, unfortunately, we have found in years past far too many people in uniform live in dilapidated and substandard housing.

The gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH] has toed the line and has worked very hard with the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER] to upgrade those conditions, eliminate that problem, and make sure all people are well taken care of.

I think she has produced a bill, a bipartisan bill, as the gentleman from North Carolina has pointed out, that can pass and should be signed into law, despite the fact it is $1 billion over what the President asked for. I think this is because the Members of Congress in this body have looked after the needs of the service people and have met those needs within the budget confines with which we are currently faced.

Mr. Chairman, I want to tell the gentlewoman, I thank her for her service, thank her for her work on this bill, and just as the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER] has said, I want to extend my very best wishes to her for a very long and happy retirement with her husband, George, and wish her and all her 5 children, 15 grandchildren, and 3 great-grandchildren, all of the best of everything that life has to offer.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY], who is also retiring this year, and has done a tremendous job since he has been in Congress, especially for the veterans and for the military readiness and for quality of life for our troops in the military.

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for yielding me this time, and I commend the chairman of the committee and the subcommittee for her wonderful work, and I look forward to seeing her in retirement.

Mr. Chairman, I support this legislation. I did not have time to orient either side, but I have a problem. However, I do support the bill. I have a problem with the Army National Guard, and the gentleman from Colorado knows my complaint.

The Army National Guard was recommended by the President this year for military construction for the Army National Guard, which has over 2,000 units, about $7 million from the President's request. The authorization committee from the Army National Guard came up with $41 million.

My point is that, really, that is not enough money. Last year the Committee on Appropriations gave us $137 million, so we are actually getting $96 million less for the Army National Guard than we got last year. That is a tremendous decrease. I point out that of the total military budget, that the Reserves and National Guard are getting only 3 percent of the authorization budget, only 3 percent, yet they have 40 percent of the missions, they have 40 percent of the missions.

So this is out of line, and if we are going to depend on the Guard and Reserve more to carry on under the total force, we certainly should maybe next year, and I do not have an amendment to offer, but next time I would hope that whoever is here will try to give more funding for the Reserves in military construction.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WICKER], a member of our subcommittee.

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

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the members of the committee that I, too, want to commend and congratulate the Chair of the Subcommittee on Military Construction of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH], and to personally thank her for the assistance she has given to this freshman Congressman as a member of her subcommittee. I also want to commend the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER] for the bipartisan approach that he and the members of the minority have taken with regard to this particular legislation. I rise, of course, in strong support of the bill.

During our subcommittee's hearings over these past few weeks, the predominant concern expressed was the continued deterioration of quality-of-life and infrastructure needs which support our military men and women. We all want to give our Armed Forces the best weapons systems, training, and equipment we can afford. Unfortunately, one area of the military that has not received as much attention in recent years has been this issue of brick and mortar.

In November 1994, the Department of Defense created a task force on the quality of life to assess the problems associated with military housing. On February 28 of this year, the chairman of this task force, former Secretary of the Army John Marsh, reported the findings of the year-long study.

The findings of the task force were disturbing. With regard to military family housing, 64 percent of these homes were classified as unsuitable. With regard to barracks for our single troops, 62 percent of these barracks were considered substandard due to overcrowding and poor conditions. One-half of all military barracks were built 30 or more years ago, and one-fourth require continuous upkeep to deal with such problems as asbestos, corroded pipes, and inadequate ventilation.

The Department of Defense also faces a 160,000-unit shortfall in barracks space. It would take 40 years, according to current estimates, and $8.5 billion to correct all of the deficiencies. Clearly, Mr. Chairman, whatever we are able to do today will fall far short of what we need to do to correct this situation.

The bill sends a clear message that we are going to take care of our military personnel. Family housing projects account for 43 percent of the bill. In addition, this bill provides $2.5 billion for one-time costs associated with base realignment and closing. Furthermore, in an effort to meet the child care needs of military facilities, this bill sets aside $34 million for child development centers.

Finally, like most of my colleagues, I am concerned about the budget deficit, the increasing national debt, which now exceeds $5 trillion. This bill is fiscally responsible, Mr. Chairman. It is within our 602 allocations, and at the same time it addresses important quality-of-life and military issues. I commend the work of the subcommittee, I commend the work of our Chair and our ranking minority member, and I strongly urge the adoption of this military construction bill.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4½ minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MINGE].

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the ranking member for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this bill because I believe it represents the wrong emphasis in spending priorities. I certainly appreciate the fact that the funding in this bill represents a cut of about $1 billion below last year. The $10 billion in spending contained in this bill, however, is higher than can be justified.

I certainly share with the previous speakers the concern about improving living conditions of men and women and families that are in our Armed Forces, but I cannot support spending on military construction at a level that is $900 million above the President's request, given the budget constraints we are facing. The fact of the matter is that in order to provide additional spending in this bill and stay within the budget allocation, the Committee on Appropriations will have to make deeper cuts in spending for education, agriculture, and other important domestic programs in subsequent appropriations bills. The issue is not just whether the programs and projects funded in this bill are for worthy causes, but can we justify the deep cuts in other programs necessary to pay for the additional increased spending in this bill; can we do it? I do not believe that we can.

Although I am opposed to this bill, I would like to compliment the managers of the bill and the members of the Committee on Appropriations for the work that they have done in applying objective criteria to the unrequested projects included in the bill. As the cochair of the porkbusters coalition, I have offered amendments to this bill in past years in other appropriations bills in order to eliminate wasteful projects. I have consulted with my porkbuster colleagues about the bill, especially Senator MCCAIN, who is the Senate cochair of the porkbusters, who helped develop objective criteria for judging military construction projects.

We have concluded that the bill largely, and I emphasize the word ''largely,'' adheres to the criteria developed by Senator MCCAIN. Members of the porkbusters coalition, I would like to emphasize, do not oppose all spending projects. We simply believe that spending projects should be subject to greater scrutiny than they have in the past, and while there is always room for improvement, this bill has undergone much greater scrutiny than previous bills, and for that I would like to commend the committee.

□ 1145

I am troubled by the number of projects funded in this bill that were not in the administration's request or in the Defense Department's long-range plan. I would like to suggest that what we ought to be doing is following a 3-part approach to spending in this area. First, we ought to have a definite dollar amount that we commit to spending, and that ought to be a goal, it ought to be a limit, and the subcommittee ought to live within it.

Second, we ought to be sticking with the plan that is in that dollar figure and we ought not to be approving spending on projects that are not within the plan. In this case, we have 42 projects, I am advised, that are not in the long-range Defense Department plan.

And, third, I submit that we should be moving away from itemizing projects in report language or in the bills themselves. Instead, we ought to be exercising our oversight function to make sure that the Defense Department or any other Federal agency is allocating the funds for certain project areas in a wise and prudent manner, but not micromanaging within our committees and subcommittees individual projects, because of the temptations that this provides for members of the committees and the subcommittees

to favor their own districts and projects that they feel are particularly important to them rather than the institution.

So, in sum, again I would like to compliment the committee and the subcommittee for their work, but say that I will be voting against this bill because of the fact that it spends $900 million more than the President has requested, and it includes 42 projects that are not on the long-range plan that cost $300 million in and of themselves.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY], chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Installations and Facilities.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3517, the Military Construction Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 1997 and I urge my colleagues to support it.

As the chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Installations and Facilities, I want to commend Chairman VUCANOVICH and Mr. HEFNER for their continued cooperation in working with those of us on the authorization committee charged with improving our military facilities. I want to echo Chairman VUCANOVICH's remarks that this bill fully conforms to the military construction authorizations passed by the House on May 15—just 2 weeks ago.

This legislation would continue the strong bipartisan support of the House for initiatives designed to slow the ongoing deterioration of military facilities critical to the Nation's defense and to the improvement of housing and other basic quality of life facilities.

Chairman VUCANOVICH has thoroughly described what is in the bill, but I want to take a moment to talk about some of the important improvements we have proposed to improve the quality of life of military personnel and their families.

Those who serve in the Nation's military know firsthand the difficult conditions in housing the military faces. Those who served in the past can often go into a barracks or a military family's home and find that it has not changed much over the years—in many cases for decades. Degraded and crumbling housing is simply unacceptable. Whether they are stationed at home or abroad, we owe the men and women who volunteer to serve this great Nation more than that and we are working hard to change it.

I am gratified by the commitment of the Secretary of Defense and the support of the service chiefs for measures to improve the quality of life for military personnel. However, I am disappointed that the administration did not back up that commitment as forcefully as it could have in its budget proposal to Congress.

For fiscal year 1997, the administration proposed steep cuts in troop housing, family housing, and child development centers. This legislation, as well as the authorization bill already passed by the House, would take a number of important steps to shore up quality of life with an approximately $675 million package of improvements to the President's budget request.

Twenty-one additional barracks projects, benefiting thousands of unaccompanied personnel, will benefit from the added funding. We seek to increase by nearly 5 times the amount of funding put toward new child development centers and we would make additional improvements to housing that will benefit over 3,500 military families.

We need to continue to improve the quality of life for military personnel and their families as well as modernize our deteriorating military infrastructure. On a bipartisan basis, the authorization and appropriation committees have developed legislation that emphasizes the priority requirements of the military services and this legislation would put dollars only toward projects that can be executed in the coming fiscal year.

These are not imaginary requirements. The military services have indicated in testimony before the subcommittee which I chair that a military construction program that adequately addresses requirements and would begin to buy down the lingering facilities backlog would be two or three times the size of the current program. This bill proposes nothing quite that grand, but it would make a significant contribution toward resolving the problem.

Mr. Chairman, on a more personal note, I want to take this opportunity to reflect on the impending retirement of the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Military Construction, BARBARA VUCANOVICH.

BARBARA, we are going to miss you, I can tell you that from a very personal standpoint. I do not think there has ever been an authorizing chairman and an appropriations chairman that worked any closer than we did, or two committees that worked more closely or two staffs that worked more closely, and that is a tribute to your leadership. You did not consult with me before you made the decision to retire, and I resent that. I would have told you not to do it. We need you here. Good luck to you as you enter a new phase of your life and a new adventure.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I do not disagree with anything that the gentleman said, but this is not a new phenomenon for administrations not to request as much money as we need. We can go back years and years and years.

Many years ago I went out to Fort Hood, TX. I saw some of the troops' wives trying to redo an old cafeteria for a day care center, and we said this is not acceptable. Not any administration since I have been here has put enough focus on quality of life and family housing in the military. It is not real sexy to go out and talk about building barracks and cutting the ribbons for a barracks, as it is for a B–1 bomber or a B–2 bomber, what have you, but it is critical for retention and for making the quality of life for our troops as well as we can.

We are so far behind. I remember just a few years ago, not only did we have a cut, we had a pause. We did not do anything in military construction. It was requested that we have a pause in military construction. We did not even keep up with the year before. So it is not a new phenomenon for us to have to go to try to put in extra money for quality of life and housing for our troops.

Mr. Chairman, I just remember talking, when Mr. RALPH REGULA was the ranking member, when I was chairman, we worked very hard for quality of life. In fact, it was the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA] and myself that brought to the forefront burdensharing. We did not even have a subcommittee called burdensharing until we brought it to the forefront about burdensharing for our troops in these foreign countries.

So it is not a new phenomenon and it is not unique to any administration that they do not ask for enough money to do the job that we think needs to be done.

Mr. Chairman, having said that, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE].

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER] for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to be here today and particularly to follow the chair of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY], because I would like to echo his comments on the cooperation between the appropriations committee and the authorizing committee. In this particular instance, we are talking about quality of life, and I would like to follow then on the remarks of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER] as well.

Unfortunately, the Department of Defense has come to rely upon us in Congress when it comes to budgetary matters with respect to quality of life. What happens is, on the procurement side, in the more exotic weapons systems, particularly those that cost a great deal of money, they push that part of the envelope right up to the edge, and then they count on Members of Congress to come through on questions of quality of life, whether it is barracks or family housing or what have you, child development centers, et cetera. And we have done that.

I want to commend the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY] for his bipartisan approach on it, the chair of the subcommittee; and my good friend from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER] for seeing to it that these quality of life issues have not been abandoned.

In particular, I can say in the area of the Pacific, we have dealt with Schofield Barracks and the renewal of barracks there, and we are very appreciative, and this year at Kaneohe for

the Marine Barracks. General Krulak, the Commandant of the Marine Corps, called very, very happy to see that we were going to start the phasing in of the new barracks proposals at Kaneohe in the State of Hawaii.

I will say that this has a further good effect. What this does is stop the competition for nonexistent rental housing between military families and civilian families. The result, the 6 years that I have been in office and the plan that I started out with and presented on a bipartisan basis, was that this would reduce rents, reduce the cost of living in Hawaii for civilian families and improve the quality of life for military families, I think a good result from that, and I am very grateful for it.

I have two other points that I would like to make very briefly. One, as a way of improving this, I hope and I think the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY] has indicated that he has an interest in this, and other Republican members on our authorizing committee have indicated an interest in this, is that we start thinking about capital budgeting and start differentiating operating costs from capital costs, particularly using as a demonstration model perhaps quality of life issues in the military. We have started that.

The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY] was instrumental in helping us put together legislation for public-private partnerships to see to it that we can get into capital expenditures. If we can differentiate capital expenditures from operating expenditures, I think we can make vast improvements in the quality of life area and demonstrate a way of moving toward more sensible spending patterns that will result not only in helping to balance the budget but in moving forward in a sensible way with our military budgeting.

So I am appreciative to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY], the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER], to the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH], and others who have helped support this issue.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, let me say that when I was first elected in a special election in 1986, there was someone here who took me under his wing, that acted as a mentor to me, someone whom I believe to be an example of the true gentleman that exists in the House of Representatives, someone who will be more than missed, someone for whom I have the greatest possible respect, someone that we know and military families throughout the country will appreciate for decades to come because of his work at Fort DeRussy and Hale Koa to see that the recreation needs of our military are taken care of. All of us are going to miss with all of our hearts Representative SONNY MONTGOMERY from Mississippi.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER], a member of the Committee on National Security.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time.

Mr. Chairman, I want to join as a member of the Committee on National Security and a member of Mr. HEFLEY's Subcommittee on Military Installations and Facilities in thanking Chairman VUCANOVICH for her great work. It is a work that really has contributed so much to the men and women who wear uniforms for our country.

It has been mentioned a couple of times that we spend more money than the President has requested in military construction, but I think Mr. HEFNER hit the nail on the head when he pointed out that we always have paid more attention to the quality of life issues than the administrations, regardless of whether they are Democrat or Republican.

I am reminded that this bill that BARBARA VUCANOVICH helped to put together and Mr. HEFNER helped to put together that provides for military construction, the defense bill taken together with that important component is roughly $100 billion less in real dollars than the 1985–86 Reagan defense budget. Because we were strong in the 1980's and because we brought down the Berlin Wall and dissolved the Soviet empire, we have been able to reduce defense expenditures. But beyond that, this bill also and the military construction budget that is an important part of the overall defense bill is in line and is consistent with the balanced budget program that the House leadership is moving forward with.

□ 1200

So this is not a budget buster. It is well within the confines of the dollar parameters that we have set.

Mr. Chairman, let me just say to gentlewoman from Nevada, who is one of the warmest, finest persons who has ever served in this body, we thank her for everything that she has brought to the deliberative process in the House of Representatives. She is a person of great wisdom, great intellect, and a big, big heart.

In another area, in the pro-life debates and the debates with respect to abortion, her speeches about ''Heather the Feather'' have touched everybody's heart. God bless her and thanks for her work.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. FOWLER], a member of the Committee on National Security.

(Mrs. FOWLER asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3517, the fiscal year 1997 military construction appropriations bill.

The President's fiscal year 1997 request for military construction reflected a cut of 18 percent from fiscal year 1996 appropriated levels, even though the Defense Science Board's quality of life task force found that 62 percent of military housing spaces and 64 percent of family housing units are unsuitable.

The bill helps correct this deficiency. While still below last year's appropriation, it significantly boosts the President's request for both new and renovated barracks and military family housing. This will address the concerns of many in today's military who are fed up with inadequate housing and are voting with their feet.

This bill supports other infrastructure improvements, as well. Earlier this year, for instance, Assistant Secretary of the Navy Pirie highlighted the Navy's need for significant investment in port infrastructure to ensure readiness. I am pleased H.R. 3517 recognizes the requirement, adding funding for projects such as wharf improvements at Naval Station Mayport.

Mr. Chairman, this bill improves the readiness of our Armed Forces. It merits our support.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

I urge strong support of this bill. It is not as much as we would like to do. I suppose that will always be with the budget restrictions that we are under. I suppose we will never have enough money to do the things that we would like to do and would need to do, but I would just like to point out to those that would be critical of this bill that every item in this bill is authorized, and we have gone to great pains to see that the money is going to be targeted to where it would do the most good for quality of life for our Armed Forces.

So I think it is a good bill, it is a bill that I think that everybody can support, and I urge that everyone in the body would take a close look at it and I would strongly urge that we have a unanimous vote on this milcon bill. And again I want to congratulate the gentlewoman from Nevada and wish her a very happy retirement, and I hope that this will be a resounding endorsement of this bill here today on the last vote that she will be bringing to this floor.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3517, the Military Construction bill for fiscal year 1997. I would like to thank the chairwoman of this committee, BARBARA VUCANOVICH, who has once again moved this bill swiftly through the Appropriations Committee, and I am sad to say will be doing it for the last time. I want to wish her well and would like to personally thank her for the service that she has provided to this important subcommittee and this institution. I would also like to thank the ranking member of the subcommittee, BILL HEFNER, for his help and assistance in bringing this legislation to the floor.

Mr. Chairman, as both the chairwoman and the ranking member have noted, this bill provides $10 billion in fiscal year 1997 for military construction, family housing and military base closure. This bill continues this committee's commitment to funding initiatives that upgrade the quality of life for the men and women of armed forces and families.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to highlight, a few important projects in the bill that are crucial to the constituents of my district.

The first project is the ongoing renovation of the dormitories at Travis AFB. This bill provides funding for one dormitory scheduled for construction this year, and funding to speed up construction of a second dorm at Travis. Additionally, this bill includes $8.6 million for the construction of 70 multi-family housing units for enlisted personnel stationed at Travis. These projects go a long way to improve Travis' housing situation. The construction of the dormitories is part of a base-wide project to upgrade and improve base housing in order to meet Air Force requirements.

This bill also provides funds to replace Travis' underground fueling system. The system was designed to provide a quick and efficient way to refuel two jets at one time. Travis currently relies on an underground system from the 1950's, which often fails because of electrical shorts which occur after rainstorms. The new fuel system is safer and more efficient than the fuel trucks on the runway. It will also put an end to the occasional leaks which are so bad for the environment.

Mr. Chairman, these upgrades are a clear sign that Travis is, and will remain, vital to the Air Force mission. These improvements in modernization will ensure that the base will meet that mission.

Finally, this bill provides for two projects at Beale AFB: the closure of landfill No. 2 and for the CARS Deployable Ground Station Support Facility. Each of these projects are important to the continued mission at Beale.

Mr. Chairman, each of the initiatives I have outlined will help maintain Travis and Beale AFB as critical defense assets and as integral parts of their respective communities.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I want to reiterate my support for this important military readiness bill.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my disappointment at the lack of funding in this bill for National Guard Armories, and to urge the Secretary of the Army to include construction funds for armories in next year's budget request.

When the authorizing committee for military construction, the House Military Construction and Facilities Subcommittee, held hearings on the fiscal year 1997 Department of Defense [DOD] authorization bill, the chairman was clear about his position on armories. No request means no funding, and no Member add-ons would be included in the bill.

This was not a new position. Last year, Chairman HEFLEY informed the Department of the Army and the Army National Guard that no armories would be funded until they were requested from the department in their annual budget request. Unfortunately, that advice was ignored this year and no armories were requested. The army knows how to solve this problem, and the ball is in their court.

As my colleagues on the National Security Committee know from my repeated speeches on this subject, the Guam Army National Guard is the only National Guard unit without an armory. At the same time, the Guam Army National Guard is one of the most recognized units in the nation, having received awards for the best recruiting and retention of any other unit in the country.

The construction of an armory for the Guam Army National Guard is a priority within the National Guard Bureau. Only recently, it was included in the $250 million priority list forwarded to the congressional defense committees at Senator REID's request.

I am pleased that the Department of the Army is now rethinking how it funds armories and has begun a dialog with the relevant committees. In order to meet the construction needs of our National Guard units, I urge the Department of the Army to include funding for armories, including a much-needed armory for the Guam Army National Guard, in next year's budget request.

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Chairman, I am unable to cast my vote in support of H.R. 3517, the Military Construction Appropriation Act, because I must attend the funeral of my friend and constituent, Seymour H. Knox III, of Buffalo.

H.R. 3517 underscores this Congress' continuing commitment to America's service personnel and their families, including many of my constituents who serve on the Niagara Falls Air Base. The bill also reflects a continuing commitment to the American taxpayer by calling for a $1.2 billion reduction from last year's level of $11.2 billion—keeping us on the path toward our ultimate goal of reaching a balanced budget by the year 2002.

According to the Quality of Life Task Force chaired by former Secretary of the Army Jack Marsh, 62 percent of troop housing and 64 percent of family housing units are currently unsuitable. This bill helps correct this deficiency.

Included in this legislation is $1 billion for family housing construction and improvements benefiting over 10,000 military families. In addition, the bill includes: $36 million for the Homeowners Assistance Fund; $34 million for child development centers; $313 million for hospital and medical facilities; and $88 million for environmental compliance.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Chairman, it has come to my attention that the move to privatize functions of the Department of Defense is apparently running into some snags when it comes to work being performed on the approximately 3,000 armories located all across our Nation, and at facilities located overseas.

First of all, I want to make certain that I am fully understood on this point, for I do not intend to detract from or denigrate any members of the National Guard and the Reserves.

Quite simply, my concern is that much of the work being performed through the Reserved Component Automation System could be resulting in additional costs, delays, and inefficiencies.

The Reserved Component Automation System program consists of installing electrical circuits and local-area-network [LAN] cable and devices in preparation for computers at armories throughout the Nation.

Apparently, the Department of Defense has determined that it cannot afford to perform this work at some of the smaller facilities through the use of outside contractors and, instead, is considering using armory personnel for this work.

Again, I am not questioning the skills, talents, and capabilities of members of the Guard and Reserves, but when there are small businesses in the private sector that have a proven track record of performing such work, I am concerned that local firms and local workers are being left out of the kind of work they customarily perform, typically at the lowest cost and with the greatest efficiency and best quality.

Mr. Chairman, a firm in my district has performed electrical and computer wiring work in as many as 70 armories, and the work they perform is of the highest quality and efficiency, and frequently at the lowest costs.

I would like to request of the distinguished chairwoman, my friend from Nevada, that we fully explore the best use of the funds that we appropriate through the Reserved Component Automation System and that we continue to apply very high standards, standards that call for cost-savings, high-quality, and greater efficiencies.

FEBRUARY 23, 1996.

Congressman BART STUPAK,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

Subject: Reserve/Armory projects.

DEAR BART: We have recently been advised that a contract has been issued to Boeing to perform the tasks we discussed on the larger sites in each State plus Europe. The contract is apparently a long term one and only for the large sites.

The information still indicates the government plans to complete the rest of the sites with armory personnel or individual contractors and since this is the arena we hoped to participate in, the door may be open.

Please let me know how I can assist you.

Sincerely,

RONALD C. LINDBERG,
Rapid Electric Sales & Service.

The Government has issued contracts for a Reserved Component Automation System which Rapid Electric has participated in by doing most of the armories in Michigan.

The project consists of installing electrical circuits and LAN cable and devices in preparation for computers.

The Government has determined it can't afford to do the smaller sites as originally planned and is considering using the armory personnel for the electrical and LAN installation.

We offer an alternative:

Rapid Electric has licensed electricians trained and experienced in these installations and can complete the work in a timely and professional manner while maintaining a cost within the allocated budget.

The work would be completed using our already trained personnel along with licensed electricians from the communities and states where the armory is located.

We would be consistent with the goals of privatisation and putting people to work as well as complying with the local codes and licensing laws.

Using nonqualified, nonlicensed personnel for installation of a national defense system is commercial senselessness. If we can't afford to do it right we are better off not to do it at all. It's better to work without a system than to depend on one that doesn't work.

The Government is expected to have an armory ready for the computer people when they arrive. If the electrical and LAN work isn't complete or does not operate when they arrive there is added expense and delay for rescheduling and return trips.

If the system fails when needed, it is of no value.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 3517, the military construction appropriations for fiscal year 1997.

This bill properly focuses on improving the quality of life for our service men and women and their families. This bill provides for new barracks and family housing, child care and medical facilities, and environmental compliance projects; $776 million will be expended

for new barracks; $34 million is appropriated for construction and improvement to day care centers and $48 million for energy conservation programs within the Department of Defense.

In Texas, $35,000,000 will go to construction and renovation of barracks at Fort Hood. Brooks Air Force Base and Dyess Air Force Base will receive $5,895,000 and $4,613,000 respectively.

At Brooks Air Force Base in Texas, $5,400,000 will be appropriated for a student dormitory. Dyess Air Force Base will receive $5,895,000 for improvements to their student dormitory facility.

Statewide, Texas will receive $6,500,000 aimed at general life safety upgrade for military personnel and their families in Texas.

I am proud to support this bill that provides for these types of quality of life programs which stress the importance of providing a healthy, happy, environment for the many families who live and work on military bases in my home State of Texas and across the country.

These young men and women are making a tremendous sacrifice in the service of our country and they deserve the improvements that this bill will make in their daily lives.

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

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman very much for his kind words, and I also urge support for this bill. I think it is a good bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

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

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment and may reduce to not less than 5 minutes the time for voting by electronic device on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote by electronic device without intervening business, provided that the time for voting by electronic device on the first in any series of questions shall not be less than 15 minutes.

After the reading of the final lines of the bill, a motion that the Committee of the Whole rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted shall, if offered by the majority leader or a designee, have precedence over a motion to amend.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3517

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, for military construction, family housing, and base realignment and closure functions administered by the Department of Defense, and for other purposes, namely:

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY

For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, military installations, facilities, and real property for the Army as currently authorized by law, including personnel in the Army Corps of Engineers and other personal services necessary for the purposes of this appropriation, and for construction and operation of facilities in support of the functions of the Commander in Chief, $603,584,000, to remain available until September 30, 2001: *Provided,* That of this amount, not to exceed $54,384,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, architect and engineer services, and host nation support, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of his determination and the reasons therefor.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, NAVY

(INCLUDING RESCISSIONS)

For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, naval installations, facilities, and real property for the Navy as currently authorized by law, including personnel in the Naval Facilities Engineering Command and other personal services necessary for the purposes of this appropriation, $724,476,000, to remain available until September 30, 2001: *Provided,* That of this amount, not to exceed $50,959,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of his determination and the reasons therefor: *Provided further,* That of the funds appropriated for ''Military Construction, Navy'' under Public Law 102–136, $6,900,000 is hereby rescinded: *Provided further,* That of the funds appropriated for ''Military Construction, Navy'' under Public Law 102–380, $2,800,000 is hereby rescinded: *Provided further,* That of the funds appropriated for ''Military Construction, Navy'' under Public Law 103–110, $2,300,000 is hereby rescinded.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, military installations, facilities, and real property for the Air Force as currently authorized by law, $678,914,000, to remain available until September 30, 2001: *Provided,* That of this amount, not to exceed $47,387,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of his determination and the reasons therefor.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, DEFENSE-WIDE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, installations, facilities, and real property for activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments), as currently authorized by law, $772,345,000, to remain available until September 30, 2001: *Provided,* That such amounts of this appropriation as may be determined by the Secretary of Defense may be transferred to such appropriations of the Department of Defense available for military construction or family housing as he may designate, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes, and for the same time period, as the appropriation or fund to which transferred: *Provided further,* That of the amount appropriated, not to exceed $12,239,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of his determination and the reasons therefor.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE MILITARY UNACCOMPANIED HOUSING IMPROVEMENT FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Department of Defense Military Unaccompanied Housing Improvement Fund, $10,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That subject to thirty days prior notification to the Committees on Appropriations, such additional amounts as may be determined by the Secretary of Defense may be transferred to the Fund from amounts appropriated in this Act for the acquisition or construction of military unaccompanied housing in ''Military Construction'' accounts, to be merged with and to be made available for the same purposes and for the same period of time as amounts appropriated directly to the Fund: *Provided further,* That appropriations made available for the Fund in this Act shall be available to cover the costs, as defined in section 502(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, of direct loans and loan guarantees issued by the Department of Defense pursuant to the provisions of subchapter IV of chapter 169 of title 10, United States Code, pertaining to alternative means of acquiring and improving military unaccompanied housing and ancillary supporting facilities.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the Army National Guard, and contributions therefor, as authorized by chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code, and military construction authorization Acts, $41,316,000, to remain available until September 30, 2001.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR NATIONAL GUARD

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the Air National Guard, and contributions therefor, as authorized by chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code, and military construction authorization Acts, $118,394,000, to remain available until September 30, 2001.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY RESERVE

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the Army Reserve as authorized by chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code, and military construction authorization Acts, $50,159,000, to remain available until September 30, 2001.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, NAVAL RESERVE

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the reserve components of the Navy and Marine Corps as authorized by chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code, and military construction authorization Acts, $33,169,000, to remain available until September 30, 2001.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE RESERVE

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities

for the training and administration of the Air Force Reserve as authorized by chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code, and military construction authorization Acts, $51,655,000, to remain available until September 30, 2001.

NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION SECURITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM

For the United States share of the cost of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program for the acquisition and construction of military facilities and installations (including international military headquarters) and for related expenses for the collective defense of the North Atlantic Treaty Area as authorized in military construction authorization Acts and section 2806 of title 10, United States Code, $177,000,000, to remain available until expended.

FAMILY HOUSING, ARMY

For expenses of family housing for the Army for constrution, including acquisition, replacement, addition, expansion, extension and alteration and for operation and maintenance, including debt payment, leasing, minor construction, principal and interest charges, and insurance premiums, as authorized by law, as follows: for Construction, $176,603,000, to remain available until September 30, 2001; for Operation and Maintenance, and for debt payment, $1,257,466,000; in all $1,434,069,000.

FAMILY HOUSING, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

For expenses of family housing for the Navy and Marine Corps for construction, including acquisition, replacement, addition, expansion, extension and alteration and for operation and maintenance, including debt payment, leasing, minor construction, principal and interest charges, and insurance premiums, as authorized by law, as follows: for Construction, $532,456,000, to remain available until September 30, 2001; for Operation and Maintenance, and for debt payment, $1,058,241,000; in all $1,590,697,000.

FAMILY HOUSING, AIR FORCE

For expenses of family housing for the Air Force for construction, including acquisition, replacement, addition, expansion, extension and alteration and for operation and maintenance, including debt payment, leasing, minor construction, principal and interest charges, and insurance premiums, as authorized by law, as follows: for Construction, $304,068,000, to remain available until September 30, 2001; for Operation and Maintenance, and for debt payment, $840,474,000; in all $1,144,542,000.

FAMILY HOUSING, DEFENSE-WIDE

For expenses of family housing for the activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments) for construction, including acquisition, replacement, addition, expansion, extension and alteration, and for operation and maintenance, leasing, and minor construction, as authorized by law, as follows: for Construction, $4,371,000, to remain available until September 30, 2001; for Operation and Maintenance, $30,963,000; in all $35,334,000.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FAMILY HOUSING IMPROVEMENT FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Department of Defense Family Housing Improvement Fund, $35,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That, subject to thirty days prior notification to the Committees on Appropriations, such additional amounts as may be determined by the Secretary of Defense may be transferred to the Fund from amounts appropriated in this Act for construction in ''Family Housing'' accounts, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same period of time as amounts appropriated directly to the Fund: *Provided further*, That appropriations made available to the Fund in this Act shall be available to cover the costs, as defined in section 502(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, of direct loans or loan guarantees issued by the Department of Defense pursuant to the provisions of subchapter IV of Chapter 169, title 10, United States Code, pertaining to alternative means of acquiring and improving military family housing and supporting facilities.

HOMEOWNERS ASSISTANCE FUND, DEFENSE

For use in the Homeowners Assistance Fund established by section 1013(d) of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966, as amended (42 U.S.C. 3374), $36,181,000, to remain available until expended.

BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ACCOUNT, PART II

For deposit into the Department of Defense Base Closure Account 1990 established by section 2906(a)(1) of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1991 (Public Law 101–510), $352,800,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not more than $223,789,000 of the funds appropriated herein shall be available solely for environmental restoration, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of his determination and the reasons therefor.

BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ACCOUNT, PART III

For deposit into the Department of Defense Base Closure Account 1990 established by section 2906(a)(1) of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1991 (Public Law 101–510), $971,925,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not more than $351,967,000 of the funds appropriated herein shall be available solely for environmental restoration, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of his determination and the reasons therefor.

BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ACCOUNT, PART IV

For deposit into the Department of Defense Base Closure Account 1990 established by section 2906(a)(1) of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1991 (Public Law 101–510), $1,182,749,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not more than $200,841,000 of the funds appropriated herein shall be available solely for environmental restoration, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of his determination and the reasons therefor.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 101. None of the funds appropriated in Military Construction Appropriations Acts shall be expended for payments under a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract for work, where cost estimates exceed $25,000, to be performed within the United States, except Alaska, without the specific approval in writing of the Secretary of Defense setting forth the reasons therefor: *Provided*, That the foregoing shall not apply in the case of contracts for environmental restoration at an installation that is being closed or realigned where payments are made from a Base Realignment and Closure Account.

SEC. 102. Funds appropriated to the Department of Defense for construction shall be available for hire of passenger motor vehicles.

SEC. 103. Funds appropriated to the Department of Defense for construction may be used for advances to the Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation, for the construction of access roads as authorized by section 210 of title 23, United States Code, when projects authorized therein are certified as important to the national defense by the Secretary of Defense.

SEC. 104. None of the funds appropriated in this Act may be used to begin construction of new bases inside the continental United States for which specific appropriations have not been made.

SEC. 105. No part of the funds provided in Military Construction Appropriations Acts shall be used for purchase of land or land easements in excess of 100 per centum of the value as determined by the Army Corps of Engineers or the Naval Facilities Engineering Command, except (a) where there is a determination of value by a Federal court, or (b) purchases negotiated by the Attorney General or his designee, or (c) where the estimated value is less than $25,000, or (d) as otherwise determined by the Secretary of Defense to be in the public interest.

SEC. 106. None of the funds appropriated in Military Construction Appropriations Acts shall be used to (1) acquire land, (2) provide for site preparation, or (3) install utilities for any family housing, except housing for which funds have been made available in annual Military Construction Appropriations Acts.

SEC. 107. None of the funds appropriated in Military Construction Appropriations Acts for minor construction may be used to transfer or relocate any activity from one base or installation to another, without prior notification to the Committees on Appropriations.

SEC. 108. No part of the funds appropriated in Military Construction Appropriations Acts may be used for the procurement of steel for any construction project or activity for which American steel producers, fabricators, and manufacturers have been denied the opportunity to compete for such steel procurement.

SEC. 109. None of the funds available to the Department of Defense for military construction or family housing during the current fiscal year may be used to pay real property taxes in any foreign nation.

SEC. 110. None of the funds appropriated in Military Construction Appropriations Acts may be used to initiate a new installation overseas without prior notification to the Committees on Appropriations.

SEC. 111. None of the funds appropriated in Military Construction Appropriations Acts may be obligated for architect and engineer contracts estimated by the Government to exceed $500,000 for projects to be accomplished in Japan, in any NATO member country, or in countries bordering the Arabian Gulf, unless such contracts are awarded to United States firms or United States firms in joint venture with host nation firms.

SEC. 112. None of the funds appropriated in Military Construction Appropriations Acts for military construction in the United States territories and possessions in the Pacific and on Kwajalein Atoll, or in countries bordering the Arabian Gulf, may be used to award any contract estimated by the Government to exceed $1,000,000 to a foreign contractor: *Provided*, That this section shall not be applicable to contract awards for which the lowest responsive and responsible bid of a United States contractor exceeds the lowest responsive and responsible bid of a foreign contractor by greater than 20 per centum.

SEC. 113. The Secretary of Defense is to inform the appropriate Committees of Congress, including the Committees on Appropriations, of the plans and scope of any proposed military exercise involving United States personnel thirty days prior to its occurring, if amounts expended for construction, either temporary or permanent, are anticipated to exceed $100,000.

SEC. 114. Not more than 20 per centum of the appropriations in Military Construction Appropriations Acts which are limited for obligation during the current fiscal year shall be obligated during the last two months of the fiscal year.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 115. Funds appropriated to the Department of Defense for construction in prior years shall be available for construction authorized for each such military department by the authorizations enacted into law during the current session of Congress.

SEC. 116. For military construction or family housing projects that are being completed with funds otherwise expired or lapsed for obligation, expired or lapsed funds may be used to pay the cost of associated supervision, inspection, overhead, engineering and design on those projects and on subsequent claims, if any.

SEC. 117. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any funds appropriated to a military department or defense agency for the construction of military projects may be obligated for a military construction project or contract, or for any portion of such a project or contract, at any time before the end of the fourth fiscal year after the fiscal year for which funds for such project were appropriated if the funds obligated for such project (1) are obligated from funds available for military construction projects, and (2) do not exceed the amount appropriated for such project, plus any amount by which the cost of such project is increased pursuant to law.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 118. During the five-year period after appropriations available to the Department of Defense for military construction and family housing operation and maintenance and construction have expired for obligation, upon a determination that such appropriations will not be necessary for the liquidation of obligations or for making authorized adjustments to such appropriations for obligations incurred during the period of availability of such appropriations, unobligated balances of such appropriations may be transferred into the appropriation ''Foreign Currency Fluctuations, Construction, Defense'' to be merged with and to be available for the same time period and for the same purposes as the appropriation to which transferred.

SEC. 119. The Secretary of Defense is to provide the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives with an annual report by February 15, containing details of the specific actions proposed to be taken by the Department of Defense during the current fiscal year to encourage other member nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, Japan, Korea, and United States allies bordering the Arabian Gulf to assume a greater share of the common defense burden of such nations and the United States.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 120. During the current fiscal year, in addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of Defense, proceeds deposited to the Department of Defense Base Closure Account established by section 207(a)(1) of the Defense Authorization Amendments and Base Closure and Realignment Act (Public Law 100–526) pursuant to section 207(a)(2)(C) of such Act, may be transferred to the account established by section 2906(a)(1) of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1991, to be merged with, and to be available for the same purposes and the same time period as that account.

SEC. 121. No funds appropriated pursuant to this Act may be expended by an entity unless the entity agrees that in expending the assistance the entity will comply with sections 2 through 4 of the Act of March 3, 1933 (41 U.S.C. 10a–10c, popularly known as the ''Buy American Act'').

SEC. 122. (a) In the case of any equipment or products that may be authorized to be purchased with financial assistance provided under this Act, it is the sense of the Congress that entities receiving such assistance should, in expending the assistance, purchase only American-made equipment and products.

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

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 123. During the current fiscal year, in addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of Defense, amounts may be transferred from the account established by section 2906(a)(1) of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1991, to the fund established by section 1013(d) of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 3374) to pay for expenses associated with the Homeowners Assistance Program. Any amounts transferred shall be merged with and be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the fund to which transferred.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill, through page 19, line 17, be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Nevada?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to this portion of the bill?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. FURSE

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. FURSE: At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

SEC. . (a) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for renovation, repair, or other military construction project in connection with Spinelli Barracks or Taylor Barracks, Mannheim, Germany.

(b) CORRESPONDING REDUCTION IN FUNDS.—The amount otherwise provided by this Act for ''MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY'' is hereby reduced by $17,400,000.

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Chairman, I want to take a moment before I start and express my deep appreciation to the ranking member of this committee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER], and how much wonderful work he does for military personnel, and also to our retiring chairperson, she has also done such great work.

My amendment, Mr. Chairman, which is endorsed by Citizens Against Government Waste, reduces the Army military construction account by $17.4 million. That $17.4 million is the cost of renovating two barracks in Mannheim, Germany.

There are three reasons why I offer this amendment. The first is that these renovations were not requested by the Department of Defense; second, they are not in the Army's 6-year future defense plan; and, third, Mr. Chairman, we are about to undertake a fundamental reevaluation of our present worldwide troop deployment patterns and it seems to me this is not the time to be committing ourselves to an over $17 million remodeling project.

My colleagues will recall the Shays-Frank burdensharing amendment. It passed the House overwhelmingly by a vote of 353 to 62 during consideration of the fiscal year 1997 defense authorization. This amendment required a report on alternative configuration, due March 1, 1997.

Now, I certainly support the effort to improve quality of life for our troops; however, the U.S. taxpayers should not be asked to pick up the tab for this installation in Europe. The United States should negotiate with the Germans to make these renovations part of their contribution.

The Japanese Government gives about 79 percent of the nonpersonnel costs incurred in stationing our troops in their country, but none of our NATO allies, not even Germany, has agreed to kick in a dime for the renovation at Mannheim. This is yet another way that the Europeans end up paying just 24 percent of U.S. nonpersonnel costs and investing their own money in other things of value.

There are better ways, it seems to me, to spend this $17 million than in renovating barracks in Europe. In my own State of Oregon, our National Guard was told that if projects were not part of DOD long-range plans they would not be added to this bill. Well, the barracks in Germany were not part of the plan and they got funding for $17 million.

And the question I think we need to ask, if this is indeed a priority, is why did the Department of Defense not include these renovations in their request?

It is very important at this time that we are reviewing our overseas presence, and I believe that while we do that review we should set our priorities better than the one in this bill that my amendment would address.

The Furse amendment, is, as I said, endorsed by Citizens Against Government Waste and Taxpayers for Common Sense. I urge that Members support my amendment and save $17 million that we can well use in military construction in this country.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment.

The amendment, I think, fundamentally misrepresents the situation on the ground in Germany and is a direct assault on the young men and women that are stationed there, young Americans who are in many cases now deployed in Bosnia.

I believe that deployment to Bosnia was supported by the gentlewoman from Oregon, but when we bring those troops back from the miserable situation in Bosnia to Germany, she wants them still to have a miserable living situation, it would appear, when they get back there.

As the chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Installations and Facilities, I want to remind the House these barracks projects have already been considered by the House. Just 2 weeks ago, the House passed the military construction authorization for the coming fiscal year as part of the defense authorization bill. No one challenged these barracks improvements at the time. No one offered an amendment, and these projects have been fully supported on a bipartisan basis throughout the committee process.

Moreover, these projects are also included in the defense authorization bill, which is reported by the Senate Armed Services Committee. We recognize the degraded and difficult living conditions of our soldiers in Germany, and so has the Army. The Army has not dedicated any military construction funding to barracks in Germany since before the drawdown began in 1989. Well, the drawdown is over, and we know where these troops are going to remain.

On April 10, 1996, I wrote to each of the military departments to determine the high priority unfunded requirements in military construction. Maj. Gen. Frank Miller, the Assistant Chief of Staff of the Army for Installation Management, responded to me on April 18. He indicated that these two projects were high priority unfunded requirements.

In testimony before the subcommittee that I chair, I asked Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Economic Security where the department would put additional funding if it became available. Here is what he said: ''I think that were we to have additional funds, the place that really needs the most attention is our overseas bases, and particularly in Europe.'' He went on to say that ''what we are asking of those people and the conditions that they are finding themselves in are pretty abysmal.'' ''Abysmal'' is the word he used.

□ 1215

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Furse amendment, and I am deeply interested in the comments of the previous speaker. The gentleman certainly raises issues that are of concern to all of us. Our troops in Bosnia are important to each American, their well-being, and their support.

But, Mr. Chairman, I would like to observe that it is our expectation that the troops in Bosnia will be withdrawn by the end of the year, or certainly sometime next year, and it is far from clear that these apartment units, these housing quarters are going to be completed in time for them to occupy them.

It is our hope and prayer, of course, that these troops will be home in the United States before then. So, I think that it is a red herring to claim that these units are for our troops in Bosnia.

Second, I would point out that the Armed Forces themselves have not included this barracks project in their long-term plan. Why is it we are building additional housing units in Europe at the instigation of the committees in Congress, when the Defense Department itself has not placed a priority on these units? I submit that this is not a responsible use of taxpayer dollars.

Third, it is important to note that we have a study underway pursuant to the request by Congress for how we should handle burdensharing obligations. Is it responsible for us to jump in and say that we should spend $17.4 million building these barracks when this study is in progress and when the Defense Department has not requested funds for the barracks themselves?

I think that the Furse amendment represents a modest, responsible, prudent approach to budgeting and that all of us would be well-advised to support this amendment to save the American taxpayer dollars or if these are dollars that must be spent according to the committee's calculations, to invest these dollars in facilities that would serve the American Armed Forces for a longer period of time and not violate the mandate from Congress with respect to the burdensharing study.

Finally, I would like to emphasize that we are not quibbling here over whether we are going to do something for the men and women in the Armed Forces or for our veterans. All of us agree that we ought to support the folks in the service. The question is what is responsible with respect to the American taxpayer, and how do we work effectively as a legislative body with the administrative branch to make these decisions?

Again, if the Defense Department itself has not included this project in its long-term plan, why are we leaping in at this point in time to second guess those experts?

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MINGE. I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Chairman, one of the things I would like to point out is that there are many needs for barracks in the United States. I would point out one place in Oregon where we do training in central Oregon. We train about 500 person-days a year, and there the trainees sleep on the armory floor and they use Porta-potties. They would love to have a barracks, but they were told, the National Guard was told it was not in the long-range plan, they would not be able to apply for these.

We are again saying this was not in the long-range plan, it was not requested, and we would like to see the long-range report completed first and make sure that our allies pick up the cost of some of these housing that then become part of their housing stock.

So, I would point out that many of the barracks need remodeling here in this country and our Army National Guard really does need to have some of that money spent on their local barracks, and I would suggest that is probably a better use of money, but it should have been authorized, or rather it should have been requested and I believe it must be in the long-range plan to be a conservative use of our taxpayers' money.

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I would also like to report that we checked with the German embassy and we were advised that apartments can be rented in the Mannheim area for $750 a month for a 2-bedroom apartment. If we have a need for housing for our troops on an interim or swing period of time especially the troops in Bosnia, why do not we utilize the market that is available in the area to provide that housing on a temporary basis? I submit that building housing or building barracks that probably would have a life expectancy of 40 years is not a responsible use of money.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the bill. I have come down to the floor for the express purpose of saying what a joy it has been to serve on the subcommittee under the chairmanship of the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH]. She has been one of the outstanding members and leaders not only on our Committee on Appropriations but in this House of Representatives and in the Republican Party.

She has been unfailingly helpful and cooperative with all the Members. It has been a joy to be a part of her subcommittee. As I said at the markup, she could give all of the rest of us subcommittee chairmen lessons in how to mark up a bill in an efficient way and get the job done for the House of Representatives.

Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman has done an outstanding job in crafting this bill that addresses the quality of life and needs of our Armed Services, and this bill includes increased funding for troops' barracks quarters, for new family housing units, for private family homes, for child development centers.

All of these items are essential to the readiness of our Armed Forces. It is a disgrace to see the substandard housing facilities in which we have sometimes allowed the men and women who serve our country to live. They deserve the very best we can provide.

Under the leadership of Chairman VUCANOVICH, this bill takes very strong

steps toward improving those conditions and I think she has done a masterful job in crafting the bill. I fully support it, and the fact that the gentlewoman is retiring, I want her to know that I believe it is a tremendous loss to the Congress and to the country to see her enter retirement. She is going to be missed very much, and I have been proud to serve under her chairmanship of the subcommittee.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Furse amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I first want to say that I applaud the subcommittee this year and the full committee as well, for the bill itself is $1.1 billion less than last year's spending bill, which I think is a step in the right direction.

However, Mr. Chairman, I must say that I am dismayed that it is still $900 million more than what the Pentagon asked for. This amendment seeks to cut $17 million of the $900 million in unrequested funds. The money is designated, as the gentlewoman from Oregon [Ms. FURSE] indicated, for barracks improvements in Germany.

While there is nothing wrong with improving the quality of life for our troops, there is something wrong in asking the taxpayer to spend $17.5 million for a military project that the Pentagon does not have in its long-range plan. It did not request it, and consequently it must not see the need for this project.

Mr. Chairman, I know that it is hard to cut spending. We do not win a lot of battles, and I regret that this amendment is likely to fail. I wish that we had the line-item veto in effect for this year's spending appropriations instead of next year's. It would have been a good first test. But unfortunately it does not start until next year.

Mr. Chairman, $17 million is a lot of money. It is a lot of money in anybody's checkbook, whether it be the Federal Government's or somebody else's. And if we are going to start in cutting back on waste and unneeded projects, this is where we ought to start.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would urge my colleagues to join with me and the Citizens Against Government Waste and the Taxpayers for Common Sense in supporting this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, for a couple of reasons, one, I do not like to be on the wrong side of Citizens Against Government Waste because I am a citizen and I am against government waste, and second, I reluctantly oppose the gentlewoman's amendment. I think it is ill-advised.

What we are doing here, we are not—and someone mentioned projects all across the Nation. Well, there is no doubt about that. There are projects that need to be done. And $17 million would not address many projects in all the many States, the requests that we have here. But the only thing we are going to do, if we adopt this amendment, the only people it is going to hurt is going to be the troops that are stationed there. And we are going to continue to have the poor living conditions there. It was not requested. We understand that. But it was a high priority when we talked to the military people that were responsible for the living conditions for those people there. It was a high priority with them.

But in many cases over the years, people have not requested these funds because it was not a higher priority with them because they had so many other things and the budget crunch came. But they need these funds.

The gentlewoman has linked her amendment to a burdensharing amendment that passed the House in the Armed Services bill. I do not believe that any redeployment of our troops will affect the Army at Mannheim, Germany. The fact of the matter is that we are consolidating our forces there, and it serves as a major railhead for the Armed Forces in Europe. In fact, it was recently used to send troops and equipment to Bosnia.

Someone mentioned that they had talked with the German Housing Authority, and I respect that, but I doubt very seriously if the Germany Housing Authority could supply the number of apartments that we would need to accommodate our soldiers that are stationed there. Plus, they are enlisted men; they do not have the kind of resources that would be needed to live on the economy in Germany.

It is true that the Germany Government owes us over $200 million based on cost sharing reached in the understanding with many United States facilities. However, having said that, cutting these funds from this bill is not in any way going to affect the behavior of the German Government. It has been our contention for many years that we do not put enough pressure on our allies about burdensharing, but we are doing better with the Japanese, the Germans and everybody that is concerned.

This project will not actually replace but refurbish facilities built in 1940. I was 10 years old when they began occupying these facilities and that goes back a long, long way.

I certainly respect the gentlewoman's endeavor here and her commitment to it, but I think it is ill-advised and I would hope that the Members of Congress would look at this, look at the whole picture, and realize that this is not the way for us to go.

□ 1230

So, reluctantly, at the threat of being on the wrong side of Citizens Against Government Waste and my dear friend from Oregon, I would request that Members look at this entire bill and see it for what it is, a good bill. The priorities are set. There is no money that is being wasted. This money will be put to a very good use, and it will benefit our sons and our daughters that are stationed in Germany. This is not a frivolous funding, and I would highly recommend that we vote against this amendment and support this bill.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Furse amendment. At first blush, it might seem that a vote in favor of the amendment would be politically correct. After all, this project is not in anyone's district. There is not a single Member of this body who is going to be able to go home and brag about bringing home pork to his district. This expenditure simply provides for the needs of our servicemen who have signed on to support our national interests and have been assigned to Europe.

Also, we might get a plus from the Citizens Against Government Waste. And I agree with the gentleman from North Carolina. I am against government waste and I hate to receive a bad mark from a public interest group such as Citizens Against Government Waste. But if we pass the Furse amendment, we will do so at the expense of the quality of life of our servicemen who have agreed to serve our country and who are in desperate need of improved barracks right now.

Now, one thing that needs to be pointed out, Mr. Chairman, is that this project has been recommended by the U.S. Army. The subcommittee asked for a list of priorities, and the Army told us that these barracks were priorities. So let's make sure that we get that straight. The point has been made that they are not in the long-range plan. The question becomes why are they not in the long-range plan and why is this not in DOD's budget. As the gentleman from Hawaii pointed out earlier, the administrations have historically depended upon this Congress to take care of quality-of-life needs. They know that we are going to do right by our troops and that we will have to add certain funds if we are going to take care of our troops, particularly these single enlisted troops who depend on these barracks in Germany. So, I would urge that we defeat the Furse amendment that we take this little step toward quality of life for our troops.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY].

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, just to respond to a few of the comments that have been made, they talk about why do the Germans not do more. We are talking about $5 million that they are willing to put into these projects. Now that is burden sharing.

One of the speakers mentioned, well, they can rent apartments for $700 a month. How many enlisted people that these are going to benefit, the lower ranked enlisted people, can afford $700 a month to live on the economy? That

might be nice, but who can afford that kind of thing? Yes, there are many projects we could do in America, and we are doing many projects across this country to try to improve quality of life across the country. But realize these are Americans that are in Bosnia now, and their permanent duty station is Germany. So when they come out of Bosnia, they go back to Germany. What kind of living conditions do we want them go come back to when they come back to Germany?

Mr. Chairman, as for it not being in the budget plan, as has been indicated by the previous speaker, it was a priority. When we asked the military about the priority, this was one of their priorities. As for the $900 million over the President's request, that is making the assumption that the President was correct with his request.

Many of us do not think that he was correct, that he cuts too deep and he cuts too fast and particularly when we are talking about quality-of-life projects. Why was it not in the long-range plans? Well, one of the reasons I think it was not in the long-range plan, it is going to be in the next long-range plan as a matter of fact. One reason it was not in the long-range plans is we had the base closure procedure and we were taking out bases all over Europe that we had, some 400 facilities at one time or another, if I remember the figure correctly, and we did not know exactly where we would be.

We know now where we will be. We know what the needs are, and we need to get about meeting those needs.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming the balance of my time, I would simply point out that, even though this bill is $900 million more than the President's request, it does represent a budget savings and a substantial savings of 10 percent over the amount appropriated by this Congress last year.

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

Mr. Chairman, there is no Member on the floor for whom I have greater affection or more respect than the gentlewoman from Oregon. She does an outstanding job for her State, for her constituents, and she does an outstanding job for this country. However, on this issue I disagree with her and would urge my colleagues to support the committee's judgment in this instance.

The reason for that is I have had the opportunity, as many Members have had, to visit housing overseas, in Germany and in other countries; and I know the condition of that housing. As I call him, the chairman in exile mentioned the fact that this was built in 1940. I was not 10 at that point in time, but I was around, albeit briefly. I understand that we need to make sure, as the gentleman from Colorado said, that when these troops return from Bosnia to their permanent duty station that they have housing which will in fact be quality-of-life housing.

Mr. Chairman, this committee in particular, as well as the authorizing committee, has worked very, very hard on quality-of-life issues. As a matter of fact, as I think the gentleman from Mississippi mentioned, in fact the Congress has been at the forefront. Not the administration, neither this one nor previous administrations, has been in the forefront of ensuring quality of life for our troops. So I want to commend the committee for including this sum, notwithstanding the fact that it may not have been on the list.

Mr. Chairman, I am not one who believes simply because an administration, whether it has been the Reagan or Bush or Clinton administration, failed to include something that it thereby is not something that is a priority item. So I commend the committee, urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment and support this expenditure for this very necessary housing for our troops.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Furse amendment.

I ask the sponsor of this amendment if she has ever visited the troops in Germany? Has she walked through one of these barracks built and paid for by the Germans during the 1930s? As chairman of this subcommittee I take pride that I have taken the time to visit with these troops, to talk to them and to see where they live. Many of them are on their first assignment and find themselves a long way from home and they do miss the amenities of the United States.

Let me share with you the condition I have found these barracks to be—76 percent of the U.S. Army's barracks in Europe still have gang latrines—when you walk into the buildings, obnoxious odors greet you because the plumbing systems are inadequately vented and emit sewer gases into the latrines and hallways. The gang latrines are undersized, crowded, covered in moisture, rot, and mold growth and do not provide even a minimum amount of privacy for our soldiers.

The concrete and plaster interior surfaces are cracked and water-logged in areas next to these latrines. Paint is peeling, replacement tiles are not available so surfaces appear as an unmatched mosaic. Stairway nosings are broken, trends are worn and uneven. Heat and air conditioning systems continuously fail. Electrical service cannot handle the number of appliances—minor comforts such as a boom box—that the modern soldier possesses.

I remind my colleagues that these are volunteers and are very proud to be serving their country. And when I have asked them what is important to them, the answer I continuously hear is a decent place to live, a place to take a private shower, to have heat and air conditioning, and enough electricity to run a microwave.

We have far too long allowed the condition of these barracks to send the signal that we don't care. As chairman of this subcommittee, I have worked to correct this unfortunate misconception—these barracks aren't in anyone's congressional district—they don't benefit one Member of this Congress—they benefit the young men and women who are deployed by President Clinton to Bosnia—as chairman of this subcommittee, and as I leave this House later this year, one of the things I am most proud of, is not just to talk about how I support our troops but to send a concrete signal that we really do care. I urge a strong vote against this amendment, and in support of the quality of life for our soldiers stationed overseas. There is nothing more important than to ensure they receive a decent place to live.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, this bill would not be the fine product that it is without the able, dedicated, and professional work of our subcommittee staff, Liz Dawson, Hank Moore, Mary Arnold and Mark Murray, and I want to personally thank them for all their efforts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Oregon [Ms. FURSE].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 121, noes 289, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 200]

AYES—121

Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Barton
Bass
Becerra
Beilenson
Berman
Bilbray
Blumenauer
Brown (CA)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Campbell
Cardin
Chabot
Clay
Coburn
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Cooley
Cummings
Danner
DeFazio
Dellums
Deutsch
Dingell
Doggett
Duncan
Durbin
Ehlers
Engel
English
Eshoo
Evans
Fawell
Filner
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Furse
Gillmor
Green (TX)
Gutierrez
Hamilton
Hancock
Hastings (FL)
Hinchey
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnston
Kennedy (MA)
Kleczka
Klug
Lantos
Lewis (GA)
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Markey
Martini
McCarthy
McDermott
McInnis
McKinney
Meehan
Metcalf
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Neumann
Ney
Nussle
Olver
Owens
Payne (NJ)
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Poshard
Ramstad
Rangel
Rivers
Roemer
Rohrabacher
Roukema
Royce
Rush
Sanders
Sanford
Schroeder
Schumer
Sensenbrenner
Shays
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Spratt
Stark
Stockman
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Towns
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Ward
Watt (NC)
Weller
Williams
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates
Zimmer

NOES—289

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allard
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Bateman
Bentsen
Bereuter
Bevill
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (FL)
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Canady
Castle
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Collins (IL)
Combest
Condit
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis
Deal
DeLauro
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dixon
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Doyle
Dreier
Dunn
Edwards
Ehrlich
Emerson
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fazio
Fields (TX)
Flake
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Franks (CT)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Frost
Funderburk
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Greene (UT)
Greenwood
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
Longley
Lucas
Manton
Manzullo
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCollum
McCrery
McHale
McHugh
McIntosh
McKeon
McNulty
Meek
Menendez
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Nethercutt
Norwood
Oberstar
Obey
Ortiz
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Payne (VA)
Pickett
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce
Quillen
Radanovich
Rahall
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Riggs
Roberts
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roth
Roybal-Allard
Sabo
Salmon
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Scott
Seastrand
Serrano
Shadegg
Shaw
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Traficant
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wise
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff

NOT VOTING—24

Bachus
Camp
Chapman
de la Garza
Fattah
Fields (LA)
Foglietta
Ford
Geren
Gutknecht
Hayes
Houghton
Jefferson
Kennelly
Lincoln
McDade
Molinari
Mollohan
Paxon
Peterson (FL)
Pomeroy
Quinn
Thornton
Wilson

□ 1300

Messrs. BLUTE, COSTELLO, OBERSTAR, and Mrs. KELLY changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. CHABOT, OLVER, FOX of Pennsylvania, and Ms. RIVERS changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to the bill?

If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the ''Military Construction Appropriations Act, 1997''.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to the bill?

If not, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD) having assumed the chair, Mr. LATOURETTE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3517), making appropriations for military construction, family housing, and base realignment and closure for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 442, he reported the bill back to the House.

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

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 369, nays 43, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 201]

YEAS—369

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allard
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Canady
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Condit
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (TX)
Filner
Flake
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Frost
Funderburk
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Green (TX)
Greene (UT)
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lowey
Lucas
Maloney
Manton
Manzullo
Martinez
Mascara
McCarthy
McCollum
McCrery
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Mink
Moakley
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce
Quillen
Radanovich
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Riggs
Rivers
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roth
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Salmon
Sanders
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Seastrand
Serrano
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Stump
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thornton
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Velazquez
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Ward
Waters
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)

White	Wolf	Young (FL)
Whitfield	Woolsey	Zeliff
Wicker	Wynn	Zimmer
Wise	Young (AK)	

NAYS—43

Barrett (WI)	Lewis (GA)	Ramstad
Becerra	Lofgren	Rangel
Beilenson	Luther	Roemer
Bryant (TX)	Markey	Royce
Camp	Martini	Sensenbrenner
Campbell	Matsui	Stark
Conyers	McDermott	Stockman
Cooley	McKinney	Upton
Frank (MA)	Minge	Vento
Furse	Nadler	Watt (NC)
Hancock	Neumann	Weller
Johnston	Oberstar	Williams
Kleczka	Owens	Yates
Klug	Petri	
LaHood	Rahall	

NOT VOTING—22

Bachus	Ford	Molinari
Brown (OH)	Gutknecht	Mollohan
Chapman	Hayes	Paxon
Clay	Houghton	Peterson (FL)
de la Garza	Jefferson	Quinn
Fattah	Kennelly	Wilson
Fields (LA)	Lincoln	
Foglietta	McDade	

□ 1322

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ORDER OF CONSIDERATION OF AMENDMENTS AND POSTPONING VOTES ON AMENDMENTS DURING FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3322, OMNIBUS CIVILIAN SCIENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1996

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during further consideration of H.R. 3322, pursuant to House Resolution 427, it shall be in order to consider the following amendments, or germane modifications thereof, in sequence: The amendment numbered 15 printed by Representative LOFGREN; the amendment numbered 6 printed by Representative KENNEDY of Massachusetts; and the amendment numbered 5 printed by Representative JACKSON-LEE; the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any of those amendments or any amendments thereto; and the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may reduce to not less than 5 minutes the time for voting by electronic device on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote by electronic device without intervening business, provided that the time for voting by electronic device on the first in any series of questions shall be not less than 15 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the material covered in the debate on H.R. 3322 yesterday.

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

There was no objection.

OMNIBUS CIVILIAN SCIENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1996

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 427 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 3322.

□ 1325

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3322) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1997 for civilian science activities of the Federal Government, and for other purposes, with Mr. BURTON of Indiana in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole House rose on Wednesday, May 29, 1996, title II was open for amendment at any point.

Are there any amendments to title II?

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

Mr. Chairman, before we started the debate today, I thought it would be useful maybe to explain the reason for the debate sequence and the way it took place yesterday on the Democrat substitute. Our side simply decided that it was appropriate to allow the Democrats to present, in any way they wished to do and as broad as they wished to present it, their substitute to our bill.

We think that our legislative product stands on its own, that it is a good science bill, it is good for the environment, it is a good long-term bill. The Democrats were obviously proud of their work. We have them the opportunity to fully describe that work before going to a vote, and we thought that was the right way to accommodate the debate in the House.

I do regret that in the course of that debate there were a couple of inaccuracies particularly represented by the gentleman from Texas when he referred to the work of the committee. At one point he referred to the work of the committee as only producing one report last year. I do wish to get that corrected be in the RECORD, and I will submit for be the RECORD a list of 16 reports filed by this committee over the year last year that indicates that this committee was working.

I do think that there is a need to produce quality rather than quantity as the mark of a legislative committee, and that is what we have been doing both legislatively and in terms of the oversight hearings that we have been conducting. I just want to make certain that any inaccuracies that were stated during that time are in fact corrected, but I hope that we did see that there is a contrast of views when the Democrats present their side and we present our side.

Now we will proceed ahead with the bill and we will go through the amendment process here, and I hope that that amendment process will in fact produce the result of a bill that can be supported on a bipartisan basis on both sides of the aisle.

AMENDMENT NO. 24 OFFERED BY MR. WELDON OF FLORIDA

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WELDON of Florida: Page 26, line 12, strike ''$2,167,400,000'' and insert in lieu thereof ''$2,107,400,000''.

Page 30, line 11, strike ''$1,957,850,000'' and insert in lieu thereof ''$2,017,850,000, of which $1,594,550,000 shall be for personnel and related costs, $35,000,000 shall be for travel, and $388,300,000 shall be for research operations support''.

MODIFICATION OF AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WELDON OF FLORIDA

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be replaced with a new amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modification of amendment offered by Mr. WELDON of Florida: Page 26, line 12, strike ''$2,167,400,000'' and insert in lieu thereof ''$2,107,400,000''.

Page 28, line 2, strike ''$410,600,000'' and insert in lieu thereof ''$405,600,000''.

Page 28, line 3, strike ''$95,500,000'' and insert in lieu thereof ''$92,500,000''.

Page 28, line 11, strike ''$281,250,000'' and insert in lieu thereof ''$276,250,000''.

Page 30, line 11, strike ''$1,957,850,000'' and insert in lieu thereof ''$2,030,800,000, of which $1,611,000,000 shall be for personnel and related costs, $31,500,000 shall be for travel, and $388,300,000 shall be for research operations support''.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the modification offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. WELDON]?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, we have not had an opportunity to review this amendment, and we are looking to determine the offset that has been represented by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. WELDON] at this time.

Further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. WELDON] to explain his particular amendment.

□ 1330

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, if I may proceed, I believe the gentlewoman will agree my amendment is a good amendment.

The bill on the floor of the House has a shortfall for NASA personnel funding. The gentleman from Pennsylvania,

Chairman WALKER, and I, as well as the gentleman from Texas, Mr. STOCKMAN, have worked hard to find a way to overcome the shortfall. My amendment would avoid possible furloughs of NASA employees, which would adversely affect every NASA center and every NASA program by restoring all of the funding shortfall. It provides for full offsets so there is no impact to the budget.

Specifically, my amendment increases funding for NASA program management by $81.5 million. It fully offsets the increase by decreasing funding in space science by $60 million, cutting $8.5 million from NASA's travel account, and cutting $13 million from various other accounts.

Even with my amendment, the space science account, which I know is an important account for the ranking minority member, still receive a net increase of $250 million above NASA's fiscal year 1997 request.

Many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have referred to the need to fix the shortfall, and my amendment would do just that. I urge all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the modification of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I do object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

The gentleman from Florida [Mr. WELDON] is recognized for 5 minutes on his original amendment.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I object. Mr. Chairman, I object and I have an amendment that has been prefiled at the desk as No. 13.

The CHAIRMAN. This is the original amendment of the gentleman from Florida. He is entitled to 5 minutes to speak on his amendment.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Are we back to the original amendment, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; it was preprinted in the RECORD.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, for purposes of ascertaining on what basis the Chair is making recognition, I would like to inquire as to who was recognized for the last amendment to this bill?

The CHAIRMAN. Yesterday, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. EHLERS] was, but it is at the discretion of the Chair to determine which Member gains recognition, and both Members who sought recognition at the beginning of the bill today are members of the committee. The Chair has that discretion and the Chair chose to recognize the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, may I further continue my inquiry? Has it not been the practice to alternate recognition between the two sides of the aisle, particularly if both Members rose at the same time, both members of the committee?

The CHAIRMAN. In this case the Chair is exercising discretion properly.

Mr. BROWN of California. In other words, the Chair is utilizing his unfettered power to recognize whomever he wishes, and does he intend to continue in that practice?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that in this case he is exercising proper discretion.

Mr. BROWN of California. Then we may expect that we will have disregarded the precedent of alternating between the two sides, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair always tries to be fair.

Mr. BROWN of California. We appreciate that very much and hope the Chair is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. WELDON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I want to do a little bit of explanation as to what has been going on here.

I think we all, on both sides of the aisle, share a desire to see this account restored to avoid any possibility of any furloughs and any significant financial shortfall on the part of NASA in terms of paying their employees.

The issue and the debate that has been going on is how do we do this in a fashion that is consistent with our responsibility to stay within the budget to fulfill our obligation to get the budget balanced, the commitment that we have made to the American people, and in that sense come up with appropriate offsets that do not adversely affect any other accounts in excess, and something that is consistent with the overall philosophy of the committee in terms of what our investment in future science and technology is.

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

Mr. WELDON of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. First of all, Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for his amendment and his good work out on the floor to attempt to correct the situation that rose largely because the administration was unable to provide us with good figures from the very outset.

We had an $81.5 million reduction in program management largely because NASA told us those were the projected levels for employment back in March. They have since come back and said that this is an unacceptable cut and that we were, in fact, cutting the numbers below what they thought were prudent.

We are attempting to, in good faith, change that situation on the floor, and the gentleman from Florida has agreed to try and help in this regard. I am as disappointed as I can be that the gentlewoman from Texas has been stopping us. We are trying to add back the 81.5 million she was in favor of doing and she has objected to an amendment to do just that.

Given that situation, the fact is what the gentleman from Florida, if I understand it correctly, is attempting to do is to find offsets for this money in other places.

One of the things that we had increased substantially in our budget, which means that we really are keeping our commitment to good environment, good science, all of the things that we have said, is to plus up the space science accounts. The No. 1 priority of the program as defined some years ago by the Augustine report, we have put $250 million more, even after the gentleman's amendment, into that account.

It is one of the real commitments we have made to the future of the NASA science programs. The gentleman protects that space science account. It takes some money out of it, but protects it in many ways. The gentlewoman comes here and she wants to strip all of the money out of the space accounts and put it all back into personnel.

We simply think this is a better approach. I am disappointed she objected. It makes the job more difficult if we cannot get cooperation on this, but I think what the gentleman is doing is an excellent amendment.

It is my understanding that the gentleman from Wisconsin will offer an amendment to the amendment here that will get us back to the right place, and I personally want to thank the gentleman for all the hard work he has put in that is moving us in the right direction.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman, and let me just reiterate that I think we all share a desire to have the proper level of funding in this important account which pays the staff for NASA. They are a very, very hard-working work force, very, very dedicated to the future of our space program.

I know in my particular district, I have Kennedy Space Center, the launch center for NASA, and we have the shuttle program there, we have a very, very dedicated work force. By restoring these funds, I think we are sending a message that we support the staff, we support the personnel and we recognize them for the outstanding job that they have been doing.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SENSENBRENNER TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WELDON OF FLORIDA

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SENSENBRENNER to the amendment offered by Mr. WELDON of Florida: After the item relating to page 26, line 12, insert the following:

Page 28, line 2, strike ''$410,600,000'' and insert in lieu thereof ''$405,600,000''.

Page 28, line 3, strike ''$95,500,000'' and insert in lieu thereof ''$92,500,000''.

Page 28, line 11, strike ''$281,250,000'' and insert in lieu there ''$276,250,000''.

Strike ''$2,017,850,000, of which $1,594,550,000 shall be for personnel and related costs, $35,000,000 shall be for travel,'' and insert in lieu thereof ''$2,030,800,000, of which $1,611,000,000 shall be for personnel and related costs, $31,500,000 shall be for travel,''.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment that makes the personnel account whole. It adds a total of $81.5 million to the personnel account, $73 million comes as a result of reductions in other accounts, and there is a transfer of $8.5 million from travel into personnel.

The biggest reduction in the other accounts is space science, which is reduced by $60 million, mission communications by $5 million, academic by $3 million, and space communications by $5 million. This, I think, is the proper way to go about making sure that the personnel account is enough to avoid furloughs. It is done in a fiscally responsible manner in providing offsets to other accounts.

I would urge the adoption of the amendment to the amendment, which would bring the amendment of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. WELDON] back in the shape that he wanted it in prior to the objection to his request to modify it.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WELDON OF FLORIDA

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as a substitute for the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. WELDON of Florida: For the amendment No. 24 offered by Mr. WELDON of Florida. In lieu of the matter proposed in amendment No. 24 insert:

Page 30, line 11, strike ''$1,957,850,000'' and insert in lieu thereof ''$2,039,350,000''.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the substitute.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, it is interesting to hear my colleagues debate about now their recently obtained concern about the personnel at NASA and the various centers around the Nation. I appreciate my colleague from Florida and his sincerity. We have had discussions, but I might note that my amendment was prefiled much earlier than those who have now offered both amendments and perfecting amendments.

Let me first say to the chairman that the head of NASA does not want the $300 million in space science, would prefer to continue the progress that he has made in downsizing, but, most importantly, is concerned about the untimely abuse that will come through this legislation of NASA personnel that have been downsized and outsized.

The amendment that I offer will restore $81.5 million to ensure to the personnel account that we have the most responsible and safe staff to do the mission of NASA. It is not an increase, it is in recognition of the administration's budget, and is, as well, in recognition of the work that has been done by NASA already.

I think it is important to note that we have had a NASA restructuring process going on since fiscal year 1993. We started with civilian service employees of 24,900, at a 5-to-4 ratio in supervisors. We are now at a civilian service of 21,000, going to a 7-to-8 ratio. We now will move forward in the future to 17,000 civil service with a ratio of 11 to 1. NASA is already a lean, mean operating machine.

With the amendment presently on the floor, it does not in any way consider what NASA has already done. When Mr. Goldin set forth to restructure NASA, he began a trip down a path of personnel reduction which had at its center a logical and employee-caring philosophy. That is why we will result in the number of only 17,000 employees with a supervisory ratio of 11 to 1.

Mr. Chairman, that is real progress. NASA has demonstrated its commitment to this process in achieving these personnel levels. But let me say to my colleagues what will happen if we follow the present amendment on the floor, that of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. WELDON]. To put it bluntly, the salaries and expenses reduction is impossible to achieve, according to NASA, without drastic action. Unless a miracle occurs, and we have both buyout legislation and a lot of takers, there is simply no feasible way to implement this reduction without resorting to furloughs, and that furlough would be an estimated time of 10 to 12 days.

I ask my colleagues, Mr. Chairman, what does that do to both the loyal employees at NASA and, more importantly, what about the many calls I get into my office about the questions of safety. We have already begun the process of downsizing. Why would this legislation pointedly go at the personnel and not respond to what has already been occurring by Dan Goldin?

Mr. Chairman, I encourage my Republican colleagues to join me on this amendment. I appreciate the sincerity with which they have attempted to modify what I have already done. We need to go forward with restoring the $81.5 million that says to NASA we applaud what you are doing, we recognize the sacrifice that has already been taken by your employees, and, yes, we are concerned about the safety and the lives of both our employees but as well those astronauts that take their lives in their hands on behalf of the American people and on behalf of American science.

□ 1345

It is my intent, Mr. Chairman, to offer this amendment and to be able to say that we expect that NASA will RIF a total of 1,400 employees by October 1, 1996. Why are we forcing them to do even more and then furloughing for now from 12 to 14 days?

This is an outrageous cut. I ask my colleagues to join me in providing for an $81.5 million restoration to allow NASA to do the job that it has to do.

Mr. Chairman, I offer my amendment to correct a problem within this legislation which, if it goes uncorrected, will fall upon the backs of the thousands of loyal, hardworking NASA employees across this country. Mr. Chairman, I am referring to language in H.R. 3322 which will result in an $81.5 million reduction in the NASA personnel account, from what the President has requested.

I do not understand why an agency which has been at the forefront of streamlining itself and lowering its cost to the American taxpayer should be punished for its accomplishments. Under Mr. Goldin, the NASA Administrator, the agency has taken extraordinary steps, without congressional prodding, to reinvent itself into an organization which is more focused on its mission and the people it serves.

When Mr. Goldin set forth to restructure NASA, he began a trip down a path of personnel reduction which had at its center logical and employee-caring philosophy. When this restructuring began, NASA had 24,900 civil servants with a supervisor ratio of 5.4 to 1. Now, the agency has 21,325 civil servants and when it is all said and done, the agency will have a mere 17,488 employees with a supervisor ratio of 11 to 1. Mr. Chairman, that is real progress. NASA has demonstrated its commitment to this process and achieving these personnel levels, but we must allow it to do so in an orderly and caring fashion for its employees. Many in this Chamber have assailed the way many corporations are throwing aside their loyal and valuable employees for the sake of Wall Street and quarterly returns. I call upon these same Members to practice what they preach and help NASA treat its employees fairly.

NASA has accomplished all of this through the use of buyouts, hiring freezes, redeployment, privatization, and outplacement, to name a few. It has a plan and a schedule. I encourage my colleagues to allow it to continue.

If this egregious cut should become law, there will be serious repercussions for the men, women, and families of NASA. The agency will be forced to furlough, for up to possibly 3 weeks, most of its employees. When was the last time anyone in Congress went without pay for such an extended time? This $81.5 million cut in salaries and expenses is ill-conceived, cannot be achieved without drastic action affecting all NASA centers, and it jeopardizes NASA's ability to safely deliver its programs. The impacts envisioned by the agency are a reduction in force [RIF] total 1,400 employees by October 1, 1996, a physical and legal impossibility or an agency-wide furlough of approximately 21,000 employees for 12 to 14 days.

In addition a $34 million cut, as some have proposed will still put an unacceptable strain on implementation of the zero-based review recommendations, including major changes in center roles and missions and consolidation of center capabilities; NASA needs the full amount of requested funding to accomplish

the complex agency restructuring currently underway.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] insist on his point of order?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my point of order.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is unfortunate that this little tiff should develop. There is a mistake in the bill, and an effort is being made to correct it. That mistake was pointed out by the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HALL], when the bill was in the subcommittee. It was pointed out when the bill was in markup in the full committee, and an amendment was offered to correct it in the full committee.

Mr. Chairman, that amendment to correct the problem in the full committee was resisted by both the chairman of the full committee and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. WELDON] and all of the Republicans together, who at that point did not feel that they had made a mistake.

Now they have come to realize that a mistake was made, I think, when they saw that the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] had filed an amendment which would have corrected the error and might be recognized to present that amendment and the case for adopting her amendment would have been overwhelming.

But, Mr. Chairman, that led then to undoubtedly some strategic discussions on the other side. Should those on our side who had pointed out the problem at the subcommittee level, the full committee level, and by filing an amendment to correct it on the floor, be allowed to correct it, or should the majority now in their new-found wisdom be allowed to correct the mistake?

Apparently, they decided that in their new-found wisdom they would be allowed to correct the mistake, and they are riding roughshod over the normal processes of the House and over the position of the minority that this is something which ought to be corrected in the simplest possible way.

So, Mr. Chairman, they have presented an amendment which, though slightly flawed in its original aspect, will be attempted to be corrected by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SENSENBRENNER]. The flaws in the original amendment, including finding a whole series of offsetting cuts which would do, if not equal, at least considerable damage to the program at NASA, and I think they hope to avoid this possibility. But the whole point of this is really a game-playing operation.

The NASA budget has been cut by several hundred million dollars. It has been plussed up in order to substantiate the chairman's frequently reiterated position that he is a strong proponent of science. It has been plussed up to add money that the agency did not ask for and will find difficulty spending, and then they have made this terrible cut, which will have the effect of causing a layoff or furlough of a substantial number of employees. And, as I say, in their wisdom they have finally recognized that this is not the right way to go.

But since I offered the amendment to correct this in the full committee and I offered it in my substitute yesterday, I take considerable umbrage at the aura of sanctimoniousness that is now enshrouding the majority which they seek to correct a mistake of their own making, and I ask that the amendment of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. WELDON] be rejected and the substitute of the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] be adopted.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think the difference between the substitute amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] and the Sensenbrenner-Weldon amendment shows the difference between the two parties in the House of Representatives.

Mr. Chairman, the Jackson-Lee substitute is an add-on. There are no offsets. It adds on $81.5 million to make the personnel account whole. They do not look at reordering priorities. They do not look at keeping the total appropriation or total authorization for NASA the same. They just want to spend some more money and not offset any of the accounts, even those that they think have been set at too high a level by the majority on the committee.

The Weldon amendment, as amended by my amendment, provides the same amount of money for the NASA personnel account as the Jackson-Lee amendment, $81.5 million to stop all of those terrible things that the gentlewoman from Texas and the gentleman from California say will happen.

But what the Weldon and Sensenbrenner amendments do is to offset other parts of NASA, so that our amendment is budget neutral. It does not increase the total amount of money that will be spent on NASA. It is budget neutral.

So, Mr. Chairman, if Members are for just plussing up the NASA account without making offsets, vote for the Jackson-Lee amendment. If Members are not for that, vote to reject it and vote for the Sensenbrenner amendment and then the Weldon amendment, as amended by the Sensenbrenner amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to enter this debate or this conversation here and say first, as I enter it, I respect the opinions of both sides and I know that we have all worked together very hard to make sure that we find a way to make NASA the kind of organization that NASA needs to be. Most of us here today have given long years doing that; many people much longer than I have. However, I am concerned about the direction that we are talking.

Mr. Chairman, I, of course, represent the Marshall Space Flight Center, and those Marshall employees there are certainly concerned about where they fit into NASA's budget picture.

I want to say in behalf of the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE], I know that she represents the Houston Johnson Space Flight Center, or at least parts of that area down there. I want my Marshall NASA employees to know that we respect them, that we are working for them.

Mr. Chairman, I am concerned that with the offsets that will be occurring under the Sensenbrenner-Weldon approach to this same issue, that we are having to raid other parts of NASA's budget. I wish, in fact, we could have a more complete NASA budget so that we did not have the raid those things. But I do want to say that I support the Jackson-Lee amendment and would encourage the Members to support it as well.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Alabama for his comments. I think both of us have had the opportunity, along with our Republican colleagues, to talk about the effectiveness of what has already occurred with NASA in terms of the downsizing and the impact that has occurred on our respective centers, Marshall, Kennedy, Johnson, and many others.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to certainly emphasize that the key point and distinction between the Weldon-Sensenbrenner amendment proudly shows that we are restoring moneys that do not impact negatively on other programs. Their amendment includes some deletions from the ROS accounts, which provides for safety measures and other operational needs in our various centers.

This amendment emphasizes the NASA staff, the work they have done, the safety necessities that we need to have in terms of keeping the appropriate amount of staff. It also reaffirms, if you will, already the RIF program that is in place where we will be seeing some 1,400 employees go by October 1996.

This causes NASA to be able to continue its mission without the tragedy of a furlough of some 2 weeks. How disruptive that will be for that to occur in the business of what NASA has to do. It will allow for the opportunity for travel for monitoring the cooperation between Russia and our space station partners.

So, Mr. Chairman, I think that with respect to what has been offered by the Republicans, after my amendment was offered on May 8, I believe the restoration of $81.5 million, which is not an increase but a restoration of funds that would meet the needs of these NASA employees with the downsizing occurring, is a more appropriate direction to

take, and I would ask my colleagues to support wholeheartedly this amendment.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BROWN of California. This conversation from the other side dealing wih the budget and no offsets is really sort of a shell game, which we all know. The majority has cut the President's budget by several hundred million dollars. This would partially restore that, this amendment of the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

The fact is, Mr. Chairman, the Subcommittee on Appropriations has already marked this bill up and has a larger figure in it than the majority has in their authorization bill.

So, whatever discussion of budget impact that is being made here, and I hear it all too frequently, is in the mind of the chairman of the committee, nothing more, because the Committee on Appropriations has already moved to correct the problem that is represented here, and we are not adding to or subtracting from the budget in the slightest.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak on behalf of the Weldon amendment. My dear friend and colleague who is in the district right next to mine, the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE], and I are very good friends and we try to work together and ensure, Mr. Chairman, that we have a safe and sound NASA.

My dear friend and colleague from Texas made a statement that we are cutting funds from the safety program. I want to reiterate and clarify that we are not doing that.

In fact, Mr. Chairman, I am a little bit concerned about the fact that when we offered this amendment to restore the money, the gentlewoman objected. I think what we are trying to do here is to make sure we have a balanced budget and we have a space station.

Frankly, my belief is if we do not balance the budget and have a space station, then we will not have a space program. This is a reasonable accommodation on both viewpoints. What we have done is restructured it so that we can fully employ the people of NASA.

Mr. Chairman, I have to speak from my heart because my wife currently works there, and I saw the pain and the suffering when our President of the United States cut Space Station Freedom. I went to a party in which they were saying good-bye to Space Station Freedom. And I more than anyone else want to see space station be completed. I want to see NASA whole again. And I have to tell you, Mr. Chairman, this amendment makes NASA whole again, and it protects the people.

Mr. Chairman, we have a great concern for the integrity and the people down in our district. They are very hard-working people that have a vision, and that vision of America is a first-class space program. We look around the world, and, Mr. Chairman, as we are looking around the world, we see Japan and we see Russia. Everybody is going into space. But, Mr. Chairman, without this amendment, we are not going to have a space program, because we need to make sure we are responsible to our grandchildren and our children that the budget is balanced so that we can pay for the space program.

Mr. Chairman, I come home at night and on weekends, and I meet my wife and she tells me of the passion and love with which people work at NASA. Mr. Chairman, you may not know this, but the engineers that work at NASA could go out in other sectors of this country and get more money, but they are doing it because they love NASA and they love this Nation. They are taking pay cuts. And they took RIF's. That is true. And we want to make sure that it is a sound financial planning.

Let me say something to you, Mr. Chairman, when we sit around the table and we discuss our budget, we have to make decisions. We have a fixed income in what we get every time. And this amendment which the gentleman from Florida has offered is the same thing as American families do. They sit around the table and make those hard decisions. We are incorporating the money that was inadvertently taken out and put it back there to ensure the viability of the space program.

And I know one day when I grow old and look back and look at my tenure here, Mr. Chairman, serving in this fine institution, I will know we did the right thing by supporting this amendment because what we are doing is we are looking out for the budget and we are looking out for the space program. And we are going to see a great and glorious space program.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman of the committee and also my chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, for coming down to the district and telling the folks firsthand just what it means to us in Congress that we are dedicated to restoring those funds.

On behalf of the people in my district, Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentleman for the consideration of this amendment and also like to say that I give my full support for it, and I am also going to tell my wife that we fought for the people of Texas and also for the people of NASA.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STOCKMAN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas.

□ 1400

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Texas. Feeling his passion, I would want him to do the right thing. But I do have to emphasize to the gentleman from Texas that he might want to reconsider his facts. Here we are, on the House floor, complaining about $81.5 million straight up for the NASA personnel. The Committee on Appropriations has already authorized some $600 million more than what the authorizing committee has done, which has Republican leadership.

Mr. Chairman, let me say to my colleagues that the question your wife will ask you, have they cut the ROS? And you have cut the ROS by $34 million. That does not go to the safety issue. It takes away from safety. The right way to go is to support the Jackson-Lee amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I know my friend from Texas would want to be on the right mark by supporting the right amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I yield to my colleague, the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from Texas for yielding. More importantly, I thank him because he has been certainly a hard worker on the issues involving Texas and Texas economic opportunities and the needs of working Texans.

This bill is for working Americans. Particularly as it relates to NASA, I cannot seem to get my Republican colleagues to understand that this is a restoration, some $81.5 million, so much less than the authorization already appropriated by the Committee on Appropriations. When we begin to look at the Weldon-Sensenbrenner, we begin to see the chipping away to what NASA has already accomplished. It has accomplished a sufficient and efficient downsizing. By October, we will find some 1,400 who will be RIF'd.

If we do not pass the Jackson-Lee amendment, we will begin to see undercutting of safety issues by the undercutting of ROS. We also are going to see cutting of academic programs, space communications, the inability to work with our foreign space station partners, like Japan and Russia, because we will have no travel budget and, of course, science.

I think we really have to maintain a truth in speaking here, and that is that we are simply trying to restore the $81.5 million, one for safety and one for the responsible carrying out of NASA's mission with the right kind of personnel.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN], the ranking member of the full committee.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, this entire bill that is before us, including the NASA part, is built on this gigantic fiction that we have to do this in order to influence the Committee on Appropriations and in order to keep the budget, to balance the budget, neither of which are true. We do not

have to cut the President's budget by several hundred million dollars in order to balance the budget because his budget is balanced.

We are not influencing the appropriators. They have already acted to appropriate, to recommend the House appropriate an amount roughly what was in my substitute, may be a little bit more. Now the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SENSENBRENNER] and others can keep harping on this fact that this bill, their bill is absolutely essential to balancing the budget and to influence the appropriators. The facts belie their statement.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the Members on the other side to try looking at the facts for a change instead of the figments of the imagination of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. COLEMAN. If I might, reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, only add that I think it is time for all of us to wake up and recognize that a good deal of the downsizing that went down at NASA went on long before the new majority became the new majority in the Congress. Indeed, this President and Vice President, AL GORE, had done a great deal in attempting to make Government work for the United States and for its citizens.

I think that what we have done at NASA is a shining example of what can be done when we all agree to put our shoulder to the wheel. I would hope that my colleagues in the majority would not walk about and continue to talk like they are the ones who invented economy in government. After all, a lot of us know that much of this began in 1993. Many of us, when this administration came into office, said it is about time.

We want very much, Mr. Chairman, to not harm the employees at NASA. We want very much, Mr. Chairman, to not harm the issue of science for the United States. We think that, without the amendment offered by my colleague from Houston, that could occur.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute and move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, this has been a fascinating discussion. First of all, again I am disappointed that the gentleman from California, a ranking member of the committee, feels it necessary as part of these debates to personalize them and attack me as though this is all being done personally. The fact is that what we are attempting to do is make some changes in the direction of government.

Now, listen carefully to what the other side is telling us. The amendment that I am opposing here, and it has been presented by the gentlewoman from Texas, increases spending by $81.5 million in this bill. Now, what we keep hearing from the majority is we can increase spending, increase spending, increase spending, increase spending, increase spending, increase spending, and balance the budget. Now, if anybody has ever figured out a way to do that in their own household, I congratulate them. I would love to think that we can continue to increase spending, increase spending, increase spending, increase spending and end up balancing our budget at the end of the day. But that is exactly what we are being told, that somehow money just drifts out of nowhere, that the American people will just continue to ante up, empty their pocketbooks to give to Government so that people in Washington can increase spending. That is what the gentlewoman does with her amendment.

Now, the gentleman from Florida has offered another amendment, combined with the gentleman from Wisconsin. What they say is, yes, let us make NASA whole, where a mistake was made by the administration in what they submitted to the Congress. But let us do it by taking out of some other accounts.

Now, we have heard from the other side that, well, that is an irresponsible approach; you cannot take it out of other accounts. Well, why not? Let us think of the other accounts we are taking it out of. First of all, we are taking it out of an account that he other side said in their debate is an account that the administration does not even want.

Now, I happen to disagree with the administration on that. I think plussing up space science is in fact a good thing for the country. In fact, I have a letter from Carl Sagan and some other members of the Planetary Society that endorse the numbers in our bill because they feel very strongly that plussing up those numbers is the right way to go. But we have lowered them a little bit in order to accommodate this mistake that was made.

The other side does not want to do that. The other side does not want to plus up that account for space science. Stick with the President's budget. The President's budget, which over the period of 7 years drops over a cliff and drops into a valley. That is what they support. That is what they are out here defending. But there is one other place where we take a good deal of money. We take a good deal of money out of the travel accounts. Now, what they are claiming is that NASA needs $45 million for travel.

We say that perhaps that NASA could get along with $31 million for travel. I guess that is one of those things where we can have a debate. Is it 31 or is it 45? We think that, in order to preserve the integrity of the personnel process at NASA, maybe they can get by with $31 million for travel. That is the main difference here, whether or not you want to cut the space science account some to accommodate this and whether or not you want to cut the travel accounts. The rest of them are minor matters.

The gentlewoman from Texas does not want to cut at all. She just wants to spend the money. Just plus up the accounts, and live with the fiction that by spending more and more and more and more and more and more you can truly balance budgets and stop us from having deficits. I just do not believe that that works anymore. I just think that is the old way of doing things. That is the old status quo argument. We have had that for 40 years in the House of Representatives of spending more and more and more on every bill and somehow not ending up with balanced budgets, ending up with huge deficits.

Mr. Chairman, now we have started a new day. We have decided that we are going to set priorities for real. I know the gentleman from Texas resents that idea. He thinks it is a terrible thing our committee has had to live with, setting priorities. But it is a good thing for us as a country to set real priorities to make real decisions and fundamentally making the direction of this country back toward balanced budgets and toward giving the American people back more of what they earn for themselves.

That is what we should be about here, not adding spending but doing the right thing and doing it within the context of what we can afford.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am always deeply challenged when the chairman of the committee ups and makes one of his great orations. I will be very brief, actually.

The gentleman is talking to the wrong audience. He should be addressing his remarks with regard to balancing the budget and keeping spending down to his Republican colleagues on the Committee on Appropriations, who have already marked up a bill that spends at least $600 million more than his bill authorizers. Now, maybe he wants it that way. I do not know. But I suggest he may need to make that speech to some of those on the Committee on Appropriations and get them to go back and bring their bill down to what he has in this bill.

Now, is this a good bill? He cited the commendations he received from Carl Sagan. Here is a letter which each Member got from the National Space Society, which is the recognized premier civilian organization in this area. It says as follows:

> The administration is seeking to fund NASA in 1997 at $13.8 billion, a $400 million reduction from the current year's budget. The House science authorization bill would cut that down to only $13.5 billion, a $300 million cut. Members of the National Space Society strongly object to the proposed reduction in NASA's budget and believe the cuts in funding undermine America's leadership in advanced technology and lessen our Nation's ability to create economic opportunities.

Obviously their point came across very well to the appropriators, because the appropriators proceeded to appropriate even more than is in the authorization bill and even more than was in

my substitute. I am establishing my record as a conservative Member of Congress by the fact that I went below the appropriators in my substitute.

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

Mr. Chairman, I think there are two important aspects of this debate. The first is how much money can we add to various spending proposals and at what point. I would like to point out that this is still the beginning of the process, not the end of the process. In fact, an amendment that I offered yesterday with respect to the National Science Foundation increased spending for the National Science Foundation in its research and related activities account without an offset, because the Committee on the Budget, which is working on this same issue, along with us and along with the Committee on Appropriations, had found a means to pay for its within the House-passed budget resolution.

As we proceed through the system, if the different committees of responsibility find ways to increase spending, in this particular case on civilian research and development, which I very much support, then I personally could at that point certainly support that.

At this point, however, dealing with the bill before us, therefore, I intend with regret, because I understand the gentlewoman's motivation, to vote against the Jackson-Lee amendment, in favor of the Sensenbrenner amendment and Weldon amendment.

However, I would like to say there is a larger debate here. Our ranking member, the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN], referred to the fact that we do not need to make any changes from the President's proposals because the President's budget is balanced. Although we are now talking about NASA, I think the same subject comes up again, as we discussed yesterday with respect to the National Science Foundation, and which will come up with respect to almost every spending proposal I could think of. That is, Mr. Chairman, that the President proposes in almost every account more spending for the next fiscal year, which is fiscal year 1997, beginning October 1 of this year.

But the point is we are voting on fiscal year 1997 now, during 1996, which is the calendar year of the election year. Therefore, there is a proposed bump in spending almost everywhere by the administration, frankly to enhance their posture in the election. The point I want to make, I think this is going to be paid for elsewhere by the administration by deeper cuts than proposed by the majority in Congress in later years.

I know that is the case with respect to the National Science Foundation's salaries accounts, because we debated that yesterday. I know the administration proposed a bump up, followed by a steep decline in spending, well below congressional majority proposals.

So far as I know, that is correct with respect to the administration's NASA proposals for spending in subsequent fiscal years as rated by the Congressional Budget Office, that both sides have agreed to use to monitor spending and evaluate spending, would have deeper cuts in future years than is proposed in the House-passed budget resolution. If I am wrong on that, I would appreciate the figures being submitted during this debate. But so far as I know, this is a proposal for higher spending at one point to be followed by a lot deeper spending cuts elsewhere.

Mr. Chairman, I think that the majority's proposal is best here for NASA, as well as for other Government agencies.

□ 1415

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

Mr. SCHIFF. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I just want to point out that when AAAS did their evaluation and compared what we did to the administration's plan that they are now defending, the AAAS, the authority on all this, the American Association for the Advancement of Science, in their R&D analysis said that NASA would fare slightly better under the House's plan, losing 23 percent instead of 29 percent in the administration's projections.

So when the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COLEMAN] a few minutes ago when he spoke said that the President and the Vice President have slashed NASA employees, he is absolutely right, and now when we look out into the future, as the gentleman points out, the AAAS says in their report that we are better in our House plan than the administration is in their plan, and I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHIFF. I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I am not sure what the gentleman from Pennsylvania is directing his comments toward. We are talking about real numbers, we are talking about what is occurring now and not prospectively, and what is happening now is that real numbers are $81.5 million being eliminated with additional cuts from ROS of $34 million, which does not allow us to respond to already downsize NASA in its present form.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, if I may reclaim my time very briefly, I want to say that we are all proposing to add the money back right now, but what is more important is the gentleman from California, the senior member of the Committee on Science and former chairman, made a specific reference to the President's budget, and my only point was to show that the President's budget means all of the President's budget, just like a congressional budget means all of the congressional budget.

We have both agreed to try to reach a balanced budget, and it is not accurate to refer to 1 year of any budget and not show what the other effects would be.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, my concern is not whether or not we bust the budget. My concern is not that we are cutting the budget; it is how we are cutting the budget. It does not add up when we say we are protecting the personnel and we take away all their tools. It does not do anything but cause for more inefficiency. It is a problem being created by this amendment of Mr. WELDON's, and that is why I think that the more sensible way is with the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

For example, when he cuts the travel budget by 30 percent, he will then jeopardize the ability of NASA civil service personnel to perform necessary project-related travel, like the trips to Russia to monitor Russian progress on the space station program, space station-related trips between Kennedy Space Center and the Johnson Space Center, travel to support launch operations of scientific payloads et cetera. I just do not think it makes sense the way that he is cutting.

As my colleagues know, we can cut the budget, but if it does not coordinate, if we leave NASA without utilities, without money for custodial services, then we really have not done anything to improve operations; we have simply cut without thinking. And that is exactly what the Weldon amendment does. I do not think it makes sense.

I think it does make sense to have a orderly downsizing, as they are doing now, that they have already accomplished, and they are continuing to accomplish. But when they say that they are protecting the personnel, they take away all their tools, then how irresponsible is that? I do not believe that we want to go that irresponsible way.

I believe that the way we must go, and it does not bust the budget, it does not exceed what the Committee on Appropriations has recommended, is to adopt the Jackson-Lee amendment.

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

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. So if I am to understand, the gentlewoman from Texas thinks that NASA should spend $45 million for travel rather than $31 million for travel; is that correct?

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. I think that we need to coordinate the real basic needs for what travel it is and look at those figures rather than deciding we just want to slash something.

Mr. WALKER. Just so I understand, the decision here is between $45 million for travel and $31 million for travel. The gentlewoman mentioned traveling

to Russia. We do not understand why they would have to do that since we already have a full-time NASA office in Russia. But nevertheless what she is saying is that what she believes is that we ought to be spending more money for travel rather than saving that money.

Is that correct?

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Let me say that the gentleman from Pennsylvania can make a simplistic argument like that, and it might sound like it makes sense, but it does not make sense unless the gentleman can relate it to reality, relate it to basic needs of a program.

We can all pay with numbers. But unless those numbers make sense in reality, we are wasting other dollars.

Mr. WALKER. If the gentlewoman from Texas would continue to yield, she is the one that mentioned travel to Russia. She says that is one of the things this money was used for.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I am saying exactly what it would cut. If the gentleman would tell me exactly what the dollars he is talking about would pay for, then we can relate. But I am talking about cutting essential travel to carry out the duty of NASA.

Mr. WALKER. And the gentlewoman does not think they cay do that on $31.5 million.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. I think we ought to look back in that testimony and see. I do not know that they can do it with $31 million. It might not make sense.

I think that the gentleman from Pennsylvania ought to be the one explaining to me why they can make all these trips with $31 million rather than talking about and trying to excite the public.

Mr. WALKER. If the gentlewoman would continue to yield, I am perfectly willing to have them do it on $31 million.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] is making the point that my colleagues want to engage in profilgate spending and he wants to save this 15 or whatever million dollars it is. We discussed that yesterday, and we came to the conclusion that this money was not being saved, and we know it is not, but it is going to be spent in other directions. He wants to spend it to increase the military budget by $12 billion or $14 billion, and I said that, and then he added also we want to make a very substantial tax cut for what he calls middle-income America.

It is not a matter of saving, never has been. It is a matter of priorities. If my colleagues' priority is spending more for defense and for tax cuts for the wealthy, they want to cut it any way they can, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], living in this land that he does, it is time to make the case that what he is doing is prudent when he is merely asserting his values, with which I strongly disagree.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield? Do I understand the gentleman from California is opposed to tax cuts for the middle class?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. CHAMBLISS). The time of the gentlewoman from Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON has expired.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, let me talk about the Jackson-Lee amendment for a few minutes, and I think the Members who are here and who are watching it now realize that we are talking about authorization bill here. The Committee on Appropriations has already appropriated $600 million more than this bill authorizes, and what we are trying to do with my colleagues from Houston, Ms. JACKSON-LEE's amendment, is to provide $81.5 million in additional authorization to make sure we do not have as much as 3 weeks' furlough of the employees there. That is really not a way to run a government, a business, or an airline, or a railroad, or anything else where we plan to authorize less than what we are going to spend so we can lay off those workers there because we are not planning for it.

Again, it does not make any sense because all we are doing is authorizing, we are not spending a penny with this bill today. The Committee on Appropriation and the appropriations bill will spend the penny; we are just authorizing them to do it. And since they have already come up with $600 million more, again my colleagues may disagree with that, well, then let us talk to the Committee on Appropriations.

But NASA has already downsized and done everything they can. NASA has already downsized, and they have become leaner, meaner. In fact, whether it be the administration or those of us in Congress who have made them provide a better value for the American taxpayer, they have cut 4,000 civil service jobs since 1993 and plan to continue to cut another 4,000 by the fiscal year 2000. And the reduction in work force will not generate the savings for this coming year because NASA cannot technically execute a reduction in work force or a RIF, one early enough to generate that savings even if it is not authorized.

That is what I think we need to go back to, and from what I understand, this $81.5 million that is needed for the authorization to make sure that we do not have that furlough of those employees, these are full-time NASA employees where planning but not authorizing funding for them, to furlough them for 10 to 12 to 21 days sometime during the year. Again that is not the way anybody should run their business, and we should not expect the Government to run that way either because we are just authorizing it today.

The future of our work force depends on the high-skilled and the skilled jobs that the space station, the aerospace industry provides, and again we should not treat those employees, whether they are NASA or whether they are contract, in saying, ''Well, we've sorry we're going to lay you off for 21 days because we don't have the authorization to spend the money even though one hand we could do it, but on the other hand we are not giving it to you.''

That just does not make any sense.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BROWN of California. With regard to this money that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] is pointing to that he now wants to save the difference in the transportation items, I would like to point out that the figure which is referred to here, the amount for transportation, was in the bill at the subcommittee level, it was in the bill when it was marked up at the full committee level, it was in the bill yesterday, as a matter of fact. And now Mr. WALKER has decided, without hearings, I might say, or any other indication, that that is really too much and it is wasted. So he is going to cut $15 million out of it in order to correct this waste.

Now my real question to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] is:

Why did he suddenly find that this money is being wasted instead of at the subcommittee level, which he did not allow markups in, or the full committee level, which he did allow markups in, or even smaller in the debate?

If they were wasteful expenditures, he should have proposed in his manager's amendment that all this waste be removed. But, no he did not find out about it until it was necessary to correct the mistake which he also should have corrected in the full committee level and did not.

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Since the Committee on Appropriations has come up, I think we should clarify, before we get too much misinformation on the floor: In our appropriation bill we cut $309 million out of essentially the operating accounts of NASA. The appropriators cut $542 million out of the operating accounts of NASA and in their bill. Now their total is higher, in large part because there are some fixed asset accounts that they count into their numbers, but if we look at the operating accounts that NASA has to spend before

going out to brag about what has happened in the appropriation committee, take a look, folks, because the fact is there is $558 million in a fixed asset account that is counted in there, and we actually——

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. In reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, we are talking about the Jackson-Lee amendment, $81.5 million. The Committee on Appropriations has authorized $600 million. that $81.5 million could come out of that $600 million, and I could be corrected, but that is what I have been told. I do not know about the fixed asset part of this amendment.

We are talking about saving employees from having a reduction in work force for 10 to 12 to 20 days by having some reasonable planning in the authorization, and that is what authorizations are supposed to be about, Mr. Chairman, that we plan for those employees to do their work full-time.

Mr. Chairman, I encourage adoption of the Jackson-Lee amendment.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am concerned as I have listened now, this is the second day I have listened to this debate in the Committee on Science and here on the floor, and I am just a little bit surprised that one of my dear colleagues from Florida really wants to cut personnel in such a way that it will affect Florida employees and citizens of Florida.

But I am concerned about all of the appropriations. I am concerned, first of all, to say that any time we are dealing with personnel, we cannot just jump without some studies. I do not think any one has ever looked at the negative impact of this particular issue that would cut money out of personnel.

First of all, the question I would like to ask is: Has anybody looked at the inflationary increase that these people will have to use to live by?

□ 1430

Have Members looked at the benefits that will be due to them in this forthcoming budget which we are trying to authorize here? If we are arguing about figures, we had better think about some of the things that influence figures. Things that influence figures are not just the way we feel philosophically. What influences figures should be what impact will this have on the employees who make up the personnel of NASA. That is the first thing we are going to think about.

Then, if we are just thinking about budget cutting, we could cut any budget that each committee has put on. If we are just going to do that, then just wantonly cut the budgets, instead of going into a personnel budget and reducing it by so many million dollars.

Mr. Chairman, I do not have this argument with what the President's budget is. I am talking about the policy of authorizing something that will give the personnel of the NASA a chance to operate like personnel of other industries.

All the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] is asking, and I am here to support her amendment, all she is asking is that we restore the NASA personnel account to the level that was requested by the President. I am hearing different things on that, standing here, but that is what her amendment is asking. I agree with that.

Mr. Chairman, if we do not pass her amendment, according to what is currently going on on the floor now, these personnel members, these are human beings, just like us in the Congress. We do not want our benefits cut, we do not want our salary cut due to the whims and whimsical ideas that people have. We want to be sure that if they are cut, there is a sound reason.

Think about what this will do, Mr. Chairman. What this will do is put them on a furlough. Have we not had enough furloughs here in the Federal Government? Have we not had enough Government employees and contractors of Government, to cause their personnel benefits and cause their pay to be cut? Have we not had enough of that? When will we learn our lesson?

Another thing, in dealing with the agency, I am hoping that somebody spoke to this agency, to NASA, and said, how can we best cut the personnel that will not negatively impact on you? I am not sure that this was ever done, because we are dealing pretty much with the budget here. We are not dealing with how these agencies should be run. I do not think any of us know that much about what is going on back in these agencies. I am not sure they even talked to them before they decided to bring up these cuts.

I am only talking about commonsense administration, commonsense, humane things that a government should not be doing; that is, cutting personnel without consulting the agency and saying to the agency, these are our objectives, these are our goals, how can we best reach that? That has not been done because, as I understand it, there was no consultation with the agency and there is no basis for this sharp reduction.

I close, Mr. Chairman, by saying if there is going to be a sharp reduction, particularly in personnel, it should be thought through, it should go through the authorizing committee, and then submit it, naturally, as we have to do to appropriations, but think about the impact, first. I beg the Members to support the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE]. It is a humane amendment. It is based on the future of the personnel of NASA. They are dedicated people in that agency, Mr. Chairman. I would appeal to the House to pass the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Florida. I think it is extremely important.

Let me indicate that the Sensenbrenner-Weldon amendment simply robs from Peter to say Paul. That is the clarification we need. Though they are belatedly offering to restore these funds, which the Jackson-Lee amendment does straight up, they then gut academic programs, they gut the space communications, they gut travel, so we cannot relate to our foreign space partners in the space station, and they gut science.

And NASA has indicated that we will see no savings with their reductions in 1997, fiscal year 1997, none whatsoever, because they cannot move that quickly. They are already downsizing, cutting jobs, cutting employees, as of October, 1996. The gentlewoman is absolutely right that Florida, Texas, and Alabama will be hurt drastically.

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

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

Mr. WELDON of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I just think we ought to have a clarification from the last set of remarks we just had. The gentlewoman from Florida accused my colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. WELDON], of seeking to slash personnel. Thank goodness the gentlewoman from Texas tried to make a clarification on that.

The fact is that both of these amendments put back in the full money for personnel accounts. The only question here is whether or not we are going to save some money out of travel accounts and out of some other accounts in order to pay the personnel, or whether or not we are going to do simply an add-on that adds on deficit spending.

Mr. Chairman, I think we ought to clarify that. There was very little good information in that last set of remarks, because it simply did not relate to the topic before us. Again, the gentleman needs to be congratulated. He is doing the responsible thing here of plusing up those personnel accounts, but doing so in a way that we can afford it and the taxpayers do not end up having it taken out of their pocketbook.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. I thank the gentleman. I will try to make my comments briefly.

Mr. Chairman, this has been a lengthy debate. I think it has been fairly productive. I just want to explain a little to my colleagues how we got into this situation. Our staff on the committee sat down with the NASA officials and were given figures on the amount of money they needed for the support of their staff, the full-time equivalents. Then 2 days before we went to committee markup, they came in with a whole new set of numbers and said they needed $81.5 million more.

It is true that the ranking member did seek in his substitute to restore that money, and I commend him for that. But he also sought about $1.5 billion additional of spending that we did not have. It would amount to borrowing more money from our children to pay for what we are doing now. I think that was irresponsible, and his substitute was defeated in committee, as it was on the floor. Nobody on the minority side presented an amendment that would exclusively restore this account.

Mr. Chairman, I have been working diligently with the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SENSENBRENNER], with the full committee chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], as well as with the chairman of the Subcommittee on VA, HUD and Independent Agencies, the gentleman from California, Mr. JERRY LEWIS, to make sure these funds are restored.

I think my amendment, with the perfecting amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SENSENBRENNER], is a good, reasonable, responsible way to accomplish the goal. And we all agree on the goal, we just disagree on how we do it.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge my colleagues to vote in support of the Weldon-Sensenbrenner amendment.

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

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COSTELLO. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I really do not like to belabor this, but sometimes it seems necessary to keep saying the same thing over again to get it across.

The gentleman from Florida [Mr. WELDON] is acting properly here to restore funding that, whether as he claims, it is the fault of the administration, or as I claim, it is the fault of the committee chairman himself, we both realize it needs to be corrected.

Then we repeat the mantra, that if we do not take away from some of these other things, travel and so forth, the budget is not going to be balanced. What does that means? That means that it does not conform to the Republican budget. The Democratic budget, which the President offered, it is still below that, and it is still in balance. They are going to contend, of course, that the President's balanced budget is phony and all that sort of stuff, so maybe it is. But it has been certified by the Congressional Budget Office as being in balance in 2002.

What is the difference? The President's budget, has been pointed out, is higher for both NASA and for the entire discretionary research and development account up to year 2000. It is substantially higher than the Republican budget over that same period of time by an amount of roughly $2 billion per year. Then it takes a sharp cut. That has been pointed out. It has been claimed, of course, that that is political manipulation, that the President is keeping the R&D budget artificially high, that the only true budget handed down from heaven itself is the Republican budget, which is roughly $2 billion per year less than the President's budget.

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

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

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I noticed that when the President's budget came up on the floor of the House, it was overwhelmingly rejected, and only 10 of the 23 Democrats on the Committee on Science voted for the President's budget. The gentleman was one of them, I give him credit for consistency, but evidently the gentleman was less persuasive then than he is today.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for that pertinent comment. I have said many times that in the 7-year runout, I do not like either the Republican budget or the President's budget. I have also said that since the main differences occur in the year 2000, and nobody can predict what is going to happen in the year 2000, and that will be in the first administration of President GORE, I am going to let President GORE worry about that problem when we get to it.

In the meantime, I am going to support the budget, which is $2 billion a year higher for R&D, and I urge my friends on that side to think carefully before rejecting it, because it will be an issue. I am spending most of my time trying to make the votes in support of a reasonable R&D program for this country an issue in this campaign.

The gentleman may think his position will stand up better than mine, and we will let the voters decide.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COSTELLO. I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman very much for his kindness in yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, let me clear up several points. Let it be perfectly clear, as one of President used to say, that this side of the aisle is not against a balanced budget. We have voted time and time again, and as a freshman I can say I have voted for a balanced budget. The misnomer we have here is that we are against giving middle-income tax cuts.

That is not accurate. We are against bashing middle-income workers at the NASA centers around this Nation by borrowing from Peter to pay Paul, as the Weldon-Sensenbrenner amendment has. It may restore belatedly $81.5 million, but it guts other programs, and we do not know if we are going to have any savings by cutting other programs and requiring NASA, that has already downsized, to not be able to communicate with its foreign space station partners, to not be able to have space communications, and taking away from the science program.

I am not sure where they are trying to go, but I would solicit my colleagues to do the right thing and support the Jackson-Lee amendment that is a restoration, not an increase, a restoration of $81.5 million, that gives to our NASA employees the ability to downsize appropriately, without safety factors being damaged, as well as putting them on a 2-week or more furlough where they cannot work and they cannot continue the mission of NASA, and cannot continue the mission of this Nation with respect to space exploration and science.

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

Mr. Chairman, this discussion here today on the two amendments really is no different than the discussion yesterday concerning the substitute offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] and the original bill sponsored by the chairman of the committee. I could say the same remarks about them, because basically what it is a question of funding programs that need to be funded, and still balancing the budget.

Mr. Chairman, the majority, which emphasizes balancing the budget, will lead us to believe that if we do not make these cuts in the TDRSS and other parts in order to fund back the personnel money for NASA, that we are not going to have a balanced budget. Mr. Chairman, it ain't so. It really ain't so. That amount of money, to begin with, is not going to make the difference in the next 7 years.

Second, under the coalition budget, which very few of their Members, the vast majority, did not support, this program for the personnel is fully funded, and so is the TDRSS and the research and development fully funded as is necessary, and we have a balanced budget by the year 2002.

As has been pointed out earlier today by the gentleman from California, our ranking minority member, it is a question of establishing priorities: What do we really want? There is no question in my mind that the radical right, under the leadership of the majority, does not want research and development. It is clear and simple. Why else are they cutting the program in this amendment, in the amendment of the gentleman from Florida? Why else?

I would also like to know from the gentleman from Florida, who offered the original amendment, what are they going to do about the TDRSS contract as presently existing, and we have a TDRSS contract to replace the present TDRSS that are in orbit, when we cut these funds? Where are we going to get the money? They are not going to get the money, so we are in violation of a contract. But so what? To them it does not mean anything. It is all in the name of balancing the budget.

That is a lot of baloney. It is not in the name of balancing the budget. It is

in the name of following, basically, what the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], feels is his straitjacket; and his straitjacket is that this is the only amount of money we are going to spend. I do not think it makes a difference to the gentleman from Pennsylvania whether we have the money there or not. If he does not want to spend it, he is not going to spend it.

□ 1445

It does not make any difference about balancing the budget. I will say it again and again. It has nothing to do with balancing the budget. It has all to do about the whims of the gentleman from Pennsylvania and how he feels about programs.

And, lo and behold, all the rest of the Members over there, they follow him down the road just like the rest of the body, the vast majority follows the Speaker right down the road. They just keep following him down that road, and I am sure that the American public is going to take a good look at the road that they are taking this country down: a road that leads to very little research and development, basic research, a road that makes mistakes now and then, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania made the mistake, why else are we having the original amendment? And later on we will have other amendments to clean up the bills that came out of committee.

It is not necessary to make those mistakes. The mistakes are basically made when they try to follow that straitjacket that is self-imposed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania on the actions of the committee.

As I said yesterday, I will say it again. As I have looked at this legislation, the original bill that came out of committee, in comparison to all the other ones we have had in the 20 years I have been here, it is the worst one and it is not necessary to be that way. It is only that way because of the dictates of the leadership of the Republican Party. It can be a good bill. It could be one that has positive features instead of negative features, but it is not going to be a good bill because they do not want it to be one.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. VOLKMER was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. VOLKMER. They would like the American public to believe that somehow through the authorization process, not even the appropriation process but in this authorization process, they are going to lead us down, this Congress, down to a balanced budget. A lot of baloney. Nothing further from the truth.

Lo and behold, we will wait until we see what the appropriation process brings along. That is where the money is really spent in this whole area. This bill only authorizes. If the gentleman wants to really save money, I would suggest, the gentleman from Florida, if he really wants to save money, that he can cut this program when we get to the appropriation bill.

He can cut back NASA if he wants to. There is no reason that he cannot. He can cut it back. We do not have to have a space station. He can vote against the space station. He can do that. He can vote against the operation of the shuttle. He can do that and save a lot of money. It is easy to do. Instead of cutting back on other things, why does he not cut back on those things that are important to his district? That really shows self-sacrifice. I would recommend the gentleman think about it.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Jackson-Lee amendment. The Brown substitute would have corrected this but we failed on that. We think this is a cut that should have never been made in the first place. We have talked about this in committee, we have talked about it on the floor earlier. I think to put it succinctly and to the point I need to quote Mr. Peterson, who is the NASA comptroller, who says:

> To put it bluntly, the S&E reduction is impossible to achieve without drastic action. Unless a miracle occurs and we have both buyout legislation and a lot of takers, there is simply no way feasible to implement this reduction without resorting to furloughs. At $81.5 million, we estimate a 10-to-12 day furlough would be necessary to make this number.

We do not want furloughs. I know no one on the other side wants furloughs. I believe that this comptroller knows what he is talking about, and submit this to Members for their consideration. I urge the adoption of the Jackson-Lee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SENSENBRENNER] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. WELDON].

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. WELDON], as amended.

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 2(c) of rule XXIII, the Chair may reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time for any vote by electronic device, if ordered, on the pending amendment.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 142, noes 271, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 202]

AYES—142

Abercrombie
Barcia
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Berman
Bevill
Bishop
Bonior
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Cardin
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Cramer
Cummings
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Durbin
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Filner
Flake
Frost
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (TX)
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoke
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kennedy (MA)
LaFalce
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren
Lowey
Maloney
Manton
Matsui
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meek
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Mink
Moakley
Nadler
Neal
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Pelosi
Rahall
Rangel
Richardson
Roemer
Rose
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Velazquez
Vento
Volkmer
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Williams
Wilson
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates

NOES—271

Allard
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Borski
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Castle
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Cooley
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Funderburk
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Greene (UT)
Greenwood
Gunderson
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kim

King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lucas
Luther
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Martini
Mascara
McCarthy
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Meehan
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Minge
Montgomery
Moorhead
Morella
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Payne (VA)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce
Quillen
Radanovich
Ramstad
Reed
Regula
Riggs
Rivers
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Upton
Visclosky
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Ward
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—21

Ackerman
Chabot
de la Garza
Fields (LA)
Foglietta
Ford
Gutknecht
Hayes
Houghton
Jefferson
Kennelly
Lincoln
McDade
Molinari
Mollohan
Moran
Murtha
Paxon
Peterson (FL)
Quinn
Wise

□ 1511

Messrs. HOLDEN, SMITH of Michigan, MASCARA, BORSKI, COYNE, and BLUMENAUER changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts and Mr. STUDDS changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. WELDON], as amended.

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 354, noes 60, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 203]

AYES—354

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allard
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cardin
Castle
Chambliss
Chapman
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Cooley
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Frost
Funderburk
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Green (TX)
Greene (UT)
Greenwood
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
LaHood
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Longley
Lowey
Lucas
Maloney
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCollum
McCrery
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Menendez
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Mink
Moakley
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Myers
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Ortiz
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce
Quillen
Radanovich
Ramstad
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Riggs
Rivers
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roth
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Sabo
Salmon
Sanders
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Studds
Stump
Stupak
Talent
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thornton
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Torricelli
Traficant
Upton
Velazquez
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—60

Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Bonior
Brown (CA)
Clay
Clayton
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Coyne
Dellums
Dixon
Doggett
Engel
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Frank (MA)
Furse
Gibbons
Gutierrez
Hastings (FL)
Hinchey
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jacobs
Johnson (SD)
Lewis (GA)
Luther
McCarthy
McDermott
McKinney
Meek
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Minge
Olver
Owens
Rahall
Rangel
Rush
Sawyer
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Skaggs
Stark
Stokes
Tanner
Torres
Towns
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Williams
Yates

NOT VOTING—20

Chabot
Conyers
de la Garza
Fields (LA)
Foglietta
Ford
Gutknecht
Hayes
Houghton
Jefferson
Kennelly
Lincoln
McDade
Molinari
Mollohan
Murtha
Paxon
Peterson (FL)
Quinn
Wise

□ 1519

Mr. MCDERMOTT and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. SHAYS and Mr. BERMAN changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

VACATING PASSAGE OF GEKAS AMENDMENT NO. 3 AND AMENDMENT NO. 3, AS MODIFIED, OFFERED BY MR. GEKAS

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the committee proceedings of yesterday, wherein my amendment No. 3 was adopted, be vacated and a new amendment also titled No. 3 be inserted in its place in lieu of the amendment yesterday. We had the wrong language submitted.

Mr. Chairman, I checked with the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] and he indicated that he has no objection.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the modified amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 3, as modified, offered by Mr. GEKAS. Page 87, after line 21, insert the following new subsection:

(h) BI-AGENCY WORKING GROUP.—The National Weather Service is encouraged to follow through on the recommendation contained in the document entitled ''Secretary's Report to Congress on Adequacy of NEXRAD Coverage and Degradation of Weather Services Under National Weather Service Modernization for 32 Areas of Concern'', dated October 12, 1995, to initiate a dialogue with the Federal Aviation Administration to form

a bi-agency working group to further assess the potential for National Weather Service operational use of Federal Aviation Administration weather radar data, and to define engineering considerations that would be involved in implementing a data sharing link between the Federal Aviation Administration and the National Weather Service.

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

Mr. Chairman, I include for the RECORD communications and related articles on the subject of my amendment.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 23, 1995.

ELBERT W. FRIDAY, Jr.,
Assistant Administrator, National Weather Service, U.S. Department of Commerce, Silver Spring, MD.

DEAR MR. FRIDAY: Throughout the implementation process of the Next Generation Weather Radar (NEXRAD) system by the National Weather Service (NWS), serious concerns were raised regarding deficient coverage of the Harrisburg metropolitan area. Unfortunately, my concerns were repeatedly rebuffed by the NWS with claims that Harrisburg weather coverage was appropriate. Now that the NEXRAD system has been fully implemented it is clear that my earlier cautions and predictions have become reality.

While the NEXRAD radar beam projects a further distance than traditional radar, due to the earth's curvature coverage originating from 120 miles north of Harrisburg in State College creates a gap from the earth's surface to a level 16,000 feet above Harrisburg, completely missing the city. Physical limitations of the NEXRAD radar beam have left open an unmonitored area which is densely populated and prone to flooding.

At the time this concern was raised, I was told by the NWS that coverage would be adequate. I content that coverage of the area is not sufficient. A NWS employee submitted to me the enclosed sampling of documented cases illustrating severe weather conditions which went undetected by the NEXRAD system.

Unfortunately, while some areas of the country may enjoy improved radar services, Central Pennsylvania has been diminished service due to the lack of attention to this flaw in the NEXRAD coverage. I believe the most significant responsibility entrusted to the NWS is to ensure the public's safety. I urge you once again to reconsider this situation which the NWS has created and confirm that your job of ensuring public safety has been satisfied.

Thank you for your consideration; I look forward to your response.

Very truly yours,

GEORGE W. GEKAS,
Member of Congress.

CASE 1—APRIL 30, 1994

Attachment 1: Summary of Severe Weather Reports. The station log sheets from NWS Harrisburg were not available for this event. However widespread severe weather occurred over central Pennsylvania during the evening of April 30. As noted on Attachment 1, damage from a severe thunderstorm was reported in uptown Harrisburg at 10:46 pm. This damage was later determined by the National Weather Service to be caused by a tornado. Although forecasters in the State College office had called the Harrisburg office about severe weather appearing on their NEXRAD in other areas of the state prior to that time, they made no mention of severe weather in the Harrisburg area at the time of the tornado. The Harrisburg Weather Service office issued a severe thunderstorm warning for this storm based on the radar at Harrisburg.

Substantial damage occurred in uptown Harrisburg and near the State Hospital that evening.

CASE 2—JULY 20, 1994

Attachment 2: Note from person on duty at Harrisburg describing a severe thunderstorm event in Huntingdon County. (The NEXRAD radar site is in Centre County; Huntingdon County is adjacent to Centre County). Harrisburg radar showed this storm to be severe, and the person on duty at Harrisburg issued a severe thunderstorm warning based on the Harrisburg radar (after being advised by State College personnel that their NEXRAD did not indicate any severe weather in Huntingdon County.)

Attachment 3: The severe thunderstorm warning issued by Harrisburg.

Attachment 4: Station log documenting the report of damage from the storm. The report was received by NWS Harrisburg from Emergency Management officials in Huntingdon County. EMA officials indicated 20 to 30 trees down and damage to homes.

Comments: The NEXRAD radar has the ability to archive paper copies of its radar display. I requested archive copies of the radar display for the time of the storm in Huntington County. Apparently the NEXRAD did not show anything alarming in Huntingdon County at that time, because State College personnel did not start to archive until 7:40 pm that day, the damage occurred at 6:50 pm.

The damage in Huntingdon County occurred less than 40 miles from State College. Harrisburg, York and Lancaster are more than twice that distance from State College.

BULLETIN—IMMEDIATE BROADCAST REQUESTED, SEVERE THUNDERSTORM WARNING, NATIONAL WEATHER SERVICE, HARRISBURG PA, 6:31 P.M. EDT WED, JULY 20, 1994

The National Weather Service in Harrisburg has issued a severe thunderstorm warning effective until 7:15 p.m. EDT for people in the following location:

In south central Pennsylvania: Huntingdon County.

At 6:30 p.m. Harrisburg radar showed a severe thunderstorm between the town of Huntingdon and the Mifflin County line. This storm was moving toward the northeast at 10 miles an hour.

This is a dangerous storm. If you are in its path you should prepare for damaging wind in excess of 55 mph, large hail, and deadly lightning. People outside should move to a shelter, preferably inside a strong building but stay away from windows.

EMERGENCY ACTION LOG

Date/Time, July, 20, 1994 Information Received, city/town/time of event, source/event. Action Taken, calls made, warnings, etc. Initials, DM.

6:05 p.m.—Bob Fenner called—quarter-size hail in State College, Warning issued 6:05 PM—DM.

6:10 p.m.—CTP called—dime-size hail at the office in State College—DM.

9:15 p.m.—Rich Moore (Huntingdon County) called—20 to 30 large trees blown down; trees blown onto houses causing an estimated $2,000 damage; ½ mile by ½ mile patch of wind damage in Mill Creek at 6:50 p.m.; (DVIP 5 to 270 top 55,000 ft shown on WSR-74c radar just before warning issuance) (I also called CTP about the storm just before warning issuance. According to this the storm was not showing severe characteristics)—DM.

CASE 3—AUGUST 4, 1994

Attachment 5: Entry from Harrisburg's station log book. At 5:28 pm, the weather observer at the Middletown International Airport issued a weather observation reporting a wind gust of 50 knots (58 mph). A wind gust of 50 knots warrants a severe thunderstorm warning according to the severe weather criteria used by the National Weather Service. The person on duty at Harrisburg sent State College a message through the NWS computer system pointing out the observation. The weather office in Mt. Holly, New Jersey sent a similar message to State College at approximately the same time.

At 5:55 pm, the person on duty at State College called the Harrisburg office to ask if the Harrisburg radar showed any severe weather in the vicinity of the airport (because their radar showed no strong storms in that area). By that time (25 minutes after the report), the Harrisburg radar showed the storm was well below severe warning criteria.

No warning was ever issued by the State College office for this event.

EMERGENCY LOG BOOK

July 29, 1994, 3 p.m.—Pit's 88D is down and 57 is up until sometime Saturday (7/30/94). They will be taking radar observations until then—GC.

July 29, 1994, 11 p.m.—Left HAR radar on overnight per request by Art Krause (PHL)—GC.

August 4, 1994—At 5:30 p.m. the observer (MDR) issued an observation reporting a windgust to 50 kts. I sent them a message pointing that out. At 5:55 p.m., State College called and ask if the Harrisburg radar showed a strong cell in that area. By that time (30 minutes *after* the report) the cell was down to 25,000; VIP 5 to 8,000. No warning was issued by State College.—GC.

August 4, 1994, 10:35 p.m.—Left the radar on overnight per request by PHL (Tony Gigi).

August 12, 1994, 10:35 p.m.—Art K. wanted radar left on—DPM.

August 13, 1994—Radar left on—DPM.

[From the Harrisburg (PA) Patriot-News, May 14, 1996]

IT'S OFFICIAL: IT WAS A TORNADO

(By Mike Feeley)

National Weather Service investigators confirmed yesterday that a small tornado touched down Saturday at a truck-parts manufacturing shop along Cameron Street in Harrisburg and danced along the treetops for a half-mile before dissipating.

Relying mostly on witness accounts and damage to the Dayton Parts plant, weather service officials said the tornado—which never showed up on radar—lasted less than a minute.

But in that time, it reduced part of the Dayton plant at Cameron and Herr streets to rubble, ruptured a gas line, toppled trees and forced the evacuation of a city housing project.

The tornado was coupled with a thunderstorm that dumped an inch of rain on the area in less than 30 minutes.

Either the tornado or severe winds blew over a 16-ton caboose on the Conrail yards in Harrisburg, said Mayor Stephen R. Reed. In all, the storm caused $5 million worth of damage in the city.

About 150 people in the Harrisburg and Camp Hill areas still were without phone service this morning, said Shirley Risoldi, spokeswoman for Bell Atlantic. Risoldi said service should be restored to all homes by the end of the day.

Saturday's twister followed a path roughly 200 yards from that of a tornado that hit in 1994, Reed said. These types of tornadoes are not uncommon for the region, investigators said.

Radar maps used by the weather service to declare weather warnings showed no signs of tornadoes in Dauphin County, said Bruce W. Budd, NWS meteorologist-in-charge in State College.

Dauphin County was under only a severe thunderstorm warning when the tornado hit. The radar maps showed the potential for a twister in Schuylkill County, however, and that county was under a tornado warning.

''The indicators show a strong outflow of wind [in Harrisburg],'' said Budd, as he reviewed radar maps of the area. ''What we don't have is any indication of a tornado. But this type of light tornado is not easily detected. Any severe thunderstorm can produce a brief tornado.''

Budd and meteorologist Richard W. Winther came to Harrisburg yesterday to investigate the report of a tornado. Most of the damage indicated a ''straight-line'' storm—similar to that of a severe thunderstorm.

But witnesses—including a motorcyclist who was knocked off his bike by a piece of debris—told the investigators they saw a funnel cloud touch down at the Dayton plant. And wreckage at the plant was strewn in such a way as to indicate a tornado had struck, Budd said.

There's evidence the tornado spent much of its short life moving along 20 or 30 feet off the ground, doing damage to larger trees in its path but leaving the smaller trees relatively undamaged.

The tornado will be classified as an ''F–1,'' or light tornado, capable of winds of between 73 and 112 mph. Saturday's winds were in excess of 100 mph, Winther said.

'It's amazing that there were about 30 kids around an ice-cream truck and with trees on both sides of the truck damaged, no one was hurt,'' he said.

RECENT TORNADOES IN THE MIDSTATE

May 1996: A small tornado cuts through Cameron Street in Harrisburg, reduces part of a truck-parts manufacturing shop to rubble, ruptures a gas line and forces the evacuation of a housing project.

May 1995: A weak tornado touched down in Millersville, Lancaster County, destroying a barn, toppling trees and other structures.

July 1994: A tornado hits the Delwood Manor housing development in northern York County, tossing sheds and blowing off pieces of roofs.

April 1994: In uptown Harrisburg, a tornado rips parts of roofs off four row homes and shatters school windows.

August 1992: Winds of 80 to 90 mph swoop into Locust Grove Trailer Park on Route 22 in Lebanon County, displacing a mobile home and uprooting trees.

LOWER PAXTON TOWNSHIP,
Harrisburg, PA, May 11, 1996.

Hon. GEORGE GEKAS,
Member of Congress, Rayburn HOB, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GEKAS: As I write this, the thunder is still rumbling in the distance from a severe storm that has just slammed Dauphin and Cumberland counties with no warning from the National Weather Service.

As a former weathercaster in the nation's tornado alley and through my own interest in meteorology, I can see no excuse for the lack of warning before this storm struck. There was not even a severe thunderstorm watch. All this despite the fact that an hour before the storm hit, radar was showing a line of intensifying storms west of Harrisburg.

Storm warnings had been posted for Juniata and Franklin counties, then there was nothing until the storms had already passed through Dauphin County and were entering Lebanon County. At that time a warning was issued for Lebanon and Lancaster counties.

My police and fire radio is alive with communications regarding severe damage to private homes, apartment buildings, even a school . . . several of the incidents involving possible injury or entrapment.

It appears Lower Paxton Township has escaped the brunt of the storm. The city of Harrisburg seems to have experienced serious damage.

This is another glaring example that the realignment of the National Weather Service, especially in closing its Harrisburg office, is not providing adequate coverage of this meteorologically dynamic area. As competent and well-equipped as the meteorologists at the Weather Service Office in State College might be, standing barefoot on my front steps in Lower Paxton Township I could tell there was a severe storm imminent.

How many more times must the safety of the residents of my township and all other communities in this region be compromised before something is done to end this threat to public safety?

I urge you to employ whatever avenues available to rectify this situation. If I may be of any assistance, I would welcome contact from your office.

Respectfully,

JAY PURDY,
Supervisor, Lower Paxton Township.

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

There was no objection

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

There was no objection

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment, as modified, offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS].

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there other amendments to title II?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SCOTT

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

The CHAIRMAN. The clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SCOTT: Page 27, line 14, strike ''$823,400,000'' and insert in lieu thereof ''$857,800,000''.

Page 27, line 19, strike $152,800,000'' and insert in lieu thereof ''$187,200,000''.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I am offering an amendment to restore funding for NASA's Advanced Subsonic Aeronautic Research Program to the level contained in the President's budget. H.R. 3322 cuts the advanced subsonic program by 34.4 million, money that is vitally important to maintaining NASA's longstanding leadership in subsonic research.

For those not familiar with subsonic research, let me briefly outline the kinds of activities being affected. Activities such as research and development to address aging aircraft, safety concerns, and aging aircraft are the kinds of aircraft popular with the newer economy airlines and the aging airframes used by the United States military.

Subsonic research in jeopardy also includes cooperative activities with the FAA to improve safety and efficiency in the Nation's air traffic management system so we do not lose control of the increasing volume of commercial and military air traffic.

Also in jeopardy is R&D on advanced technologies that could result in quieter, more fuel efficient aircraft and an understanding of how aircraft operations affect the environment.

Mr. Chairman, I acknowledge and support the need to cut Government spending where appropriate in order to meet our budget responsibilities. However, a cut in NASA's aeronautic authorization program is extremely counterproductive to our shared goals of increasingly stronger economy and a stronger America.

Mr. Chairman, the American aeronautics industry has an annual sales of over $60 billion and is responsible for this country's greatest positive balance of trade.

Without the research and support of NASA, the U.S. aeronautics industry would not be competitive in the global marketplace. This was in fact the purpose for which Congress created NASA in the first place. It is important to remember that in 1917 Congress created NASA's predecessor for the express purpose of regaining America's competitiveness in aviation at a time when dominance in this area had been lost to the Europeans.

Now at a time when the Europeans are in high gear, supporting the research and development of the Airbus, we are poised to shoot ourselves in the foot again by cutting the very programs that kept the United States aeronautics program competitive. This amendment will enable these subsonic programs to continue at a reasonable level.

Mr. Chairman, recently I had the chance to see firsthand how this program works and the results of this program because I had the opportunity to participate in celebrations commemorating the production of the new Boeing 777, and also another program commemorating the McDonnell Douglas C–17. Both programs use the wing design and composite materials developed more than a decade ago by NASA. These aircraft, one commercial, one military, are now on the cutting edge of aircraft technology and greatly advance the competitive position of the United States in the world marketplace. Without the research under the advanced subsonic program, we are in jeopardy of losing our competitive edge 5, 10, and 15 years from now.

Mr. Chairman, we should not contribute to any effort which might lead to the loss of U.S. preeminence in aeronautics. I urge Members on both sides of the aisle to support this amendment and therefore support this country's economy.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in fiscal year 1994, this program was funded at $106 million. The bill before us has a funding level for this program at $152.8 million for fiscal year 1997. Now, that is an increase of about 45 percent over a 3-fiscal-year period.

I believe that that increase is generous enough in light of the extreme fiscal situation that we are facing and the bipartisan drive to try to balance the budget.

Also, the amendment that has been offered by the gentleman from Virginia, while well-intentioned, is an add-on without corresponding offsets. We went through that entire issue in the last amendment, and the House voted very strongly in favor of, where we do have add-on, to have a corresponding offset so that the bill will maintain its fiscal neutrality.

This amendment does not maintain fiscal neutrality. It ends up increasing the authorization by $34 million-plus, and that means $34 million-plus of deficit spending should the Committee on Appropriations match the authorization level.

In summation, I do not think that we need this additional money. I think that it is important that there be on offset, not an add-on. I believe that this program has been given generous increases over the last 3 fiscal years under both Democratic and Republican-controlled Congresses and the amount that is in the bill unamended is enough.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I intend to support this amendment. I think it is a vitally necessary amendment. Of course, my critiera is whether or not it was in my substitute, and it was in my substitute; or it must be a very good amendment.

I am not quite sure how to deal with the arguments on the other side. Of course, part of the argument is maybe that this is corporate welfare and we do not fund corporate welfare. If it benefits corporations, we do not do it. So they want to keep the program considerably below the level that is being recommended by the administration.

□ 1530

Well, maybe it is just that they do not want to do anything the administration wants, no matter how good it is. Of course, they are raising again the subject of the budget; it does not have any offsets in it. Now, that was the same argument that we heard on the previous amendment and on various other amendments.

It is quite obvious that on the majority side, they have a great deal of wisdom, shared by almost every one of them, as evidenced by the fact that they all, in that wisdom, decided to vote against the prior amendment. So, I do not want the belabor these things too much.

It is my contention, of course, that this is one of the crucial programs in NASA's portfolio. It is doing something that specifically helps a major U.S. industry, which is faced with intense competition from around the world, specifically from Europe and the Airbus consortium. If we cannot do something to provide an adequate level of support for U.S. industry engaged in this competition, we are going to lose to the Europeans where the Airbus is a government-funded consortium.

We can argue that we want to be pristine in this. If there is a healthy aircraft industry, they ought to be taking up the whole cost for this. That has not been the case for the last 75 years. They know it, and part of their revolution is to change things that have been going on for the last 75 years, even though it was this program of working cooperatively with the industry that made us the preeminent supplier of aircraft to the world, preeminent because we were the best.

Mr. Chairman, now we have decided that we no longer need to continue that path for subsonic aircraft research. Now, I do not see a similar attitude toward the hypersonic aircraft research. It appears that this is not quite as much corporate welfare, although it is the same basic type of research. Maybe the reason is that we know that there will not be a commercial market for hypersonic planes. Even though this is applied research, the hypersonic, on behalf of American corporations, and this normally is the criteria for corporate welfare, in this case we will not call it corporate welfare for some reason or another.

I have not quite figured that out, but the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] will have a good explanation which he will give you shortly, I am sure.

Now, it is my view, and I take delight in pointing this out, that the position taken by the majority in these situations is full of contradictions. They, for example, have language in their report which provides certain direction to NASA with regard to applied research. It says the committee encourages NASA to review funding levels for polymer matrix composite programs to achieve a balance between composite and metallic technologies. Aluminum has been the material of choice for all significant commercial aircraft structures and continues to offer opportunities for cost-effective improvements in aircraft structural performance.

Now, this sounds to me an awful lot like a recommendation to pursue a particular line of advanced subsonic research because it has a more direct application to existing commercial aircraft design. Is that a good idea? Possibly. Or is this an example of corporate welfare, telling the government how to spend its money in support of certain technologies which are already well developed and have a large base in industry?

Apparently, if they like the program, it is not corporate welfare. If they do not, it is corporate welfare. I urge support for the Scott amendment.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment of the gentleman from Virginia. I think that clearly again I emphasize the creation of work for the 21st century, and I think we are doing a disservice by eliminating those dollars for that direction. So I rise to support the Scott amendment.

I would also like to add a comment regarding the amendment that I would offered, Mission to Planet Earth, and would ask if I could enter into a colloguy with the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN].

As the gentleman knows, I had considered offering this amendment and had raised this with the committee on NASA's Mission to Planet Earth Program. But instead I would like to take the time to ask a few questions about the National Research Council's review of the Earth Observing System and how the Brown recommendation is compared to the actions taken in this bill. It is true that last year the chairman of the Committee on Science asked the well-respected National Research Council to undertake a review of NASA's Mission to Planet Earth Program and the Earth Observing System? In fact, I believe we discussed that in committee.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

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

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman is absolutely correct in her statement.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. If the gentleman will continue to yield, is it also true that the National Research Council panel validated the scientific goals of Mission to Planet Earth and recommended, and I quote: NASA should implement most of the near-term components of Mission to Planet Earth/Earth Observing System, including Landsat 7, AM–1, PM–1 and the Tropical Rainfall Measuring Mission without delay in reduction in overall observing capability, and the Chemistry–1 mission should not be delayed?

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, if the gentlewoman would continue to yield, she is absolutely correct in the citation that she has made. In addition, the National Research Council went on to conclude, and I quote: Based on a series of reviews, a series of reviews, the program has evolved from its original plans to a reshaped program that is more responsive to the science, more resilient, more open to the introduction of new technologies. There has been a shift from a fixed series of large vehicle missions to a mixed fleet exploiting small- to medium-class spacecraft. However, any further structural changes to the near-term EOS missions would cause severe

program dislocations. Further budgetary reductions or imposed constraints on technical options would require the elimination of key sensors, slips in schedule, loss of data continuity and the elimination of all advanced technology development that could enhance future research and lower cost, end of quotation.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I would take from that statement that that was nothing but a clear and strong message from the National Research Council, I might add, an independent council, that assessed the Mission to Planet Earth and the Mission to Planet Earth directives in H.R. 3322 consistent with the recommendations of that National Research Council's independent review, a review that was in fact, as we understand it, requested by the chairman of the Committee on Science?

Mr. BROWN of California. If the gentlewoman will continue to yield, the gentlewoman is correct. That review was requested by the chairman of the Committee on Science. The legislation before us would actually cancel the PM–1 and Chemistry–1 spacecraft, cut the funding available for the Mission to Planet Earth Program by 27 percent and would fundamentally unravel the integrated scientific program that has been put in place.

The actions taken in H.R. 3322 fly in the face of the conclusions and recommendations of the National Research Council's review. I might point out that the chairman of the committee, when he asked for advice from the scientific body, has a tendency to ignore it unless it conforms with his own preestablished conclusions. I noted that the gentleman referred favorably to the AAAS report when he thought it substantiated his conclusions. Normally he does not agree with the report that they make each year with regard to R&D funding and the budget.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Reclaiming my time, it is interesting as we discuss this, and that is why I think the amendment would have been appropriate, but I wonder if the gentleman shares the view of at least one of our Republican colleagues that indicated that money spend on global change research is money down a rat hole.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, is this the same Member who says it is liberal claptrap also?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, sounds familiar. Very much so.

Mr. BROWN of California. I do not share that view. In my opinion, such research is imperative if we are to truly understand the planet on which we live including the complex interactions that determine our climate and develop the policy options that offer the most benefit to all our citizens.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN], and I would certainly agree with him. I hope that we will be able to pursue this through conference and be able to ensure that what we do have is the reasoned response to the National Research Council's review and be able to comply with that most timely study. I thank the gentleman and I yield back my time.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Scott amendment to restore $34.4 million in funds to NASA's Advanced Subsonic Program. This increase would bring funding back to the requested level and reinvest vitally needed resources in maintaining NASA's longstanding global leadership in aeronautics research.

While advanced subsonic technology may seem like science fiction to some, this research does in fact help address safety, fuel efficiency, and environmental impact concerns for today's and the next generation of commercial aircraft. For anyone who has ever expressed concern about the aging aircraft used by some domestic airlines and the U.S. military, subsonic research is not just a smart investment, it is peace of mind.

And, although I fully recognize the need to cut the budget deficit, aeronautics research and technology spending has a tremendous net beneficial impact on our national economy and international balance of trade. The aeronautics industry has annual sales of over $60 billion and produces a positive balance of trade of $25 billion. In Ohio alone, the aerospace industry is responsible for approximately 300,000 jobs and injects some $13.5 billion into the State's economy.

While a $34 million cut from the request level may not seem like a lot of money, it is about 20 percent of the program's funds. I believe such a deep cut in this important program is unwarranted and exacerbates the overall funding cuts suffered by the Agency since 1993.

Our trading partners throughout the world are increasing their investments in research and technology and are consequently snatching markets away from our domestic companies. Faced with intense competition in a growing global aerospace market, we should do all we can to promote our aerospace industry and maintain NASA's preeminence in aeronautics.

I urge Members to support this important amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SCOTT].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 157, noes 250, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 204]

AYES—157

Abercrombie
Baldacci
Barcia
Bateman
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Berman
Bevill
Bishop
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Cardin
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Coyne
Cramer
Cummings
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Durbin
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Filner
Flake
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Green (TX)
Hall (TX)
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoke
Horn
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kennedy (MA)
Klink
LaFalce
Lantos
LaTourette
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren
Lowey
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
McCarthy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meek
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Mink
Moakley
Moran
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Petri
Pickett
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Richardson
Rivers
Roemer
Rose
Rush
Sabo
Sawyer
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Stockman
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Velazquez
Visclosky
Volkmer
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Wilson
Woolsey
Yates

NOES—250

Allard
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Castle
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Cooley
Costello
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Funderburk
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Greene (UT)
Greenwood
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hostettler
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lucas
Luther
Manzullo
Martini
Mascara
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon

Meehan	Reed	Stearns
Metcalf	Riggs	Stump
Meyers	Roberts	Talent
Mica	Rogers	Tate
Miller (FL)	Rohrabacher	Tauzin
Minge	Ros-Lehtinen	Taylor (NC)
Montgomery	Roth	Thomas
Moorhead	Roybal-Allard	Thornberry
Morella	Royce	Tiahrt
Myers	Salmon	Torkildsen
Myrick	Sanders	Upton
Nethercutt	Sanford	Vento
Neumann	Saxton	Vucanovich
Ney	Scarborough	Walker
Norwood	Schaefer	Walsh
Nussle	Schiff	Wamp
Orton	Seastrand	Watts (OK)
Oxley	Sensenbrenner	Weldon (FL)
Packard	Shadegg	Weldon (PA)
Parker	Shaw	Weller
Peterson (MN)	Shays	White
Pombo	Shuster	Whitfield
Pomeroy	Skeen	Wicker
Porter	Smith (MI)	Williams
Portman	Smith (NJ)	Wolf
Poshard	Smith (TX)	Young (FL)
Pryce	Smith (WA)	Zeliff
Quillen	Solomon	Zimmer
Radanovich	Souder	
Ramstad	Spence	

NOT VOTING—27

Ackerman	Gutierrez	Mollohan
Chabot	Gutknecht	Murtha
Chapman	Hayes	Paxon
Clyburn	Houghton	Peterson (FL)
de la Garza	Jefferson	Quinn
Fields (LA)	Kennelly	Roukema
Foglietta	Lincoln	Wise
Ford	McDade	Wynn
Gibbons	Molinari	Young (AK)

□ 1601

Mr. BEREUTER changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. SCHUMER and Mr. BEILENSON changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title II?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROEMER

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROEMER

Page 24, line 20, insert ''and'' after ''Administration;''.

Page 24, lines 21 through 24, strike paragraph (2).

Page 25, line 1, redesignate paragraph (3) as paragraph (2).

Page 25, lines 13 and 15, and page 26, lines 4 and 6, redesignate paragraphs (2) through (5) as paragraphs (1) through (4), respectively.

Page 26, line 14, strike ''$498,500,000'' and insert in lieu thereof ''$230,700,000''.

Page 27, line 4, strike ''$711,000,000'' and insert in lieu thereof ''$679,400,000''.

Page 38, line 14, through page 43, line 6, strike subtitle C.

Page 43, line 7, redesignate subtitle D as subtitle C.

Amend the table of contents accordingly.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto be limited to 1 hour, with the time equally divided between the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] and myself.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SENSENBRENNER] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

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

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 6 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I guess I ask for the patience of this body, since we seem to go through this argument on eliminating the space station a couple of times a year. Certainly people on both sides could dust off their talk from 1992 or 1994 and virtually give almost the identical talk for cutting the space station or for supporting it.

I am not going to give the previous speech, because it seems that we on the opposing side of the space station continue to get more and more arguments in favor of cutting the space station, especially from the scientific community. So let me give some background as to why this is not good science. This is not in the interests of the scientific community or in the interests of taxpayers in America today.

Mr. Chairman, Scientific American, which is one of the most distinguished periodicals written in the United States today, the June issue, has a very interesting article on the space station this month. Let me quote from it: ''Scientific panels, such as the National Research Council's Space Studies Board, have warned that, although some interesting research will be possible on the station, the expected returns cannot, cannot justify the facility's overall cost.''

Another quote from this ''Science in the Sky'' article in the Scientific American, dated June 1996: ''To date, no large companies are planning major research or manufacturing efforts on the Space Station.''

We hear from a host of proponents of the space station that this is going to solve everything from cancer to AIDS, to making, manufacturing, and testing new crystals. This is absolutely not what Scientific American says. They go on to look at what is good in the space station and what, out of the eight original missions that the space station had, what are we going to do now, in 1996, from when it was first designed in 1984.

With regard to high-technology products, it says in Scientific American: ''No larger companies are currently interested in manufacturing in space.'' Astronomy, remote sensing for different platforms put on the space station, those are certainly gone now since 1984, but there is no research currently planned from inside or outside or anywhere on the space station.

On biotechnology, it says that ''NASA and its partners are planning some experiments, but the commercial interest is limited only to subsidized research.'' So these claims that there is all this private sector interest and big manufacturing interests in the space station, and they are going to help the taxpayers pay for this, is just not accurate, not according to the latest article in Scientific American.

Members might say, as we approach some very, very difficult circumstances in reaching a balanced budget over the next 5 or 6 years, that we have to make some tough choices around this body. Based on science and merit, the space station is the most logical choice to eliminate.

When President Reagan first came up with the idea in 1984, he said the space station would cost us $8 billion. Does anybody in this body have any idea about the projected cost today? It is not $18 billion, it is not even $58 billion, it is close to $90 billion when we add in the costs of what we have spent, of what the space shuttle will cost us to put these different platforms up into the atmosphere, the cost of protecting it, the cost of maintaining it for the 10 or 12 years it is up there in space.

Mr. Chairman, we are talking about $90 billion. Some may argue, well, Members of Congress, we have already spent about $12 billion or $13 billion, we might as well finish it. Do Members want to justify an expense of $70 or $75 billion more of the taxpayers' money because we have spent $12 billion or $13 billion bad dollars? I do not think that makes a whole heck of a lot of sense. That does not make sense to people who are working so hard for so long for their tax money to pay their bills and to try to insist on a fair cost here in Washington, DC, when we do expend a dollar.

Mr. Chairman, I have the utmost respect for people on the other side of this issue, including the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HALL] and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CRAMER], who was elected the same year and serves with me on the Committee on Science, and Members on the other side of the aisle. But we have to have the courage in this body to make some tough spending cuts to get to a balanced budget.

If Members look at science and look at merit, this space station just does not pass the test of what hardworking American families will ask in terms of return on their tax dollar. It is not going to return good science. It is surely not going to return any kind of good return for these high-tech objectivity measures that people do not even have interest in at the manufacturing level, according to Scientific American, and we definitely have to make some of these tough choices to get to a balanced budget.

Citizens Against Government Waste endorses this amendment offered by myself and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GANSKE] and a host of other groups do as well, too, that I will list in the next few minutes. I urge the body to support this elimination of the space station, in the interests of science and in the interest of balancing the budget.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, we are going through one of the annual rites of spring in Washington. The tulips bloom, the dogwoods become very beautiful, and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] introduces his amendment to kill the space station.

Let me say that I will match my record on spending issues against that of the gentleman from Indiana and anybody else in this House, and I support the space station. The Citizens Against Government Waste has given me their Taxpayer Hero Award consistently. The National Taxpayers Union has named me the tightwad of the decade in terms of my votes on taxes and spending, and I am proud of that, and I support the space station.

I am not going to belabor this point very much, but I do wish to make two points for the committee's consideration. The first is that the United States taxpayers have already put $12 billion into designing the space station and building 50,000 pounds of hardware. If the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana is adopted, that $12 billion investment will just evaporate. We just chalk that up to experience, and this vote is really a vote on whether or not to stiff the taxpayers the $12 billion that they have invested in this.

The space station is on time, it is on budget. We have settled on a design. We are not redesigning it. We are building the hardware now and we are looking forward to the launches of the first elements sometime next year.

The second point is that America's credibility is on the line, because we are the leaders of an international consortium that includes Russia, the member nations of the Russian space agency, Canada, and Japan. Should the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana be adopted, the United States will unilaterally cancel the space station, and the investments that have been made by the taxpayers of all those other countries will similarly be waived. That is about 4 billion U.S. dollars.

So if we end up stiffing our international partners and our allies, we are going to make sure that they are not going to want to get together with the United States, either on scientific endeavors or on any other endeavor, for fear that the Congress will change its mind and pull the rug out from underneath them.

Let us stay the course. Let us vote against the Roemer amendment. Let us build the space station, and then let us operate the space station and benefit from the scientific research that goes on.

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

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GANSKE], coauthor of this bipartisan amendment.

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Chairman, I rise, not surprisingly, since I have cosponsored this amendment, in support of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this should not be an annual rite of spring. We should eliminate this funding. James van Allen, a respected scientist at the University of Iowa, and many other scientists have said that we will get much more bang for our buck by funding unmanned scientific explorations. The space station's spending is already $43 million over budget, or, as NASA would say, the expenses have experienced cost growth.

Despite these higher expenditures, NASA has fallen behind in the construction schedule. According to the GAO, we will sink $94 billion into this orbiting erector set before it is over, if NASA does not go any further over budget.

Our share of the price tag is not the only problem. The space station is supposed to be international, so let me speak to comments made by my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin. The memoranda of understanding between NASA and the space agencies of our partners has not been finalized. We have no definitive agreements with any of our partners, whose contributions are necessary for the completion of this space station.

NASA insists that Russia has made commitments to the project. However, none of these agreements are in writing. NASA must know something that Russia does not know. For example, NASA states that an American will always be in command of the space station. The Russians, however, say that question has not been settled.

The fact that we have no written agreement with Russia I think is particularly problematic. Russian Presidential elections will be held this June, and it is uncertain who the successor to Yeltsin will be.

□ 1615

Should Mr. Yeltsin lose, it is likely that Mr. Zyuganov will be the President of Russia. As most Members know, he hates the West, and I would doubt that we would see any cooperation with the space station.

Another ally, Canada, will not decide whether they will pay for completion of the robotic arm until 1997. What if they decide not to? I suppose NASA will be back here in Congress asking for another chunk of change.

While NASA's overall budget has been declining and will continue to decline, the space station seems to be immune to scrutiny. NASA has consolidated control of the entire space station budget with the program manager, giving him an additional $300 million per year. These funds were previously controlled by various research offices responsible for scientific experiments to be conducted on the space station. This consolidation has made it possible for funds allocated for research to be used for construction of the space station.

What good will building the space station do if we spend all of the research money building the space station? Mr. Chairman, I am afraid that well-intentioned but misguided efforts to complete this project will not give us what we want. These concessions cost millions of dollars. We have the delay of completion of scientific projects in other areas. This is a black hole. The money goes in, nothing comes out.

For example, our offer to launch Russia's science power platform will upset the station construction schedule by causing a 5-month delay in launching Japan's science module and an 8-month delay in launching the centrifuge which some say is essential for life sciences research. I think we just should not throw more good money after bad. It is time to cut our losses. I believe that we should face reality, we should stop the money vacuum known as the space station now. Vote ''yes'' on this amendment.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HALL].

Mr. HALL of Texas. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I, of course, like all the other Members who will speak and who have spoken, have the highest regard for the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] and those who support him. We just differ with him. We just think he is still wrong and probably will be wrong in the next Congress and in the Congress after that and the one after that. Because he is a fine young man, he will be reelected, and he will be here when I am in the corner room of the Rockwall Nursing Home, but I will still be calling out to save the space station for us old folks.

As I mentioned to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] at the recent full committee markup of the bill, the space station amendment, as the gentleman has said, is one of the endearing traditions here. I respect his convictions.

Mr. Chairman, the value of research today is already demonstrated in a lot of ways, but in a limited way by experiments that are being conducted on the space shuttle. In previous sessions, we have held hearings and we have held a number of hearings where we heard from some of the leading medical researchers of our day.

Dr. Michael DeBakey walked these halls 3 days, going in to visit with Members to tell them of the value of the space station and the hope that the space station holds out; in his early 80's, Dr. Mickey LeMaistre, head of M.D. Anderson, who knows the attacks that cancer makes on the citizenry, and all of us have someone in a cancer ward.

I think there is one word that the space station holds out and that one word is so important to people that are wasting away in the cancer wards. It is so important that we are even talking about revolutionizing the FDA because of that one word, and that one word for people is hope. They have hope that

there is medication for them. They have hope that there is a breakthrough. We have not found that here in this environment. We hope and they hope that we will find it in the weightless environment of space.

Yes, it is a large expenditure of money, but the American people have cried out that they want this station, and if you really want to hear a hue and cry all across the universities of this country, from children in the first grade on up to the senior colleges, do something to the space station.

We almost lost the space station several sessions ago but we have never lost it. This body has always said yes, that this gives that one thing called hope. And when we talk about Russia and whether or not they are going to stay hitched, it has been certainly my finding in Russia itself that they seem not to have money for other things, but for educational pursuits and for the space station they seem to allocate and have money to set aside for it.

Both sides requested that AL GORE give us some assurance as to what their intentions were and what they thought the Russian intentions were. I read to you a letter from AL GORE addressed to us dated May 9. It says:

> As you are aware, I recently wrote to Prime Minister Chrnomyrdin regarding the status of funding for the Russian Space Agency's cooperative activities with NASA on the international Space Station program. In response, the Prime Minister has firmly pledged that Russia will meet its commitments to the ISS program in full.

It goes on to say other things. Members all have copies of this letter. I invite them to read it. But its assurance to us that the leaders of this country, the leaders of that country, certainly the investment that Japan and other countries have made ought to cry out to us: Save this space station and give these people hope.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I would just say to the distinguished Member from Texas that he certainly will probably never be in a nursing home. As talented and as fired up as he is, he will probably be on the space station if it is built some day.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the hardworking gentlewoman from New York [Ms. VELÁZQUEZ].

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Roemer amendment to eliminate funding for the space station.

Just 3 weeks ago, we debated a bill that drastically cut housing aid to lower income Americans. In the name of deficit reduction, this body eliminated housing assistance for hundreds of thousands of Americans. The argument we heard was that, as a nation, we simply could not afford it.

But today, many in this Chamber are singing a different tune. This bill is definitely not about reducing spending. This bill continues the foolish proposal to spend billions of dollars for an orbiting public housing project, for just a few astronauts.

How can we tell millions of homeless people that there isn't enough money to put a safe roof over their heads, and then, continue to fund the space station? It is unconscionable to pour billions of dollars into this science fiction experiment, when we cannot afford to take care of our own citizens.

My colleagues, the real question before us today is whether millions of Americans will be forced to go without the most fundamental of needs—housing—in favor of an expensive space toy. Spending cuts to balance the budget must be applied to all domains, not just to the social programs. It is wrong to place this burden on the backs of the defenseless poor, without asking others to pay as well.

Let us not pour any more of our scarce funds into building a luxury hotel in the sky—especially after we just demolished public housing for the needy down here on Earth.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the Roemer amendment to cancel funding for the space station.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds just to rebut the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. VELÁZQUEZ].

There is a cut in the NASA budget. It is a pretty significant cut. We went through all of that in terms of the debate on the personnel. But just to set the record straight, from fiscal year 1996 to fiscal year 1997 this bill cuts the total NASA budget by $325 million.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. WELDON].

Mr. WELDON of Florida. I thank the subcommittee chairman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to take part in this traditional rite of spring, to oppose the Roemer amendment and speak out in support of the future, in support of our children, in support of the space station. I would like to address several of the arguments that have been made by the people who would favor killing our space station.

One of them is that they bring out articles and quotations from bench researchers that say, no, do not spend the money on space station, spend the money on my research. I have done bench research. I have done life sciences research. I can tell my colleagues they could go into any university anywhere in the United States and say, ''Would you rather we spend $17 billion on the station or on more bench research?'' And they would gladly say, ''Give us the money for more bench research.'' The question before us is, is that the more appropriate use of our resources?

Another point that is being made by the opponents of the space station is this $90 billion figure. The space station is costing $17 billion to construct. The $90 billion figure comes from a GAO study where they added in the cost of running the shuttle program for those 7 years and the cost of all the research on the space station.

This would be equivalent, in my opinion, to saying to go out to dinner with your wife and see a movie does not cost $30, you have to factor in the cost of paving the roads to get back and forth from the restaurant and the cost of heating or cooling your house while you are in the restaurant. This kind of accounting is very, very deceptive.

The truth is the space station is on time and on budget, and there are very, very few programs run by this Federal Government that can make that claim. The space station program has been through downsizing. NASA has been through downsizing, and they have learned to be able to be lean, mean and efficient. This program is on time and it is on budget.

What this program is about is about the future. When we look at the cost of the space station and compare it to what we are going to spend over the next 7 years on defense, on health care, on roads and highways, this comes out to be less than 0.1 percent. I think it is about 0.01 percent of what we as a Nation are going to spend. The American people have said over and over again over the past 5, 6, 7 years, yes, we want to make this investment in the future, because that is what this is all about, the future.

I am told by teachers in my district that there is nothing that we can get children more excited about in the area of math and science than talking about space and manned space and the future. Support the station, vote ''no'' on the Roemer amendment.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER], who used to serve on the Committee on Science and was a strong supporter and coauthor of this amendment in the past.

Mr. ZIMMER. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, 5 years ago when the gentleman from Indiana and I were freshmen and both rookie members of what was then the Science, Space and Technology Committee, we took the well of this House to warn that the space station was going to be an orbiting white elephant, that it was going to be a black hole in space that would suck up billions of tax dollars and radically expand the deficit, and we said that it simply was not worth the money.

Now, 5 years later, I wish I could say that we were wrong, but every day provides us with new evidence that we were right. In a period of declining NASA budgets, the space station, which is now estimated by the GAO to cost more than $94 billion, has already begun to cannibalize more valuable programs in space.

Bill Clinton's proposed NASA budget drops from $13.8 billion next year to $11.6 billion in the year 2000, and when inflation is factored in, the cut is even deeper. The Republican budget provides somewhat more money for NASA, but even so, the amount of available funds

is drastically less than we thought it would be just a few years ago. There is simply not enough money to build the space station and to meet the Nation's more pressing needs for scientific research in space and on Earth.

According to this month's Scientific American, NASA's research and development outlay, bloated by the space station, represents almost 40 percent of the Nation's total nonhealth, nonmilitary research and development budget. The huge annual costs of the space station are sucking the life out of more cost effective programs of NASA, such as our magnificent orbiting observatories, unmanned interplanetary missions, the mission to planet Earth, as well as the development of cheaper launch systems which will make it possible for us someday to have an affordable space station.

This spring NASA has already used reserve funds to cover $144 million in cost growth of the space station program, $100 million is attributable to the program being behind schedule, and $44 million is due to the cost growth in some of the contracts. The Congressional Research Service reports that NASA officials are worried because these increases are occurring so early in the construction phase of the program.

□ 1630

There is one aspect that I think deserves particular attention this spring, and that is our relationship with Russia as a partner in the space station. When Bill Clinton and AL GORE proposed the Russian partnership, it generated greater support in this body because it seemed like a diplomatic coup. A symbol of the cold war was becoming a symbol of international cooperation.

But, unfortunately, it looks like our partnership with Russia is turning out to be a colossal mistake. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. HALL], says Russia always comes up with money when it is needed for space, and he refers us to a letter from the Vice President and promises from the Prime Minister of Russia. But the Russian Government has already delayed funding for its service module, a critical component of the space station, and work on the service module has fallen 5 months behind because the prime contractor has received only $10 million of the $55 million that has been requested.

The Russian Government still has not approved a timetable for making these payments. The Russian service module is scheduled for launch in 1998. If it is not delivered on time, it could devastate the schedule and the budget of the space station. NASA Administrator Dan Goldin has said, ''If we do not have the service module, we cannot complete construction of the space station.

If Russia withdraws from the station, NASA estimates that assembly would be delayed by 18 months and would cost the United States an additional $2 billion. Additionally, the United States and our remaining international partners would have to develop and fund a new escape vehicle.

Now, regardless of who wins the upcoming elections for President in Russia, it is clear we will be dealing with a nation that is characterized by internal political strife, by ultranationalism, authoritarianism, and perhaps insurgent imperialism as well as tremendous corruption. While we should, obviously, support Russia's struggle to become a democratic, capitalistic nation, we cannot afford to gamble $94 billion on it.

We just can not be certain that there is going to be a happy ending to the Russian melodrama. It is not too late to cut our losses on this space station. We should support the Roemer-Ganske amendment.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CRAMER].

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague and chairman of the Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics, and I again rise in opposition, strong opposition, to the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER].

This is, in fact, getting to be an annual ritual, I say to my colleague. I feel like one of those toys kids buy for Christmas, where you pull the back of the toy and the conversation comes out ''Save Space Station'', ''Save Space Station'', ''Kill Space Station'', ''Kill Space Station.''

There have been 10 votes on the floor of the House since 1991 over this issue. As I count it, there have been 32 total votes both in the committee and on the floor on this very issue. I think we have had a fair fight and I think, I say to my colleague, it is time for us to get off of NASA's back.

There is not an agency that has been under more scrutiny than NASA has been over the space station project. They have redesigned it since 1991, they have cut the budget, they have cut their personnel, they have come to Congress, they have dealt with us in an open, direct way, and yet we keep saying every year now is the time to turn our back on it.

We have invested billions of dollars. Our international partners have their partnership with us at stake in this project. They have invested billions of dollars. Now is not the time to turn our back on it.

I want to echo some of the comments that my colleague from Florida, Mr. WELDON, made about children and mathematics and science. We happen to have the international space camp there at the Marshall Space Flight Center, there in Huntsville in my district, and I get to go out there two or three times a year and see all these young people come in from all over the world with their parents, young people that are inspired by NASA and by the space program, young people that want to commit their careers to mathematics and science, young people that are using NASA as their image of what they want to do with their education and their careers. Let us not tell those young people that we are the kind of country that can in fact turn our back on this kind of investment, that can turn our back on the space station program.

Space station is the centerpiece of what NASA is all about. We have, in fact, many scientific projects that our doctors are planning to conduct on the space station. In my first year here I sat down with my colleague from Texas and a number of Texas doctors that were here that had joined with doctors from all over the world, and again they said the advances we had made in NASA technology that has given them benefits of robotics and surgery benefits and valves for artificial hearts, that we would lose our ability to complete those technologies if we, in fact, turn our back on the space station.

So I say we have had a fair fight. It is the irresponsible thing to do to turn your back on this project at this particular point. Let us kill this killing amendment and let us also kill the amendment that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] will offer next, which intends to maim the NASA space station program. Let us stop this and let us get on with it.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. STOCKMAN].

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have only been here a few short months, but I already feel like I know the gentleman from Indiana like a brother. We voted on this so many times now that I am being called an old bull in the Committee on Science.

This is something that we apparently do around here as a ritual, but let me tell my colleagues what this is really all about. When I was a child I looked at the TV and I watched us go up in Apollo to the Moon. I believed and saw and realized America was about something greater than I could ever imagine; that was America has a vision for the future.

America is a country and a nation seeking out new places. We were founded by a man that had that vision, and we continued throughout, as we looked to the West to develop, to search and look for new solutions, and to go, as they say in ''Star Trek,'' boldly where no one else has ever gone.

What we are saying here is if we eliminate space station, we eliminate the vision for America. We will not hear anybody coming up here and saying we will have a new solution. This is what we are going to do.

Mr. Chairman, of all the money we spend in Government research, I submit this is the most important thing we do: Create new cures for illnesses and develop new processes to which we can feed the world.

We are obligated. We do not have a choice in this. We have to build the space station, because up there in the skies are the solutions to here on

Earth. Mr. Chairman, there is no other purpose for the United States in this greatest quest.

Right now we look at the movies and the different things across the country and we know that Americans want a space station. We voted on this many times, and I submit to my friends that it is the wisest use of money. In fact, it has been researched that for every dollar we spend in space we get $7 back. That is not an expense, that is an investment.

As an accountant, I look and see things differently, and if my wife and I have trouble with our budget, we do not say, ''Honey, let us cut the bonds''; ''Honey, let us cut the investment.'' No, we say let us cut the expense, but do not cut the investments.

Space station is an investment in our future. It is an investment in the next generation for work. If we cut research and development, tomorrow's jobs will be in Japan and in Germany because they are continuing their space program. I submit we have to support this not for us, but for the next generation.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, may I ask how much time is remaining on both sides?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] has 13 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SENSENBRENNER] has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 minutes to just reply to some of the questions and comments that have been made.

Mr. Chairman, certainly this vote is a tough one. It is a tough one to eliminate the space station because people think that they do not want to make any votes in this body to move toward a balanced budget. There are some Democrats here in the House of Representatives that do not want to vote to cut anything. There are some Republicans in this body that will vote to cut everything but defense and the space station. We here, a bipartisan group, have come together and tried to put together an amendment based upon science and merit and the taxpayers' interests.

Now, this question is asked over and over and over, why do we keep doing this? Why do we keep making us go through this ritual every year of voting on the space station? It is because groups like the National Taxpayers Union support this amendment; Citizens Against Government Waste support this amendment; Citizens for a Sound Economy support this amendment; Taxpayers for Common Sense; the Concord Coalition. A bipartisan group of people dedicated to balancing the budget support this amendment.

This is not a bunch of Members of Congress running around trying to devise some way of balancing the budget on their own and taking away a vital project to the United States' research interests. These are grass roots organizations that feel that we should not be building this.

Now, again, I hear over and over from my colleagues this is great science. Again, I refer to Scientific American. High-tech products: Who is going to build them? Who is the company? According to this article, no large companies are currently interested in manufacturing in space. Where are they? How much money are they putting up? I want to know. That is a fair question.

Astronomy: No research currently planned, according to this article. Subsidies are required in biotechnology. They are not going to do it on their own. More taxpayers' money.

And when we talk about more taxpayers' money, we are coming back to the American taxpayer over and over and over again, with this budget going from $8 billion to $90 billion, whereas our taxpayers are sending the Russians $100 million of our hard-earned money, yet that is not going down. On the same hand, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SENSENBRENNER] said we are cutting NASA. Well, we are cutting NASA in all the wrong places to protect the space station.

The space station is cannibalizing, it is eating up these other programs, like Mission to Planet Earth, like new construction, like shuttle upgrades. These programs are being cut back and displaced. That is not in the best interest of good science.

So we have the space station within the science and the NASA project that is eating up more and more of our available good dollars to do good programs when NASA is doing some good things in areas like the Clementine project and the Hubble and the Galileo that went to Jupiter. We are doing some marvelous things in NASA, but we will not be doing anything in NASA before long if the space station continues to gobble up all these moneys.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues that we are not going to be disappointing the American taxpayer when we say that $14 billion already spent is going to be chased by another $70 billion before this is over. Let us save the taxpayer that $70 billion now.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, this is the key vote on the space station this year. I would hope that the committee will stay the course. I ask the membership to vote no on the Roemer amendment.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 127, noes 286, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 205]

AYES—127

Ackerman
Barrett (WI)
Bass
Bereuter
Blute
Brown (OH)
Camp
Christensen
Coble
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cummings
Danner
DeFazio
Dellums
Dickey
Dingell
Dixon
Doyle
Duncan
Durbin
Ensign
Eshoo
Evans
Fattah
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Furse
Ganske
Gibbons
Goodlatte
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hamilton
Herger
Hilleary
Hoekstra
Holden
Hutchinson
Inglis
Jacobs
Johnson (SD)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kildee
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
LaFalce
Lantos
Largent
Latham
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Longley
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey
Martini
McCarthy
McHugh
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Menendez
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Myrick
Nadler
Neumann
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Rivers
Roemer
Roukema
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sanford
Schroeder
Schumer
Shays
Shuster
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Solomon
Stark
Studds
Stupak
Towns
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Wamp
Waxman
Wilson
Woolsey
Yates
Zimmer

NOES—286

Abercrombie
Allard
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Campbell
Canady
Cardin
Castle
Chambliss
Chapman
Chenoweth
Chrysler
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coburn
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Cooley
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis
Deal
DeLauro
DeLay
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Doggett
Dooley
Dornan
Dreier
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fawell
Fazio
Filner
Flake
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Frost
Funderburk
Gallegly
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Green (TX)
Greene (UT)
Greenwood
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Heineman
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoke
Horn
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hunter
Hyde
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam

Johnston	Nethercutt	Souder
Jones	Ney	Spence
Kasich	Norwood	Spratt
Kelly	Ortiz	Stearns
Kennedy (RI)	Orton	Stenholm
Kennelly	Oxley	Stockman
Kim	Packard	Stokes
King	Parker	Stump
Knollenberg	Petri	Talent
Kolbe	Pickett	Tanner
LaHood	Pombo	Tate
LaTourette	Pryce	Tauzin
Laughlin	Quillen	Taylor (MS)
Lewis (CA)	Radanovich	Taylor (NC)
Lewis (GA)	Rahall	Tejeda
Lewis (KY)	Regula	Thomas
Lightfoot	Richardson	Thompson
Linder	Riggs	Thornberry
Livingston	Roberts	Thornton
Lofgren	Rogers	Thurman
Lucas	Rohrabacher	Tiahrt
Manton	Ros-Lehtinen	Torkildsen
Martinez	Rose	Torres
Mascara	Roth	Torricelli
Matsui	Roybal-Allard	Traficant
McCollum	Royce	Volkmer
McCrery	Salmon	Vucanovich
McDermott	Sawyer	Walker
McHale	Saxton	Walsh
McInnis	Scarborough	Ward
McIntosh	Schaefer	Waters
McKeon	Schiff	Watt (NC)
Meek	Scott	Watts (OK)
Metcalf	Seastrand	Weldon (FL)
Meyers	Sensenbrenner	Weldon (PA)
Mica	Serrano	Weller
Millender-McDonald	Shadegg	White
	Shaw	Whitfield
Miller (FL)	Sisisky	Wicker
Montgomery	Skaggs	Williams
Moorhead	Skeen	Wolf
Moran	Skelton	Wynn
Morella	Smith (NJ)	Young (AK)
Myers	Smith (TX)	Young (FL)
Neal	Smith (WA)	Zeliff

NOT VOTING—21

Chabot	Gutknecht	Mollohan
de la Garza	Hayes	Murtha
Doolittle	Houghton	Pastor
Fields (LA)	Jefferson	Paxon
Fields (TX)	Lincoln	Peterson (FL)
Foglietta	McDade	Quinn
Ford	Molinari	Wise

□ 1704

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Chabot for, with Mr. Gutknecht against.

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chairman, on recorded vote No. 205, I was incorrectly recorded as voting ''aye.'' Please let the RECORD show it was my intention to vote ''no.'' I have been and continue to be a strong supporter of the space station.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title II?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROEMER

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROEMER: Page 25, line 12, strike ''$1,840,200,000'' and insert in lieu thereof ''$1,765,200,000''.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, with the agreement of the gentleman from Indiana, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto be limited to 10 minutes equally divided between the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] and myself.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] will be recognized for 5 minutes, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SENSENBRENNER] will be recognized for 5 minutes.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the House has spoken on eliminating the space station in that last amendment. They do not think that we should eliminate the space station. This amendment that I offer now for the consideration of this House is not the elimination of the space station. It is very, very different than eliminating the space station. All this amendment offered by myself and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GANSKE] does is to cut $75 million out of a $2.1 billion allocation for the space station every single year. They get $2.1 billion. We are just saying in this year's budget cut 3 percent, $75 million out of $2.1 billion.

Now, when everything else is being cut around here, when we argued about a cut in Head Start for a month and a half, when we argued about cuts in Medicare, when we have been arguing about cuts, some of the safety nets for some of our senior citizens and some of our schoolchildren, certainly a space station that gets $2.1 billion each year should be a part of balancing the budget.

Now, the other side, Mr. Chairman, is going to say this is a killer amendment, this is going to kill the space station. A 3-percent cut? Three percent, $75 million out of $2.1 billion, is not going to cut this space station. It is not going to eliminate the space station. This is just a way of saying what is fair is fair in terms of getting to a balanced budget.

So in conclusion, before I yield a few seconds to the gentlewoman from Texas, I urge Members to consider voting not for an elimination of the space station but for a 3-percent cut in a $2.1 billion budget. This is what would be fair to the American people.

This is the fairest way to get to a balanced budget in the next 6 years. This is fair to NASA when they are cutting the shuttle, when they are cutting new construction and a host of other important programs. Do not let the space station continue to cannibalize the other programs in NASA.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] who is going to argue against me.

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank my good friend from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER]. There is not a person on the Committee on Science that I do not have the greatest respect for, like the gentleman and his integrity on this issue. But just like I disagreed with the gentleman on the previous vote and the previous effort to eliminate the space station, let me argue vigorously against the decrease because I would simply say that we cannot do any more.

The space station has already done as much cutting back through a series of restructuring and redesigns. We do not have any more slack in the program. What we have done is we have got a $2.1 billion program that will see us launch in about a year and a half. We have got a privatization program going on that efficiently uses both the civilian employees as well as our private sector employees or our civil service employees.

I will simply say to the gentleman from Indiana that we know that there are priorities, and those priorities have to be that we share with the American people. But I do believe that the space station creates jobs for the 21st century. I would ask my colleagues to vote against the gentleman from Indiana and support the space station.

Mr. Chairman, I have the utmost in respect for my fellow committee member and Democratic colleague, Mr. ROEMER, but I happen to believe that his position with regard to the space station is patently wrong. The Nation has always expanded its horizons and explored all its frontiers and the international space station *Alpha* continues in the tradition of American know-how and fortitude. *Alpha* has had a long and tortuous history, and finally, after many years, several redesigns, numerous congressional votes and several administrations, this Nation, along with its international partners are on the cusp of beginning the constant human presence in space; our final frontier. With the first momentous launch of *Alpha* hardware almost upon us, hardware is being cut, tested, and assembled even as we speak.

Alpha will allow us to do research that cannot be done here on mother Earth. The station will provide opportunities for research in the areas of materials, life sciences, physics, astronomy, and many other sciences. In addition, the very effort of designing and building the space station has created new building and engineering techniques, light-weight materials, and many new technologies.

NASA has accepted the funding cap Congress has held it to and has testified and pledged that barring unforeseen acts of God, they will complete the project on time and on budget. Period. Our international partners have promised their full economic and operational support, and NASA has a strong record of working with them to solve problems that arise as the program progresses.

I have always supported the space station, and I continue to do so, as evidenced by my vote today. I support the project, its goals, and its efforts. I also support the motivated and hard working employees of NASA, its many contractors, and all those involved in putting this project together. Let's honor them and

their efforts by voting against the Roemer amendments, one to eliminate the space station and the alternative to reduce its funds.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very deceptive amendment because it says that, if we just take a little bit of money out of a $2.1 billion program, we will be able to save some money and nothing is going to happen to it. That conclusion is absolutely false.

One of the reasons why NASA brought itself into disrepute in the last decade is that both NASA and Congress decided to reduce costs in many of the accounts. The reduced costs saved money in the next fiscal year, but it ended up resulting in projects not being completed and projects were completed late and cost overruns. All of the engineers stayed on the payroll to complete the project when the meter is ticking.

NASA Administrator Dan Goldin, who I believe has done a marvelous job in making NASA faster, better and cheaper, has written me a letter. I want to quote it in part. It says, simply put, an arbitrary reduction of $49 to $100 million means a slowdown of work. A slowdown of work means a schedule slip, and schedule slip means increased cost. Analytically, the impact to the station schedule is up to 3 months, referring to the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER], and the increased cost as much as $200 million, or at least twice the amount saved by the proposed amendment.

This is an unacceptable risk to our careful balance of hardware elements and payroll deployment. What the gentleman from Indiana is doing here today in the name of saving money is to set this House and NASA up for a complaint that the station experiences cost overruns because of the stretch-out and the schedule slip that is caused by the gentleman from Indiana's amendment. Then he will be back next year when the dogwood bloom and the tulips sprout saying NASA has not been able to hold to its schedule; there has been a cost overrun; let us kill the Space Station.

Well, the way to prevent the gentleman from making that argument is by rejection of his amendment today because the $75 million he proposes to save now will cost the taxpayers $200 million according to the NASA Administrator, who says he works for the President of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS].

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, heaven is not reached by a single bound. But we build the ladder by which we rise.

Mr. Chairman, the international space station has, and will continue, to provide Americans with substantial benefits in areas including medicine, the environment, transportation, and even communications. And the benefits don't just stop there. Since the inception of the U.S. space program, the secondary applications of space technology have yielded $9 to the economy for every tax dollar spent. The returns are clearly well worth the investment.

The partnerships created through the space station serve as an exceptional model for future international ventures. The partners of this program have already contributed billions of dollars to the space station, demonstrating their commitment to completing the largest cooperative science program in history.

The international space station will be a world-class orbiting laboratory, which will serve as a test-bed for hundreds of science and technology experiments that could not be conducted on this planet. We will learn new research techniques for growing tissue samples outside of the human body, for use in cancer research and bone injuries. There will be new understandings of the aging process, with subsequent developments in counteracting the effects of aging.

Imagine the possibilities of academic involvement in the space station's activities. Through the cooperative efforts of NASA and academic institutions throughout the world, the space station will launch future generations into a brand new dimension of learning about space science.

Author J.G. Holland said, "Heaven is not reached by a single bound. But we build the ladder by which we rise." We are currently building that ladder, in a series of bounds. What we find at the top of this ladder will inspire future generations to imagine, explore, and actually see, first-hand, the unprecedented advances that the space station will provide. We must retain funding for the space station. I urge a "no" vote on the Roemer-Ganske amendment.

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

□ 1715

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were ayes 146, noes 269, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 206]

AYES—146

Ackerman
Allard
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Bass
Bereuter
Blumenauer
Blute
Brown (OH)
Camp
Christensen
Clay
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Costello
Coyne
Cummings
Danner
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Dickey
Dingell
Dixon
Doyle
Duncan
Durbin
Ehrlich
Ensign
Evans
Fattah
Ford
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Furse
Ganske
Gibbons
Gillmor
Goodlatte
Gordon
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Hefley
Herger
Hilleary
Hinchey
Hoekstra
Holden
Hutchinson
Inglis
Jacobs
Johnson (SD)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
LaFalce
LaHood
Largent
Latham
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey
Martini
McCarthy
McHugh
McInnis
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Menendez
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Montgomery
Myrick
Nadler
Neumann
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Rivers
Roemer
Roukema
Rush
Sanders
Sanford
Schaefer
Schroeder
Schumer
Serrano
Shays
Shuster
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Spratt
Stark
Studds
Stupak
Tauzin
Thompson
Torkildsen
Towns
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Wamp
Waters
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Williams
Woolsey
Yates

NOES—269

Abercrombie
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Campbell
Canady
Cardin
Castle
Chambliss
Chapman
Chenoweth
Chrysler
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coleman
Combest
Condit
Cooley
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis
Deal
DeLay
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fawell
Fazio
Filner
Flake
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Frost
Funderburk
Gallegly
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gilchrest
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Green (TX)
Greene (UT)
Greenwood
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefner
Heineman
Hilliard
Hobson
Hoke
Horn
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hunter
Hyde
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (RI)
Kim
King
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Lantos
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
Lofgren
Longley
Lucas
Manton
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McHale
McIntosh
McKeon
Meek
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Moorhead
Morella
Myers
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Norwood
Ortiz
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Pastor
Petri
Pickett

Pombo	Shaw	Tiahrt
Pryce	Sisisky	Torres
Quillen	Skaggs	Torricelli
Radanovich	Skeen	Traficant
Rahall	Skelton	Volkmer
Regula	Smith (NJ)	Vucanovich
Richardson	Smith (TX)	Walker
Riggs	Smith (WA)	Walsh
Roberts	Solomon	Ward
Rogers	Souder	Watt (NC)
Rohrabacher	Spence	Weldon (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen	Stearns	Weldon (PA)
Rose	Stenholm	Weller
Roth	Stockman	White
Roybal-Allard	Stokes	Whitfield
Royce	Stump	Wicker
Sabo	Talent	Wilson
Salmon	Tanner	Wise
Sawyer	Tate	Wolf
Saxton	Taylor (MS)	Wynn
Scarborough	Taylor (NC)	Young (AK)
Schiff	Tejeda	Young (FL)
Scott	Thomas	Zeliff
Seastrand	Thornberry	Zimmer
Sensenbrenner	Thornton	
Shadegg	Thurman	

NOT VOTING—19

Chabot	Hayes	Moran
Conyers	Houghton	Murtha
de la Garza	Jefferson	Paxon
Fields (LA)	Lincoln	Peterson (FL)
Fields (TX)	McDade	Quinn
Foglietta	Molinari	
Gutknecht	Mollohan	

1733

Mr. SAWYER changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Ms. DELAURO and Mr. MARKEY changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title II?

If not, the Clerk will designate title III.

The text of title III is as follows.

TITLE III—UNITED STATES FIRE ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 301. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Fire Administration Authorization Act of 1996''.

SEC. 302. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 17(g)(1) of the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 (15 U.S.C. 2216(a)(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''and'' at the end of subparagraph (E);

(2) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (F) and inserting in lieu thereof ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(G) $27,560,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997.''.

SEC. 303. FIRE SAFETY SYSTEMS IN ARMY HOUSING.

Section 31(c)(1)(A)(ii)(II) is amended by inserting '', or in the case of housing under the control of the Department of the Army, 6 years after such date of enactment'' after ''date of enactment''.

SEC. 304. SUCCESSOR FIRE SAFETY STANDARDS.

The Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 is amended—

(1) in section 29(a)(1), by inserting '', or any successor standard thereto,'' after ''Association Standard 74'';

(2) in section 29(a)(2), by inserting ''or any successor standards thereto,'' after ''whichever is appropriate,'';

(3) in section 29(b)(2), by inserting '', or any successor standards thereto,'' after ''Association Standard 13 or 13–R'';

(4) in section 31(c)(2)(B)(i), by inserting ''or any successor standard thereto,'' after ''Life Safety Code),''; and

(5) in section 31(c)(2)(B)(ii), by inserting ''or any successor standards thereto,'' after ''Association Standard 101,''.

SEC. 305. TERMINATION OR PRIVATIZATION OF FUNCTIONS.

The Administrator of the United States Fire Administration shall transmit to Congress a report providing notice at least 60 days in advance of the termination or transfer to a private sector entity of any significant function of the United States Fire Administration.

SEC. 306. REPORT ON BUDGETARY REDUCTION.

The Administrator of the United States Fire Administration shall transmit to Congress, within three months after the date of the enactment of this Act, a report setting forth the manner in which the United States Fire Administration intends to implement the budgetary reduction represented by the difference between the amount appropriated to the United States Fire Administration for fiscal year 1997 and the amount requested in the President's budget request for such fiscal year. Such report shall be prepared in consultation with the Alliance for Fire and Emergency Management, the International Association of Fire Chiefs, the International Association of Fire Fighters, the National Fire Protection Association, the National Volunteer Fire Council, the National Association of State Fire Marshals, and the International Association of Arson Investigators.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to title III?

If not, the Clerk will designate title IV.

The text of title IV is as follows:

TITLE IV—NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 401. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Authorization Act of 1996''.

SEC. 402. DEFINITIONS.

For the purposes of this title, the term—

(1) ''Act of 1890'' means the Act entitled ''An Act to increase the efficiency and reduce the expenses of the Signal Corps of the Army, and to transfer the Weather Bureau to the Department of Agriculture'', approved October 1, 1890 (26 Stat. 653);

(2) ''Act of 1947'' means the Act entitled ''An Act to define the functions and duties of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for other purposes'', approved August 6, 1947 (33 U.S.C. 883a et seq.);

(3) ''Act of 1970'' means the Act entitled ''An Act to clarify the status and benefits of commissioned officers of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and for other purposes'', approved December 31, 1970 (33 U.S.C. 857–1 et seq.);

(4) ''Administrator'' means the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration; and

(5) ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Commerce.

Subtitle A—Atmospheric, Weather, and Satellite Programs

SEC. 411. NATIONAL WEATHER SERVICE.

(a) OPERATIONS AND RESEARCH.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to enable the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to carry out the operations and research duties of the National Weather Service, $445,668,000 for fiscal year 1997. Such duties include meteorological, hydrological, and oceanographic public warnings and forecasts, as well as applied research in support of such warnings and forecasts.

(b) SYSTEMS ACQUISITION.—(1) There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to enable the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to carry out the public warning and forecast systems duties of the National Weather Service, $64,991,000 for fiscal year 1997. Such duties include the development, acquisition, and implementation of major public warning and forecast systems, including the upgrade of computer facilities. None of the funds authorized under this subsection shall be used for the purposes for which funds are authorized under subsection (e). None of the funds authorized under this subsection shall be used for the purposes for which funds are authorized under section 102(b) of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Authorization Act of 1992 (Public Law 102–567). None of the funds authorized by such section 102(b) shall be expended for a particular NEXRAD installation unless—

(A) it is identified as a National Weather Service NEXRAD installation in the National Implementation Plan for modernization of the National Weather Service, required under section 703 of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Authorization Act of 1992 (Public Law 102–567); or

(B) it is to be used only for spare parts, not as an installation at a particular site.

(2) Of the amounts authorized under paragraph (1), $42,935,000 shall be for NEXRAD program management, operations, and maintenance.

(c) NEW NEXRAD INSTALLATIONS.—No funds may be obligated for NEXRAD installations not identified in the National Implementation Plan for 1996, unless the Secretary certifies that such NEXRAD installations can be acquired within the authorization of NEXRAD contained in section 102(b) of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Authorization Act of 1992.

(d) ASOS PROGRAM AUTHORIZATION.—Of the sums authorized in subsection (b)(1), $10,056,000 for fiscal year 1997 are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary, for the acquisition and deployment of—

(1) the Automated Surface Observing System and related systems, including multisensor and backup arrays for National Weather Service sites at airports; and

(2) Automated Meteorological Observing System and Remote Automated Meteorological Observing System replacement units.

and to cover all associated activities, including program management and operations and maintenance.

(e) AWIPS COMPLETE PROGRAM AUTHORIZATION.—(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), there are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary for all fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1996, an aggregate of $271,166,000, to remain available until expended, to complete the acquisition and deployment of the Advanced Weather Interactive Processing System and NOAA Port and to cover all associated activities, including program management and operations and maintenance through September 30, 1999.

(2) No funds are authorized to be appropriated for any fiscal year under paragraph (1) unless, within 60 days after the submission of the President's budget request for such fiscal year, the Secretary—

(A) certifies to the Congress that—

(i) the systems meet the technical performance specifications included in the system contract as in effect on August 11, 1995;

(ii) the systems can be fully deployed, sited, and operational without requiring further appropriations beyond amounts authorized under paragraph (1); and

(iii) the Secretary does not foresee any delays in the systems deployment and operations schedule; or

(B) submits to the Congress a report which describes—

(i) the circumstances which prevent a certification under subparagraph (A);

(ii) remedial actions undertaken or to be undertaken with respect to such circumstances;

(iii) the effects of such circumstances on the systems deployment and operations schedule and systems coverage; and

(iv) a justification for proceeding with the program, if appropriate.

(f) CONSTRUCTION OF WEATHER FORECAST OFFICES.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to enable the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to carry out construction, repair, and modification activities relating to new and existing weather forecast offices, $11,000,000 for fiscal year 1997. Such activities include planning, design, and land acquisition related to such offices.

(g) STREAMLINING WEATHER SERVICE MODERNIZATION.—

(1) REPEALS.—Sections 706 and 707 of the Weather Service Modernization Act (15 U.S.C. 313 note) are repealed.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—The Weather Service Modernization Act (15 U.S.C. 313 note) is amended—

(A) in section 702, by striking paragraph (3) and redesignating paragraphs (4) through (10) as paragraphs (3) through (9), respectively; and

(B) in section 703—

(i) by striking ''(a) NATIONAL IMPLEMENTATION PLAN.—'';

(ii) by striking paragraph (3) and redesignating paragraphs (4), (5), and (6) as paragraphs (3), (4), and (5), respectively; and

(iii) by striking subsections (b) and (c).

SEC. 412. ATMOSPHERIC RESEARCH.

(a) CLIMATE AND AIR QUALITY RESEARCH.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to enable the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to carry out its climate and air quality research duties, $99,272,000 for fiscal year 1997. Such duties include internannual and seasonal climate research and long-term climate and air quality research.

(b) ATMOSPHERIC PROGRAMS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to enable the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to carry out its atmospheric research duties, $43,182,000 for fiscal year 1997. Such duties include research for developing improved prediction capabilities for atmospheric processes, as well as solar-terrestrial research and services.

SEC. 413. NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL SATELLITE, DATA, AND INFORMATION SERVICE.

(a) SATELLITE OBSERVING SYSTEMS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to enable the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to carry out its satellite observing systems duties, $308,473,000 for fiscal year 1997, to remain available until expended. Such duties include spacecraft procurement, launch, and associated ground station systems involving polar orbiting and geostationary environmental satellites, as well as the operation of such satellites. None of the funds authorized under this subsection shall be used for the purposes for which funds are authorized under section 105(d) of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Authorization Act of 1992 (Public Law 102–567).

(b) POES PROGRAM AUTHORIZATION.—Of the sums authorized in subsection (a), there are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary $147,664,000 for fiscal year 1997, to remain available until expended, for the procurement and launch of, and supporting ground systems for, Polar Orbiting Environmental Satellites, K, L, M, N, and N[1].

(c) GEOSTATIONARY OPERATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL SATELLITES.—Of the sums authorized in subsection (a), there are authorized to be appropriated to the Administrator $70,757,000 for fiscal year 1997, to remain available until expended to procure up to three additional Geostationary Operational Environmental NEXT Satellites (GOES I–M clones), instruments, and supporting ground systems.

(d) NATIONAL POLAR-ORBITING OPERATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL SATELLITE SYSTEM PROGRAM AUTHORIZATION.—Of the sums authorized in subsection (a), there are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary, for fiscal year 1997, $39,500,000, to remain available until expended, for the procurement of the National Polar-Orbiting Operational Environmental Satellite System, and the procurement of the launching and supporting ground systems of such satellites.

(e) ENVIRONMENTAL DATA AND INFORMATION SERVICES.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to enable the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to carry out its environmental data and information services duties, $44,898,000 for fiscal year 1997. Such duties include climate data services, geophysical data services, and environmental assessment and information services.

Subtitle B—Marine Research

SEC. 421. NATIONAL OCEAN SERVICE.

(a) MAPPING AND CHARTING.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary, to enable the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to carry out mapping and charting activities under the Act of 1947 and any other law involving those activities, $36,500,000 for fiscal year 1997.

(b) GEODESY.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary, to enable the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to carry out geodesy activities under the Act of 1947 and any other law involving those activities, $20,163,000 for fiscal year 1997.

(c) OBSERVATION AND PREDICTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary, to enable the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to carry out observation and prediction activities under the Act of 1947 and any other law involving those activities, $11,000,000 for fiscal year 1997.

(2) OCEAN AND EARTH SCIENCES.—In addition to amounts authorized under paragraph (1), there are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary, to enable the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to carry out ocean and earth science activities, $3,000,000 for fiscal year 1997.

(d) ESTUARINE AND COASTAL ASSESSMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary, to enable the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to support estuarine and coastal assessment activities under the Act of 1947 and any other law involving those activities, $2,674,000 for fiscal year 1997.

(2) OCEAN ASSESSMENT.—In addition to amounts authorized under paragraph (1), there are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary, to enable the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to carry out the National Status and Trends Program, the Strategic Environmental Assessment Program, and the Hazardous Materials Response Program, $21,925,000 for fiscal year 1997.

(3) DAMAGE ASSESSMENT PROGRAM.—In addition to amounts authorized under paragraph (1), there are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary, to enable the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to carry out the Damage Assessment Program, $1,200,000 for fiscal year 1997.

SEC. 422. OCEAN AND GREAT LAKES RESEARCH.

(a) MARINE PREDICTION RESEARCH.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary, to enable the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to carry out marine prediction research activities under the Act of 1947, the Act of 1890, and any other law involving those activities, $14,808,000 for fiscal year 1997.

(b) NATIONAL SEA GRANT COLLEGE PROGRAM.—(1) Section 212(a) of the National Sea Grant College Program Act (33 U.S.C. 1131(a)) is amended to read as follows:

''(a) GRANTS AND CONTRACTS; FELLOWSHIPS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out sections 205 and 208, $34,500,000 for fiscal year 1997.''.

(2) Section 212(b)(1) of the National Sea Grant College Program Act (33 U.S.C. 1131(b)(1)) is amended by striking ''an amount'' and all that follows through ''not to exceed $2,900,000'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''$1,500,000 for fiscal year 1997''.

(3) Section 203(4) of the National Sea Grant College Program Act (33 U.S.C. 1122(4)) is amended by striking ''discipline or field'' and all that follows through ''public administration)'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''field or discipline involving scientific research''.

(c) COASTAL OCEAN PROGRAM.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary, to enable the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to carry out the Coastal Ocean Program, $17,300,000 for fiscal year 1997.

Subtitle C—Program Support

SEC. 431. PROGRAM SUPPORT.

(a) EXECUTIVE DIRECTION AND ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIVITIES.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary, to enable the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to carry out executive direction and administrative activities under the Act of 1970 and any other law involving those activities, $20,000,000 for fiscal year 1997.

(b) CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary, to enable the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to carry out central administrative support activities under the Act of 1970 and any other law involving those activities, $33,000,000 for fiscal year 1997.

(c) RETIRED PAY.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary, for retired pay for retired commissioned officers of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration under the Act of 1970, $7,706,000 for fiscal year 1997.

(d) MARINE SERVICES.—

(1) SERVICE CONTRACTS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law and subject to the availability of appropriations, the Secretary shall enter into contracts, including multiyear contracts, subject to paragraph (3), for the use of vessels to conduct oceanographic research and fisheries research, monitoring, enforcement, and management, and to acquire other data necessary to carry out the missions of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. The Secretary shall enter into these contracts unless—

(A) the cost of the contract is more than the cost (including the cost of vessel operation, maintenance, and all personnel) to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration of obtaining those services on vessels of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration;

(B) the contract is for more than 7 years; or

(C) the data is acquired through a vessel agreement pursuant to paragraph (4).

(2) VESSELS.—The Secretary may not enter into any contract for the construction, lease-purchase, upgrade, or service life extension of any vessel.

(3) MULTIYEAR CONTRACTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraphs (B) and (C), and notwithstanding section 1341

of title 31, United States Code, and section 11 of title 41, United States Code, the Secretary may acquire data under multiyear contracts.

(B) REQUIRED FINDINGS.—The Secretary may not enter into a contract pursuant to this paragraph unless the Secretary finds with respect to that contract that there is a reasonable expectation that throughout the contemplated contract period the Secretary will request from Congress funding for the contract at the level required to avoid contract termination.

(C) REQUIRED PROVISIONS.—The Secretary may not enter into a contract pursuant to this paragraph unless the contract includes—

(i) a provision under which the obligation of the United States to make payments under the contract for any fiscal year is subject to the availability of appropriations provided in advance for those payments;

(ii) a provision that specifies the term of effectiveness of the contract; and

(iii) appropriate provisions under which, in case of any termination of the contract before the end of the term specified pursuant to clause (ii), the United States shall only be liable for the lesser of—

(I) an amount specified in the contract for such a termination; or

(II) amounts that were appropriated before the date of the termination for the performance of the contract or for procurement of the type of acquisition covered by the contract and are unobligated on the date of the termination.

(4) VESSEL AGREEMENTS.—The Secretary shall use excess capacity of University National Oceanographic Laboratory System vessels where appropriate and may enter into memoranda of agreement with the operators of these vessels to carry out this requirement.

(5) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary, to enable the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to carry out marine services activities, $56,292,000 for fiscal year 1997.

(e) AIRCRAFT SERVICES.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary, to enable the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to carry out aircraft services activities (including aircraft operations, maintenance, and support) under the Act of 1970 and any other law involving those activities, $9,153,000 for fiscal year 1997.

(f) FACILITIES REPAIRS AND RENOVATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary, to enable the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to carry out facilities repairs and renovations, $7,546,000 for fiscal year 1997.

Subtitle D—Streamlining of Operations

SEC. 441. PROGRAMS.

(a) PROGRAMS.—No funds are authorized to be appropriated for the following programs and accounts:

(1) The National Undersea Research Program.

(2) The Fleet Modernization, Shipbuilding, and Construction Account.

(3) The Charleston, South Carolina, Special Management Plan.

(4) Chesapeake Bay Observation Buoys.

(5) Federal/State Weather Modification Grants.

(6) The Southeast Storm Research Account.

(7) National Institute for Environmental Renewal.

(8) The Lake Champlain Study.

(9) The Maine Marine Research Center.

(10) The South Carolina Cooperative Geodetic Survey Account.

(11) Pacific Island Technical Assistance.

(12) VENTS program.

(13) National Weather Service non-Federal, non-wildfire Fire Weather Service.

(14) National Weather Service Regional Climate Centers.

(15) National Weather Service Samoa Weather Forecast Office Repair and Upgrade Account.

(16) Dissemination of Weather Charts (Marine Facsimile Service).

(17) The Southeast United States Caribbean Fisheries Oceanographic Coordinated Investigations Program.

(18) National Coastal Research and Development Institute Account.

(19) Global Learning and Observations to Benefit the Environment program.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Science of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report certifying that all the programs listed in subsection (a) will be terminated no later than September 30, 1996.

(c) REPEAL OF SEA GRANT PROGRAMS.—

(1) REPEALS.—(A) Section 208(b) of the National Sea Grant College Program Act (33 U.S.C. 1127(b)) is repealed.

(B) Section 3 of the Sea Grant Program Improvement Act of 1976 (33 U.S.C. 1124a) is repealed.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 209 of the National Sea Grant College Program Act (33 U.S.C. 1128(b)(1)) is amended by striking ''and section 3 of the Sea Grant Program Improvement Act of 1976''.

(d) ADDITIONAL REPEAL.—The NOAA Fleet Modernization Act (33 U.S.C. 851 note) is repealed.

SEC. 442. LIMITATIONS ON APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) MAXIMUM AMOUNT.—No more than $1,765,359,000 are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary for fiscal year 1997, by this Act and any other Act, to enable the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to carry out all activities associated with Operations, Research, and Facilities.

(b) REDUCTION IN TRAVEL BUDGET.—Of the sums appropriated under this Act for Operations, Research, and Facilities, no more than $20,000,000 may be used for reimbursement of travel and related expenses for National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration personnel.

SEC. 443. TERMINATION OF THE CORPS OF COMMISSIONED OFFICERS.

(a) NUMBER OF OFFICERS.—Notwithstanding section 8 of the Act of June 3, 1948 (33 U.S.C. 853g), no commissioned officers are authorized for any fiscal year after fiscal year 1996.

(b) SEVERANCE PAY.—Commissioned officers may be separated from the active list of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. In lieu of separation pay, officers so separated shall be eligible only for severance pay in accordance with the terms and conditions of section 5595 of title 5, United States Code, and only to the extent provided in advance in appropriations Acts.

(c) TRANSFER.—(1) Subject to the approval of the Secretary of Defense and under terms and conditions specified by the Secretary, commissioned officers subject to subsection (a) may transfer to the armed services under section 716 of title 10, United States Code.

(2) Subject to the approval of the Secretary of Transportation and under terms and conditions specified by the Secretary, commissioned officers subject to subsection (a) may transfer to the United States Coast Guard under section 716 of title 10, United States Code.

(3) Subject to the approval of the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and under terms and conditions specified by that Administrator, a commissioned officer subject to subsection (a) may be employed by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration as a member of the civil service, if the Administrator considers that individual to be the best available candidate for the position. No new civil service position may be created pursuant to this paragraph.

(4) The Administrator shall, before December 1, 1996, transmit to the Committee on Science of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report listing all officers employed by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration under paragraph (3), a description of their responsibilities as members of the NOAA Corps, and a description of their responsibilities as civil service employees of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

(d) REPEALS.—(1) The following provisions of law are repealed:

(A) The Coast and Geodetic Survey Commissioned Officers' Act of 1948 (33 U.S.C. 853a–853o, 853p–853u).

(B) The Act of February 16, 1929 (Chapter 221, section 5; 45 Stat. 1187; 33 U.S.C. 852a).

(C) The Act of January 19, 1942 (Chapter 6; 56 Stat. 6).

(D) Section 9 of Public Law 87–649 (76 Stat. 495).

(E) The Act of May 22, 1917 (Chapter 20, section 16; 40 Stat. 87; 33 U.S.C. 854 et seq.).

(F) The Act of December 3, 1942 (Chapter 670; 56 Stat. 1038.

(G) Sections 1 through 5 of Public Law 91–621 (84 Stat. 1863; 33 U.S.C. 857–1 et seq.).

(H) The Act of August 10, 1956 (Chapter 1041, section 3; 70A Stat. 619; 33 U.S.C. 857a).

(I) The Act of May 18, 1920 (Chapter 190, section 11; 41 Stat. 603; 33 U.S.C. 864).

(J) The Act of July 22, 1947 (Chapter 286; 61 Stat. 400; 33 U.S.C. 873, 874).

(K) The Act of August 3, 1956 (Chapter 932; 70 Stat. 988; 33 U.S.C. 875, 876).

(L) All other Acts inconsistent with this subsection.

Following the repeal of provisions under this paragraph, all retirement benefits for the NOAA Corps which are in existence on September 30, 1996, shall continue to apply to eligible NOAA Corps officers and retirees.

(2) The effective date of the repeals under paragraph (1) shall be October 1, 1996.

(e) ABOLITION.—The Office of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Corps of Operations and the Commissioned Personnel Center are abolished effective September 30, 1996.

Subtitle E—Miscellaneous

SEC. 451. WEATHER DATA BUOYS.

(a) PROHIBITION.—It shall be unlawful for any unauthorized person to remove, change the location of, obstruct, willfully damage, make fast to, or interfere with any weather data buoy established, installed, operated, or maintained by the National Data Buoy Center.

(b) CIVIL PENALTIES.—The Administrator is authorized to assess a civil penalty against any person who violates any provision of this section in an amount of not more than $10,000 for each violation. Each day during which such violation continues shall be considered a new offense. Such penalties shall be assessed after notice and opportunity for a hearing.

(c) REWARDS.—The Administrator may offer and pay rewards for the apprehension and conviction, or for information helpful therein, of persons found interfering, in violation of law, with data buoys maintained by the National Data Buoy Center; or for information leading to the discovery of missing National Weather Service property or the recovery thereof.

SEC. 452. DUTIES OF THE NATIONAL WEATHER SERVICE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—To protect life and property and enhance the national economy, the

Secretary, through the National Weather Service, except as outlined in subsection (b), shall be responsible for—

(1) forecasts and shall serve as the sole official source of weather warnings;

(2) the issue of storm warnings;

(3) the collection, exchange, and distribution of meteorological, hydrological, climatic, and oceanographic data and information; and

(4) the preparation of hydrometeorological guidance and core forecast information.

(b) COMPETITION WITH PRIVATE SECTOR.—The National Weather Service shall not compete, or assist other entities to compete, with the private sector when a service is currently provided or can be provided by commercial enterprise, unless—

(1) the Secretary finds that the private sector is unwilling or unable to provide the services; and

(2) the service provides vital weather warnings and forecasts for the protection of lives and property of the general public.

(c) AMENDMENTS.—The Act of 1890 is amended—

(1) by striking section 3 (15 U.S.C. 313); and

(2) in section 9 (15 U.S.C. 317), by striking all after ''Department of Agriculture'' and inserting in lieu thereof a period.

(d) REPORT.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Science of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report detailing all National Weather Service activities which do not conform to the requirements of this section and outlining a timetable for their termination.

SEC. 453. NATIONAL OCEANOGRAPHIC PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM.

(a) PROGRAM REQUIRED.—(1) Subtitle C of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding after chapter 663 the following new chapter:

''CHAPTER 665—NATIONAL OCEANOGRAPHIC PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM

''Sec.

''7901. National Oceanographic Partnership Program.

''7902. National Ocean Research Leadership Council.

''7903. Ocean Research Partnership Coordinating Group.

''7904. Ocean Research Advisory Panel.

''§ 7901. National Oceanographic Partnership Program

''(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary of the Navy shall establish a program to be known as the 'National Oceanographic Partnership Program'.

''(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of the program are as follows:

''(1) To promote the national goals of assuring national security, protecting quality of life, and strengthening science and education through improved knowledge of the ocean.

''(2) To coordinate and strengthen oceanographic efforts in support of those goals by—

''(A) identifying and carrying out partnerships among Federal agencies, academia, industry, and other members of the oceanographic scientific community in the areas of data, resources, and education; and

''(B) reporting annually to Congress on the program.

''§ 7902. National Ocean Research Leadership Council

''(a) COUNCIL.—There is established a National Ocean Research Leadership Council (hereinafter in this chapter referred to as the ''Council'').

''(b) MEMBERSHIP.—The Council is composed of the following members:

''(1) The Secretary of the Navy, who shall be the chairman of the Council.

''(2) The Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, who shall be the vice chairman of the Council.

''(3) The Director of the National Science Foundation.

''(4) The Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

''(5) The Deputy Secretary of Energy.

''(6) The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

''(7) The Commandant of the Coast Guard.

''(8) The Director of the Geological Survey of the Department of the Interior.

''(9) The Director of the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency.

''(10) The Director of the Minerals Management Service of the Department of the Interior.

''(11) The President of the National Academy of Sciences, the President of the National Academy of Engineering, and the President of the Institute of Medicine.

''(12) The Director of the Office of Science and Technology.

''(13) The Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

''(14) One member appointed by the Chairman from among individuals who will represent the views of ocean industries.

''(15) One member appointed by the Chairman from among individuals who will represent the views of State governments.

''(16) One member appointed by the Chairman from among individuals who will represent the views of academia.

''(17) One member appointed by the Chairman from among individuals who will represent such other views as the Chairman considers appropriate.

''(c) TERM OF OFFICE.—The term of office of a member of the Council appointed under paragraph (14), (15), (16), or (17) of subsection (b) shall be two years, except that any person appointed to fill a vacancy occurring before the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term.

''(d) RESPONSIBILITIES.—The Council shall have the following responsibilities:

''(1) To establish the Ocean Research Partnership Coordinating Group as provided in section 7903.

''(2) To establish the Ocean Research Advisory Panel as provided in section 7904.

''(3) To submit to Congress an annual report pursuant to subsection (e).

''(e) ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than March 1 of each year, the Council shall submit to Congress a report on the National Oceanographic Partnership Program. The report shall contain the following:

''(1) A description of activities of the program carried out during the fiscal year before the fiscal year in which the report is prepared. The description also shall include a list of the members of the Ocean Research Partnership Coordinating Group, the Ocean Research Advisory Panel, and any working groups in existence during the fiscal year covered.

''(2) A general outline of the activities planned for the program during the fiscal year in which the report is prepared.

''(3) A summary of projects continued from the fiscal year before the fiscal year in which the report is prepared and projects expected to be started during the fiscal year in which the report is prepared and during the following fiscal year.

''(4) A description of the involvement of the program with Federal interagency coordinating entities.

''(5) The amounts requested, in the budget submitted to Congress pursuant to section 1105(a) of title 31 for the fiscal year following the fiscal year in which the report is prepared, for the programs, projects, and activities of the program and the estimated expenditures under such programs, projects, and activities during such following fiscal year.

''§ 7903. Ocean Research Partnership Coordinating Group

''(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Council shall establish an entity to be known as the 'Ocean Research Partnership Coordinating Group' (hereinafter in this chapter referred to as the 'Coordinating Group').

''(b) MEMBERSHIP.—The Coordinating Group shall consist of members appointed by the Council, with one member appointed from each Federal department or agency having an oceanographic research or development program.

''(c) CHAIRMAN.—The Council shall appoint the Chairman of the Coordinating Group.

''(d) RESPONSIBILITIES.—Subject to the authority, direction, and control of the Council, the Coordinating Group shall have the following responsibilities:

''(1) To prescribe policies and procedures to implement the National Oceanographic Partnership Program.

''(2) To review, select, and identify and allocate funds for partnership projects for implementation under the program, based on the following criteria:

''(A) Whether the project addresses critical research objectives or operational goals, such as data accessibility and quality assurance, sharing of resources, or education.

''(B) Whether the project has broad participation within the oceanographic community.

''(C) Whether the partners have a long-term commitment to the objectives of the project.

''(D) Whether the resources supporting the project are shared among the partners.

''(E) Whether the project has been subjected to adequate peer review.

''(3) To promote participation in partnership projects by each Federal department and agency involved with oceanographic research and by prescribing guidelines for participation in the program.

''(4) To submit to the Council an annual report pursuant to subsection (i).

''(e) PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM OFFICE.—The Coordinating Group shall establish, using competitive procedures, and oversee a partnership program office to carry out such duties as the Chairman of the Coordinating Group considers appropriate to implement the National Oceanographic Partnership Program, including the following:

''(1) To establish and oversee working groups to propose partnership projects to the Coordinating Group and advise the Group on such projects.

''(2) To manage peer review of partnership projects proposed to the Coordinating Group and competitions for projects selected by the Group.

''(3) To submit to the Coordinating Group an annual report on the status of all partnership projects and activities of the office.

''(f) CONTRACT AND GRANT AUTHORITY.—The Coordinating Group may authorize one or more of the departments or agencies represented in the Group to enter into contracts and make grants, using funds appropriated pursuant to an authorization for the National Oceanographic Partnership Program, for the purpose of implementing the program and carrying out the Coordinating Group's responsibilities.

''(g) FORMS OF PARTNERSHIP PROJECTS.—Partnership projects selected by the Coordinating Group may be in any form that the Coordinating Group considers appropriate, including memoranda of understanding, cooperative research and development agreements, and similar instruments.

''(h) ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than February 1 of each year, the Coordinating Group shall submit to the Council a report on the National Oceanographic Partnership Program. The report shall contain, at a minimum, copies of any recommendations or reports to the Coordinating Group by the Ocean Research Advisory Panel.

''§ 7904. Ocean Research Advisory Panel

''(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Council shall appoint an Ocean Research Advisory Panel (hereinafter in this chapter referred to as the 'Advisory Panel') consisting of not less than 10 and not more than 18 members.

''(b) MEMBERSHIP.—Members of the Advisory Panel shall be appointed from among persons who are eminent in the field of marine science, or related fields, and who are representative, at a minimum, of the interests of government, academia, and industry.

''(c) RESPONSIBILITIES.—(1) The Coordinating Group shall refer to the Advisory Panel, and the Advisory Panel shall review, each proposed partnership project estimated to cost more than $500,000. The Advisory Panel shall make any recommendations to the Coordinating Group that the Advisory Panel considers appropriate regarding such projects.

''(2) The Advisory Panel shall make any recommendations to the Coordinating Group regarding activities that should be addressed by the National Oceanographic Partnership Program that the Advisory Panel considers appropriate.''.

(2) The table of chapters at the beginning of subtitle C of title 10, United States Code, and at the beginning of part IV of such subtitle, are each amended by inserting after the item relating to chapter 663 the following:

''665. National Oceanographic Partnership Program ..... 7901''.

(b) INITIAL APPOINTMENTS OF COUNCIL MEMBERS.—The Secretary of the Navy shall make the appointments required by section 7902(b) of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a)(1), not later than December 1, 1996.

(c) INITIAL APPOINTMENTS OF ADVISORY PANEL MEMBERS.—The National Ocean Research Leadership Council established by section 7902 of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a)(1), shall make the appointments required by section 7904 of such title not later than January 1, 1997.

(d) FIRST ANNUAL REPORT OF NATIONAL OCEAN RESEARCH LEADERSHIP COUNCIL.—The first annual report required by section 7902(e) of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a)(1), shall be submitted to Congress not later than March 1, 1997. The first report shall include, in addition to the information required by such section, information about the terms of office, procedures, and responsibilities of the Ocean Research Advisory Panel established by the Council.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—No funds are authorized to be appropriated by this Act for the National Oceanographic Partnership Program for fiscal year 1997.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to title IV?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WAMP

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WAMP: Page 83, line 1, strike ''$445,668,000'' and insert in lieu thereof ''$450,668,000''.

Page 83, line 10, strike ''$64,991,000'' and insert in lieu thereof ''68,984,000''.

Page 85, line 10, insert ''of which up to $116,483,000 may be available for fiscal year 1997,'' after ''available until expended,''.

Page 88, line 18, strike ''$308,473,000'' and insert in lieu thereof ''$287,997,000''.

Page 89, line 22, strike ''$39,500,000'' and insert in lieu thereof ''$19,024,000''.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Chairman, as we move into this title, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, my amendment would add $20.5 million to the National Weather Service budget. Specifically, it increases the local warnings and forecast budget by $5 million. It increases the computer facility upgrades budget by $4 million. It increases the advanced weather interactive processing system budget by $11.5 million, for a total of $20.5 million.

The entire increase is offset by a reduction of $20.5 million in the polar convergent satellite program, which is a cost-shared program with the Defense Department. Since the defense authorization bill recently passed by this body only authorized $19 million for this program, yet the Committee on Science's mark still continued $39.5 million, we are reducing that amount to offset this increase, so that this increase is fully accounted for by spending reductions in other areas.

Why would we do this? The importance of the National Weather Service's modernization effort. We know great work has been accomplished through the Department of Commerce upgrading our National Weather Service system, implementing the NEXRAD radar system, in next generation radar nationwide.

Many outstanding Members of this body, like my friend, the gentleman from Huntsville, AL [Mr. CRAMER], have been very active in this effort. We are installing new, more powerful Doppler radars and state-of-the-art satellite across the Nation.

However, there are some areas that have been identified as being deficient, where the service is degraded because of soft spots in the system, and the Department of Commerce actually recognized that three of those areas exist in southeast Tennessee and northeast Alabama, one area, actually two congressional districts, the gentleman from Alabama, Mr. CRAMER's, and mine, but one area; plus Indiana and Arkansas.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SOUDER] and the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HUTCHINSON] are affected as well, and we have Doppler radar needs that the Department of Commerce has certified to build these radars in our region, because the radars that are part of the NEXRAD system are too far from our area and are too high up in the air to cover the storms that blow through our region.

Specifically, this last weekend, again, tornadoes touched down in Bradley County, TN that were not detected from Morristown, TN because the radar is too high, so new Dopplers that are programmed in the system for these three areas have been approved and certified by the Department of Commerce.

Mr. Chairman, one of the best nonpartisan things we do here is the health and safety of the citizens of this country, and local weather forecasting is as close to the ground as it gets. It is important that we come together in a bipartisan way. I did not just want to increase spending, so we offset it. We worked with the chairman of the Committee on Science. We hope that the committee, the full committee here will support this reasonable increase in funding, since it is offset with another program that obviously does not need the money, based on our latest defense authorization bill.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF CALIFORNIA AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WAMP

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as a substitute for the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROWN of California as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. WAMP: Page 83, line 1, strike ''$445,668,000'' and insert in lieu thereof ''$471,672,000.''

Mr. BROWN of California (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment to the amendment in order to fully restore funding for the critical personnel of the National Weather Service. H.R. 3322 proposes a $26 million reduction from this account which I believe will seriously jeopardize the safety and well being of every American.

We have been informed by the National Weather Service that in order to implement this reduction, they would have to consider elimination of midnight shift personnel in every weather forecast office and eliminate rush hour forecast products nationally. In addition they would have to close planned warning and forecast offices and would have to defer the opening of any additional NEXRAD sites that were recently identified as necessary by the National Research Council. There is no question that the proposed cuts in H.R. 3322 would endanger public safety.

As reflected in the President's request, the National Weather Service is already committed to permanent reductions of over $25 million in base operations. They need, however, to make the transition to the modernized weather office system in order to realize these savings. Without the necessary operational infrastructure and personnel in place, the National Weather Service will not be able to utilize the full operational capabilities envisioned by the modernization plan.

My amendment does not attempt to numerically offset this increase with any reduction

elsewhere in the bill. I want to point out that the bill we are considering today already seriously underfunds NOAA and the National Weather Service. The bill already reduces NOAA's programs in our jurisdiction by $155 million and will lead to great difficulty in carrying out critical satellite, weather forecasting, and research activities. To propose an offset would only legitimize this ill conceived plan to distort our national priorities.

I also point out that yesterday on this same bill, Mr. SCHIFF offered an amendment to raise funding for the National Science Foundation by $40 million with no offset. This had the full backing of the Republicans and passed easily. I make this point to illustrate the fiction we are being asked to participate in by pretending there is some magic number that in some way limits us in this authorization. This fiction seems to be only enforced when it is convenient.

I will close by reminding my colleagues that the serious nature of this problem we are trying to address here has been clear since this bill was first brought before the committee. I have tried on several occasions now to offer a substitute that addresses this and a number of other problems in the bill. These attempts have failed along party lines.

I commend the gentleman from Tennessee for his attempt at this late date to fix this problem. However, my fear is that his amendment does not fully address the problem. If his amendment passes in its current form, the National Weather Service will still face the necessity to reduce service to the public. In addition, the gentleman may only be compounding the problem by cutting elsewhere in the bill. I urge my colleagues to support my substitute to his amendment. Lets fully fund the Weather Service Operations.

Mr. Chairman, at the risk of appearing to be cynical, let me try and interpret what has been happening in connection with this legislation.

The bill before us, which was reported out of the full committee with little or no change from the chairman's recommendations, contained a number of problems. I sought to offer a substitute in the full committee, which was rejected on basically a party line vote, which corrected all of the problems that have been brought up here, and which we are now acting on.

Yesterday the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SCHIFF] found a little problem in the National Science Foundation budget, and he offered a $40 million add-on which we had offered in the full committee and it had been rejected. He did not have an offset to it, but he admitted that we really did not need an offset, so we proceeded to adopt that.

The gentleman from Florida [Mr. WELDON] offered this morning an amendment to add $81.5 million back for NASA personnel, when they finally discovered that the President's budget provided the funding that was needed, and if they cut $81 million out of it, it would result in layoffs and furloughs, which would be bad for a lot of people's health.

The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. WAMP] now has discovered that the $26 million which I recommended be put back in the full committee really is necessary to protect the health and welfare of the citizens of our districts and our constituents. Part of the game here is both sides are trying to protect vulnerable Members by allowing them to offer amendments which will be popular in their districts. Of course, on our side, we do the same thing. We try and put the other side in the position of voting for something that will be very bad for them in their district.

After finally weighing the situation, we have decided that there are at least three or four instances in which the Republicans really cannot stand the heat from the mistakes in this bill, that is, from the political mistakes in this bill, so they are going to try and put the money back in to take care of the situation.

They are going to argue in front of God and everybody that this is based upon some sudden new insight, but what it really amounts to is they have decided that they do not want to take the political heat that they are going to get from, say, cutting back on weather service facilities and personnel in a district highly dependent on it, or cutting back on personnel for a major NASA lab in a district in which the economy depends on it, or a major energy lab. That is the way politics works, and we might as well be frank and admit it.

When we on our side try to point out that we had corrected all of these in our substitute, they say you did not do it the right way, or something like that. Of course, they are using the fact that our figures do not conform to their budget, as if this was holy writ, and therefore, anything that we do is obscene, until they find out that it is pretty nice to have something close to our budget in order to elect one of their Members.

Mr. Chairman, I hate to say this, because it makes me look so cynical and self-serving, but I thought that we ought to have that on the record. My substitute is very simple. It provides for the same additions that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. WAMP] has, or it fully funds the restoration of the personnel that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. WAMP] only partially funds and which was in the President's budget.

It does not attempt to offset this with a numerical increase to offset it from another portion of the bill. It does, however, have in it the provision that the gentleman from Tennessee makes reference to. There is no offset. We have decided to be honest and not have an offset. The gentleman from Tennessee found an offset in a program, polar orbiting satellites, which the agency had decided not to do anything about for the next 2 years anyway, so he is going to reduce the budget by that amount, which is a sort of a subterfuge, but if he can get away with it, fine.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the Members to be honest and to accept my substitute, which provides the same benefit that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. WAMP] does, and does not go through the motions of trying to offset this with some more or less specious offset, which is unnecessary, even if it was a real offset.

□ 1745

I know that since a part of the majority's position is going to be to wave the flag and claim that they have to have these offsets in order to balance the budget, which we pointed out means to increase the budget where they want and cut it where we want, I urge that Members support my substitute, recognizing that I probably will not win.

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

The gentleman from California does not need to be cynical about the process. The fact is what he is watching is the legislative process at work. Members do have a right under an open rule to come out here and offer amendments. We have to decide whether or not to accept some of those amendments or to fight some of those amendments.

It is not anything different than what goes on in Congress. In fact, it is the essence of the process to make some of these decisions as a Congress, and some of them change my bill, some of them enhance the bill. They in fact are an important part of how we do legislation. I do not resent the fact that the bill gets changed a little bit along the way. It is the way the process works. I have even happily accepted some amendments along the way because I thought they were the right things to do.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to have the gentleman acknowledge this. I am not trying to present this as some perverse or evil process. I just wonder why it is when I offered the same amendments in committee the Chair did not have the perspicacity to realize that they might be necessary.

Mr. WALKER. When the gentleman offered them in committee, in some cases we did not have the full information available to us to evaluate it. In other cases he offered them as a part of a substitute that contained many, many other items. In a number of the cases when the gentleman referred to the fact that he had offered them in committee, he did not offer separate amendments on the subject matters. What he offered was a substitute that covered a whole variety of items, and we rejected his substitute as going the wrong direction.

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

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Chairman, I just want to point out that at the full committee level I was on record, and I

think our chairman will remember, stating that I wanted to address this on the House floor and I would be looking actively for an offset so that we could do the responsible thing. But I specifically stated at the markup I wanted this addressed and detailed what I wanted addressed on the House floor.

So it was not like it mysteriously appeared, Mr. BROWN, and in all fairness Mr. CRAMER and I think it worked in about the most bipartisan way here. Let us not bring partisanship into this issue of NEXRAD radar system, please. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. WALKER. The gentleman is correct. He did reserve his rights for the floor. I am pleased that we were able to work something out. I am glad to modify the bill to do that.

It seems to me, though, that we do not want to do the Brown substitute. As the gentleman from California himself has said, this is not offset. It will increase the National Weather Service local warning and forecast budget by $26 million. That means that we are not dealing in the same manner that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. WAMP] has done, in the responsible way of assuring that we do this with an offset.

Unlike the Wamp amendment, which adds money for both modernization and local warnings and forecasts, the Brown amendment eliminates all the reductions that the Committee on Science made to the National Weather Service headquarters and specialized weather programs, and does not include any money for the modernization program. That strikes me as being an odd set of priorities. What you are doing is plusing up the account for the headquarters staff and overhead while not putting the money into the modernization program that the Weather Service regards as its most important priority. So the Wamp amendment in fact moves us toward a much stronger content level on it.

Why reduce the headquarters staff? Why do we think that is important? We are going along there with the inspector general. This is not some ideological kick. The inspector general said in his most recent report that the National Weather Service headquarters staff could be identified as having over $32 million in potential savings, and those reductions can be made in headquarters staff.

Why is that the case? Because as they modernize the Weather Service, the fact is that they are able to utilize some equipment to replace people, and so the modernization program is actually resulting in the ability to reduce headquarters staff. That is what is reflected in what we have done in the bill, what is reflected in the Wamp amendment, and we think that it makes sense to go along with what the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. WAMP] wants to do here.

We believe that, in the case of the Brown substitute, that it puts the money that is not offset into a bureaucracy. We think that the money should go into some things with regard to headquarters, but there also ought to be money for modernization, and I thank the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. WAMP] for what he has done.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to do something carefully here. I want to speak on behalf of the Brown substitute and on behalf of the Wamp amendment as well. I support the Brown substitute now because I supported the Brown substitute for the entire bill. If that fails, then of course I will support the Wamp proposal as well. I am concerned about the budget impact on the National Weather Service.

I want to reaffirm what the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. WAMP] has said. We are neighbors there, from north Alabama, northeast Alabama, up there into Tennessee. We have struggled hard to make sure our very vulnerable area of the country is in fact included in the National Weather Service's modernization plan. Budget has impact on the service that the Weather Service can offer to our area so we are concerned not only about the placement of a new NEXRAD, one placement that will accommodate two congressional districts and we have worked hard together to make sure that we not have to cause a budget item that would reflect for two NEXRAD's but that we join together and accomplish that with one placement of NEXRAD and I think we have in fact worked in a model bipartisan way toward that and will accomplish that.

What I am concerned about that causes me to support the Brown substitute as well, and, if that fails, as well as what the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. WAMP] is proposing here today is that beyond just the NEXRAD's, we have got a personnel issue that if we deny the National Weather Service this kind of budget item, then we are saying to them that they will have to direct the consequences down to the level of midnight forecasts, they will have to absorb this impact somewhere outside of headquarters, somewhere in the field as well. So I think both of these approaches will accomplish what I want to see accomplished. I think the Brown substitute does it in a much more complete way than what the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. WAMP] is proposing, but I am concerned enough about the impact of what we do to stand up here and to say support the Brown substitute first and, if that fails, support the Wamp amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, yesterday I referred to the Committee on Science as a do-little committee that was, through this piece of legislation, offering a do-little agenda for this country when it comes to job creation through invigorating our science and technology policy, going absolutely the wrong direction if our goal is to have more high-paying jobs in this country based on science and technology.

I think the Wamp amendment today provides another example of the do-little legacy of this committee, because it is attempting to repair changes in our science policy that should never have been made in the first place. In any case, I was not here on the floor a little earlier this afternoon when the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], the chairman of the committee, asserted that my comments of yesterday were inaccurate. He particularly took umbrage at my claim that the committee had just one committee report to its credit for all of 1995. Take note he did not disagree with my comment that the committee had absolutely zero, that is, a big goose egg when it comes to legislation signed into law through its work last year but he did quarrel with the fact that they had only one committee report. He said they had 16. In fact, I have the Committee on Science calendar for last year, and it confirms that there was only one committee report for all of last year. This is distinguished, of course, as my remarks did, from those reports associated with the filing of more and more of these bills to fulfill the Gingrich ideological agenda.

A committee report, for those who do not understand the difference, is a matter of oversight, that we in Congress have a responsibility to exercise oversight over NOAA, over all of these various bureaucracies to see that they are doing their job. But this committee, unlike the time when my good friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN], chaired the committee and had 13 oversight reports of committees, has not kept pace with its work.

True, the chairman of the Committee on Science has been very involved in oversight of the Clinton administration, looking for any political examples it can find that might be useful in this year's elections. Perhaps that provides some of the reason why just merely pursuing good science has gotten second shift when it comes to oversight.

So I stand by my comments of yesterday regarding the lack of productivity of a committee that ought to be central to a jobs policy for this country. But I would cite this Wamp amendment as an example of more of the problem that when you pursue political rhetoric and political ideology over good science, you make mistakes like this. I believe that it is fair to say that there were not but a handful, if that, of our colleagues on the Republican side who had the slightest idea what was being done in committee when these cuts to NOAA were made and now that probably one or two people in the body have the slightest idea whether the restoration level that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. WAMP]

is proposing is the appropriate level or whether the offset that he would propose will guarantee the integrity of NOAA services. And, of course, since the Committee on Science rarely meets, it goes 4 or 5 months without even convening, there is no committee record of any type. There has not been bringing in any expert or any citizen concerned with this to look at the NOAA issues. So we have no evidence or record upon which to support this amendment.

I would say that what we have had in the Committee on Science is amply demonstrated by this, not legislation that could be passed on a bipartisan basis as occurred under both Republicans and Democrats in previous administrations, not committee reports exercising the oversight policy; rather, we have just had an example that the main kind of science coming out of this committee is political science and we have had more excellence in pursuit of error.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. WAMP].

The amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. WAMP].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title IV?

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to engage in a colloquy with the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, the chairman of the Committee on Science.

Mr. Chairman, I am greatly concerned that the replacement of the Erie Weather Service Office at Erie, PA, with radar service from Pittsburgh, Cleveland, and Buffalo would increase weather-related accidents on Pennsylvania's north coastal region. Reports issued by both the General Accounting Office and the National Research Council support this conclusion by identifying radar coverage gaps and other shortcomings with the new nationwide NEXRAD coverage system. After the terrible consequences of unforeseen tornadoes in 1985 that devastated a number of communities in our region and the ever-present danger of unpredictable lake-effect weather on Lake Erie, the communities of northwest Pennsylvania in my view must have weather service they can depend upon.

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

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I want to assure the gentleman that the National Weather Service is studying any potential impact that a removal of the Erie weather station would have on local forecasting. In the meantime, Erie will continue to receive its current radar coverage until January 1998 when the National Weather Service will complete its study. At that point the National Weather Service will recommend whatever arrangement is best to guarantee the continued safety of the local communities in northwestern Pennsylvania.

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. I appreciate receiving those assurances from the distinguished chairman of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title IV?

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

Mr. Chairman, there are many problems with this legislation. One of the most significant is the lack of title dealing with the Department of Energy's R&D programs. Why not? I believe the explanation is that a bipartisan majority of the committee, and probably the House, would fund them at a much higher level than the chairman would like.

These members recognize the role energy plays in preserving our economic well-being and national security. What Mr. WALKER purports to be the relevant House action in this area guts funding for almost every sector of energy research: conservation, solar and renewable, nuclear—including fusion—as well as important fossil R&D efforts to reduce the environmental impacts of what will continue to be the source of over 85 percent of energy production.

If we were to follow the Walker budget, we would be practically zeroing out conservation, solar and renewables, and fossil energy.

When we marked up this bill in committee, we were promised a subcommittee markup on an energy authorization in the ensuing weeks. This did not happen.

Then, when H.R. 3322 was originally scheduled for floor action, we were told that there would be a subcommittee markup the following week.

It would be cynical to suggest that this announcement was made merely to allay the concerns of numerous members of the majority who are concerned over the chairman's vision of energy R&D.

However, it is interesting to note that once H.R. 3322 was pulled from the floor schedule the energy markup was canceled.

It is also interesting to point out that it has been 3 weeks since the Energy and Environment Subcommittee has met for any reason, so it is not as if we have been overwhelmed by the schedule. Perhaps someone who is setting the committee's schedule could tell us when energy policy is going to be a high enough priority for us to act.

When we began the debate on this bill, the committee chairman claimed that we handled the energy accounts on the floor last year. He refers us back to H.R. 2405, which the House passed last October. Let me remind Members that the genesis of this so-called vision of our energy future—a vision that calls for a $500 million reduction in energy research—not from the request, but from fiscal year 1996—was based on an amendment that the gentleman from Pennsylvania brought to the floor on his own and did not reflect the will of the committee.

Let me quote Mr. WALKER from the debate over the inclusion of fiscal year 1997 authorization in the Walker amendment, Science Committee Chairman WALKER stated, ''I never contended that I brought this matter before the Committee. I brought it to the floor as my own amendment.''—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, October 11, 1995—H9847.

The claim of the gentleman from Pennsylvania that, because he wrote a fiscal year 1997 energy R&D budget on the floor last October, there is no need to review these accounts is incredible. This is an absolute contradiction to our treatment of the National Science Foundation budget, which like the DOE accounts received 2 year authorization in last year's science authorization, but unlike DOE, which is apparently not worthy of our consideration, the NSF budget was included in H.R. 3322.

What is the reason for doing so? I imagine it may have something to do with the lack of support for the chairman's vision of our future energy research needs.

I had considered offering an amendment on energy R&D, but have decided not to, as it has become apparent that it is a waste of the Members' time to in any way improve upon this meaningless and irrelevant legislation.

Instead, I will submit for the RECORD, at the proper place and time, a letter to Appropriations Chairman LIVINGSTON from members of the Science Committee, Republicans and Democrats, expressing our concern over energy R&D authorization levels and the continued irrelevance of the back-of-an-envelope budget the committee chairman has endorsed.

In closing, I want to reemphasize that this is in no way an ''Omnibus'' bill. Semi-omnibus would be a more accurate description, and in many instances, what is contained in the bill is not worthy of our support.

Mr. Chairman, I include the following for the RECORD:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 7, 1996.

Hon. BOB LIVINGSTON,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As Members of the House Science Committee, we are writing to express our concern over House-passed authorization levels contained in H.R. 2405 for civilian research and development activities for the Department of Energy.

Even if there is no further action by the Science Committee on its DOE accounts, your Committee needs to understand that the Science Committee provided for flexibility in the setting of FY 1997 funding levels in H.R. 2405. This is due to the continued relevance of the Davis amendment to these authorizations. The Davis amendment clarifies that authorization for these programs should be reconsidered if in the budget and appropriations process, more funds become available.

Last October, when the House considered H.R. 2405, an amendment offered by Chairman Walker was adopted which raised authorization levels for FY 1996 to meet the previously appropriated level, but also set FY 1997 levels. While the action taken regarding FY 1996 levels was in keeping with the Davis Amendment adopted during Science Committee mark-up, the Committee had not considered DOE funding for FY 1997 at all.

In the debate over the inclusion of FY 1997 authorization in the Walker amendment, Science Committee Chairman Walker stated, ''I never contended that I brought this matter before the Committee. I brought it to the

floor as my own amendment.'' (Congressional Record, October 11, 1995—H9847)

Since the House acted on H.R. 2405, there have been several developments which warrant reconsideration of these numbers. For example, the Congressional Budget Office has revised its economic assumptions, resulting in greater flexibility in making discretionary spending decisions. Also, the Energy & Environment Subcommittee has held a series of hearings on energy research and development, which have proven to be very helpful in our ability to judge the value of the various programs in question.

We are very grateful to Energy & Environment Subcommittee Chairman Rohrabacher for scheduling these hearings. However, they will be for naught if the Committee is unable to act on this hearing record in a timely manner.

The need to revisit DOE R&D funding is apparently shared by Chairman Walker and Subcommittee Chairman Rohrabacher, who have publicly pledged their willingness to move a FY 1997 DOE R&D authorization bill. While we support this action, we are concerned that the mark-up of this legislation will occur too late to influence your Committee's consideration of these accounts.

We recommend that your Committee not consider itself bound in any way by the FY 1997 levels passed in HR 2405. Energy policy is too important to our national security and economic strength to be based on last year's information. Thus, Congress should not act presumptively to drastically reduce these vital accounts.

Sincerely,

Mike Doyle; Sherwood Boehlert; John Tanner; John W. Olver; Steve Largent; George E. Brown, Jr.; Tim Roemer; Eddie Bernice Johnson; Paul McHale; Zach Wamp; Lynn N. Rivers; Zoe Lofgren; Bart Gordon; Jane Harman; Tim Holden; Mike Ward; Robert E. Cramer, Jr.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title IV?

If not, the Clerk will designate title V.

The text of title V is as follows:

TITLE V—ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

SEC. 501. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Environmental Research, Development, and Demonstration Authorization Act of 1996''.

SEC. 502. DEFINITIONS.

For the purposes of this title, the term—

(1) ''Administrator'' means the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency;

(2)''Agency'' means the Environmental Protection Agency; and

(3) ''Assistant Administrator'' means the Assistant Administrator for Research and Development of the Agency.

SEC. 503. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Administrator $487,126,600 for fiscal year 1997 for Science and Technology activities, including program management and support, in the areas specified in subsection (b).

(b) SPECIFIC PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES.—Of the amount authorized in subsection (a), there are authorized to be appropriated the following:

(1) For air related research, $74, 119,900.

(2) For global change research, $1,400,000.

(3) For water quality related research, $26,294,000.

(4) For drinking water related research, $26,593,700.

(5) For toxic substances related research, $12,341,500.

(6) For lab and field expenses, $73,031,600.

(7) For headquarters expenses of the Office of Research and Development, $9,254,800.

(8) For multimedia related research expenses, $174,060,100, of which $5,000,000 shall be for graduate student fellowships.

(9) For program management expenses, $6,399,000.

(10) For pesticide related research, $20,632,000.

(11) For research related to hazardous waste, $12,000,000.

(12) For environmental research laboratories, $51,000,000.

(c) ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Administrator for fiscal year 1997—

(1) for oil pollution related research, $2,076,900; and

(2) for research related to leaking underground storage tanks, $769,000.

(d) LIMITATIONS.—No funds are authorized to be appropriated by this title for—

(1) the Environmental Technology Initiative;

(2) the Climate Change Action Plan;

(3) Indoor Air Research;

(4) North Dakota Center for Air Toxic Metals Research;

(5) drinking water research conducted by the American Water Works Association Research Foundation, other than amounts awarded through a competitive process;

(6) the Water Environmental Research Foundation;

(7) the National Urban Air Toxic Research Center;

(8) the Gulf Coast Hazardous Substances Research Center;

(9) urban waste management research at the University of New Orleans, other than amounts awarded through a competitive process;

(10) the Resources and Agricultural Policy Systems Program at Iowa State University or

(11) the Oil Spill Remediation Research Center.

SEC. 504. SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH REVIW.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall assign to the Assistant Administrator the duties of—

(1) development a strategic plan for scientific and technical research activities throughout the Agency;

(2) integrating that strategic plan into ongoing Agency planning activities; and

(3) reviewing all Agency research to ensure the research—

(A) is of high quality; and

(B) does not duplicate any other research being conducted by the Agency.

(b) REPORT.—The Assistant Administrator shall transmit annually to the Administrator and to the Committee on Science of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environmental and Public Works of the Senate a report detailing—

(1) all Agency research the Assistant Administrator finds is not of sufficiently high quality; and

(2) all Agency research the Assistant Administrator finds duplicates other Agency research.

SEC. 505. GRADUATE STUDENT FELLOWSHIPS.

In carrying out the graduate student fellowship program for which funds are authorized to be appropriated by this title, the Administrator shall ensure that any fellowship awarded to a student selected after the date of the enactment of this Act is used only to support scientific research that would further missions of the Office of Research and Development in fields in which there exists or is projected to exist a shortage in the number of scientists.

SEC, 506, SCIENCE ADVISORY BOARD.

(a) ANNUAL REPORT.—The Science Advisory Board shall submit to Congress and to the Administrator an annual report that contains the views of the Science Advisory Board on proposed research programs as described in the President's budget for research, development, and demonstration activities at the Environmental Protection Agency. Such report shall be submitted to Congress as soon as practicable after the submission of the President's budget to Congress. The Administrator shall cooperate with the Director of the Science Advisory Board, particularly with respect to the timely provision of budget information to the Science Advisory Board, to allow the Science Advisory Board to carry out its duties under this subsection.

(b) EVALUATION.—The Science Advisory Board shall conduct periodic evaluations of selected areas of the current and planned research development, and demonstration activities of the Environmental Protection Agency. The areas of evaluation shall be selected by the Science Advisory Board in consultation with the Administrator, the Office of Research and Development, other Agency programs and appropriate committees of the Congress. Reports containing the Science Advisory Board's evaluations and recommendations shall be filed with such committees and the Administrator. The Administrator shall provide to such committees a written response to the Science Advisory Board's evaluation and recommendations within 60 days after the Science Advisory Board's report has been submitted.

(c) REVIEW OF CERTAIN RESEARCH ACTIVITIES.—The Science Advisory Board shall annually review the research activities of the Environmental Protection Agency and shall include the results of such review in the annual report required by subsection (a).

(d) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—The Administrator shall submit to the Congress any report required by law to be submitted to the Administrator by the Science Advisory Board. The Administrator shall make any such submission not later than 60 days after the Administrator receives the report from the Science Advisory Board.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to title V?

☐ 1800

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. LOFGREN

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. LOFGREN: Page 118, line 17, strike paragraph (2).

Page 118, line 18, through page 119, line 12, redesignate paragraphs (3) through (11) as paragraphs (2) through (10), respectively.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to one of the most egregious research bans in this bill. The very thought of Congress banning areas of scientific research should be offensive to all of us and to all American citizens.

H.R. 3322 attempts to restrict the EPA from spending money on the climate change action plan, a research program designed to identify cost effective ways of limiting carbon emissions in the future. The genesis of this program was the international concern expressed at the Rio Convention that increased emissions of greenhouse gases will lead to an increase in global temperatures or climate change.

The Committee on Science has held several hearings on the issue of climate change, and I believe this has been a reasonably productive exercise. We have heard from the world's experts, who represent the vast majority of scientists on climate change, and we have also heard from some skeptics who have participated in the public debate.

It is fair to say most Members on both sides of the issue have come away from these hearings better informed, whether or not they were swayed by the arguments. One of the few points of agreement, however, has been that the potential for climate change is plausible and we must continue to carry out the research to understand how much and how soon.

At the same time, we must understand how to achieve a reduction in our consumption of fossil fuels and emissions of greenhouse gases. This has relevance far beyond the obvious environmental concerns. It is simply good economics. Whether we do only the most cost effective things that are justified, regardless of whether there is climate change or whether we go beyond the so-called no regrets policy to do the more difficult things, it makes good sense to examine the issue. This is what the climate action plan does.

The climate action plan is based on an array of voluntary programs that, if successful, will save almost $2 billion annually by the year 2000. These include programs such as the Green Lights Program, the Energy Star Computer, Natural Gas Star, and other voluntary efforts that are strongly supported by industry.

Mr. Chairman, I personally believe that the evidence is mounting that human actions have had an impact on the Earth's climate and will have an increasing influence. I recognize, however, that other well-meaning Members may disagree. We should all agree, however, that we have a responsibility to more fully understand this issue. We should also agree that we should move toward a more energy efficient future beginning with voluntary programs such as those in the climate action plan.

This is hardly money down a rat hole, as was stated in our Committee on Science markup. The climate action plan will have far-reaching economic benefits as well as potentially important environmental benefits. I hope Members will join me in striking the prohibition on this program. Let us leave science to the scientists, not to the politicians.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is intended to reverse what I consider one of the more egregious portions of this bill, which is found on page 118, line 14, under the title of limitations. And it says that no funds are authorized to be appropriated by this title for, and in this case paragraph 2, the climate change action plan.

Now, there are a total of five prohibitions here that prohibits funds from being spent for any of these five, and I expect amendments to eliminate some of these other prohibitions as well, but what I consider to be the most egregious is all of these are important programs already in place by this administration. They fall within that category of research and development which the distinguished gentleman from southern California [Mr. ROHRABACHER] came up yesterday and acknowledged that he considered to be liberal claptrap, and as a result of that categorization, which apparently is accepted by everybody on the Republican side, they propose to just categorically not fund any research within these various areas.

Now, this particular kind of research, actually it is not research as much as it is a program to act on the potential impact of certain new research findings, what these amendments do is preclude us from using scientific knowledge no matter where it comes from, the Federal Government, universities, or the private sector. If this research indicates that a certain program of action is necessary to alleviate the prospective damage revealed by this research, we are prohibited from developing a program to do that, an action plan to accomplish that.

Mr. Chairman, I do not care what the field is, I think that is the wrong way to approach any kind of public policy activity. We cannot just blindly prohibit certain kinds of things from taking place. This reminds me of the kind of thing that would get done in an autocratic dictatorship or a theocracy or something of that sort.

If the results of scientific research indicate that action is necessary, we should not prohibit that activity. The amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California [Ms. LOFGREN] would strike that language from the bill and, in my opinion, improve it considerably.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the gentle lady's amendment to strike the prohibition on EPA's climate action plan. The goal of the climate action plan has been to identify actions that could be undertaken to return U.S. greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels by the year 2000. This is essentially the nonbinding target which the U.S. agreed to as part of the Framework Convention on Climate Change which came out of the 1992 Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.

The action plan consists of 44 separate activities directed toward all sectors of the economy. The programs and activities are voluntary. A number of them also derive from the Energy Policy Act because of the dual nature of the problem—that is, building a sustainable future based on cost effective, environmentally safe energy sources.

In addition to Federal funding, a substantial amount of private capital has been committed to this problem. This will achieve energy savings valued at $61.2 billion out to the year 2000. Eighteen of the forty-four activities are designed to increase energy efficiency in the residential, commercial, and industrial sectors of the economy. EPA's part of this plan also focuses on technologies for methane recovery from coal mines, land fills, and natural gas systems.

The administration estimates that without the action plan, greenhouse gas missions would grow from 1,462 million metric tons in 1990 to 1,674 million metric tons by 2000. The program thus far has been very successful although we have a long way to go to achieve the targets suggested by the Rio treaty.

It is important to point out that this issue has involved two administrations and virtually all the other nations of the world. Building a sustainable future is not a partisan issue but it is a serious issue. Simply prohibiting funds from being spent to explore our options is irresponsible.

I urge the adoption of the Lofgren amendment.

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

I think we ought to get to the facts about what this amendment does. What this amendment does is sets off an area of research within EPA, which means that the money that would be spent for this research would come from all other environmental research, and the money that would thereby be given to other environmental research of equal standing, and perhaps more important priorities, would actually be given now to global climate change.

Now, the reason why we have this particular language in the bill right now, which the Lofgren amendment eliminates the termination of EPA's global climate change research program, is because we had good reason to decide that this was not high priority. First, the Office of Research and Development, which is authorized in this title, is intended to support the Environmental Protection Agency with good science. Currently we do not regulate CO_2 emissions. EPA does not regulate CFC's, and in this bill we have authorized EPA's stratospheric ozone research above the level requested by the President.

In other words, where EPA has real jurisdiction we have decided to actually increase the amounts of money going into that research. Now, if we adopt this particular amendment, what we will do is run the risk that we will take money away from places where we are increasing the money and give it to global climate change.

Second, the agency has been using its research to do impact assessment of global warming not improving the models it will tell us if and by how much the world may warm. That, in my mind, is not exactly the priority that most of us would choose.

Now, we are currently spending almost $2 billion across the Federal Government on global climate change research. It is important we prioritize that research. This is not a case of cutting out all the money for global change. I happen to think that global change research is a very, very appropriate thing to be funded. I think $2 billion being spent by the Federal Government is a lot of money, being spent for a lot of programs. What we ought to

do is make certain it is being spent wisely and well.

The administration has spread climate change research through 12 agencies right now, including the Department of Defense, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Energy, the Department of Interior, NASA, NSF, and NOAA. EPA has a relatively small piece of that climate change budget, roughly about $20 million. We do not need 12 agencies doing essentially the same kind of research.

EPA, in this particular office, is not the place to conduct global climate change research. The research they are conducting is of a lesser value than that done by their agencies and should be terminated in favor of better research elsewhere.

The bottom line is if we choose to spend this $20 million in this place on climate change impact assessment out of the EPA budget, the hire priority research, such as maybe endocrine disrupter research, that we approved yesterday, drinking water research, clean air research, a lot of the other things are going to suffer. This money comes out of other high priority regulatory type matters in order to go into this account where we are already in other agencies spending $2 billion.

If that is what people want to do in the name of environment, then perhaps they will vote for this particular amendment. But we had exactly this same amendment on the floor last year and this exact same amendment was turned down last year. It seems to be that the Congress wisely understood last year that there are very important environmental matters to be researched at EPA. This is not one of the ones that should be done there. It should be done elsewhere, where they do a better job than what is being done at EPA. Vote against the Lofgren amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment offered by my colleague from California. It is no secret by now that this committee is committed to gutting the global climate research program. H.R. 3322 provides 27-percent fewer resources than the administration requested in the fiscal year 1997 budget in some of the strictest fiscal discipline applied to any of the programs under the bill.

The ban on using funds for the global climate change action plan is based on ideology, not information. Before I came to the Congress of the United States, I started two of the most successful energy conservation companies in the United States. They are still, today, two of the largest energy conservation companies in this country, and I can tell Members that energy conservation simply makes sense.

We now have a growing body of information about the carbon dioxide gases which are choking off the overall environment of this world. For us to wait until we have a critical situation which requires mandates, I think, is just plain silly.

When we look at the rising trade deficits that occur in the United States month after month after month, literally 50 percent of our annual trade deficit goes for one product, and that is importing foreign oil. Why not get behind a program which voluntarily asks industry to participate in ways of creating energy conservation instead of sending off our petroleum dollars to the OPEC'ers overseas? Why not keep the jobs here? Why not do it in a voluntary way? Why not support the amendment by my colleague from California, Ms. LOFGREN, in a way that will make sense for people in this country and that will create jobs for the people of the United States?

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

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman may not be aware that earlier in the Congress, over the objections of many in the minority, we passed a bill to concentrate attention on hydrogen research. It is something we have pushed very, very heavily because we think that what the gentleman says is absolutely correct, that one of the ways in which we can achieve energy independence is to develop a new kind of energy regime. That bill is now in the Senate. We hope it will come back.

I would hope the gentleman would support us and what this committee is attempting to do in terms of transitioning to a new hydrogen economy as a way of addressing those kinds of issues.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I appreciate the gentleman's concern. There is a question about whether or not hydrogen energy is the best methodology that we ought to be using in the future, and it seems to me, if that is nothing more than corporate welfare for the nuclear power industry, it is something we should take up.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman further yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman that, in fact, we are trying to move the research away from any association with the nuclear side of it in the bill, and we are attempting to address exactly that issue, and hydrogen, the gentleman must admit, is an absolutely clean energy source, in fact, if we can utilize it.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I appreciate the gentleman's concern, and I do not have a problem with trying to develop other resources, but I do have a problem when we try to use those arguments to oppose the basic fundamental requirement of this legislation, which was to just ask industry to voluntarily find ways of keeping our levels of carbon dioxide emissions down to the 1990 levels.

□ 1815

It seems to me that this is not requiring any kind of mandate. It is not in any way suggesting that we have to enforce those levels on industry. All it is saying is if we voluntarily get these industries to participate in this program, we can keep jobs here in the United States, we can cut down on our balance of trade deficit, and we can essentially strengthen the economy of America.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, that is not what this particular program does. In fact, what the gentleman is talking about is a $20 million expenditure that largely is going right now to impact assessments of global warming. It is not going to the voluntary programs.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I appreciate the gentleman's comments, but the fact is that I have been assured that the purpose of this amendment is in fact to do just what I have suggested, which is to make a 27-percent cut in the Climate Change Action Plan, which the amendment of the gentlewoman from California [Ms. LOFRGEN] essentially restores the budget cuts for.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, in other sections of EPA, the gentleman is absolutely right. But this is the research account. In the research account, that Action Plan is not a part of what is being done here. The $20 million is not being spent on the Action Plan, it is being spent on impact assessments and things of that kind.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I yield to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. LOFGREN] for a clarification of whether or not this is a restoration of the 20 percent cut or whether some other account is being affected.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Massachusetts will yield, basically if the gentleman looks at page 188 of the bill, line 18, there is a prohibition on the utilization of funds already appropriated for the Climate Change Action Plan. And I would add, in addition to line 17.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] has expired.

(On request of Mr. WALKER, and by unanimous consent, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. LOFGREN].

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would read further on page 118, extending on to page 119, there are also prohibitions on research in the area of indoor air, drinking water research conducted by the American Waterworks Association, as well as a

number of other prohibitions on scientific research activities.

Mr. Chairman, it is my view that it is a tremendous error for Members of Congress, most of whom are not scientists, I think we have three or four scientists among our 435, to substitute our judgment for those of scientists.

This is clearly an area that we know, as you referenced earlier, is of significant impact not only to the United States but to the world. My children are 11 and 14. I do not want them to be adults and live in a world where climate change is too late to impact, as the climate change action plan attempts to do on a voluntary basis before it is too late.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, the climate change action plan, if I understand properly, is a small portion of the overall Global Warming Program, which is the subject of a 27-percent cut here. In the case of the climate change action plan, there is a 100-percent cut in this particular portion, but that is part of the overall 27 percent cut.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I appreciate the clarification. If I might respond, let me read what the bill currently says.

No funds are authorized to be appropriated by this title for, No. 1, the environmental Technology Initiative; No. 2, the climate change action plan; No. 4, indoor air research, which I know we are going to come back to in a few minutes so I will be very kind about this; and, four, the Center for Air Toxics. In any event, the appropriate portion of this is that the climate change action plan will not receive any funds under this legislation.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, the action plan is not tied to the research program. The two Members on that side have quoted absolutely accurately, but the only thing we have in our program relates to the Office of Research. The Office of Research does not do the action plan.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, as I understand, the ORD portion does take up some significant technology aspects that are included in the cut that has been taken up by this bill. Some of the new technologies are in, in fact, cut under the portion of this bill which is granted coverage under the limitations which I just cited.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, there is practically no impact here because the action plan that the gentleman referred to earlier of doing business hookups is, in fact, not in the Office of Research, and that is all I am trying to say to the gentleman; to portray what is being done here is eliminating that program is inaccurate. That is not the case. What we are doing is simply trying to deal with global change research on a priority basis.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am rising today in support of the amendment which the gentlewoman from California [Ms. LOFGREN] has offered on this underlying bill which allows the EPA to continue their work on the climate change action plan.

But I would like to just comment for a moment on the comments by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], who is arguing here in his previous set of comments that all they are really doing is eliminating the consideration of the global climate change action plan from any involvement in EPA, that there are at least 11 other places in the budget where global climate change is covered in some way by research.

But it seems to me that the one perhaps most significant and most coherent locus of that research is right here under the EPA, which has a responsibility given to it by the Congress to deal with global climate change in the climate change action plan.

So for that reason at least, if we were going to be doing anything, we ought to be concentrating in this area where the Environmental Protection Agency has the responsibility given to it by Congress to deal with the climate change action plan.

Now, the amendment of the gentlewoman from California corrects what I think is a serious wrong-headedness of the Republican budget ax. Her amendment allows the EPA, the Environmental Protection Agency, to meet the responsibilities which have been rightfully assigned to it by the Congress.

Climate research has far-reaching implications for environmental protection, and this Congress has a responsibility to recognize the need for such research into our local as well as our global environment.

But once again the majority has demonstrated their carelessness and insensitivity where broad issues of environmental protection are concerned.

Mr. Chairman, in the wake of what has been a record-breaking winter and then the current crowd that, if sustained, could create a sand dune desert the size of the great State of Texas covering much of the southern high plains of this country, it seems to me it is preposterous for this Congress to turn its back on understanding climate change.

During the 104th Congress I have heard much about cost-benefit analysis. Apparently, some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have a problem with the analysis part of that cost-benefit analysis. But you do have to have data in order to do analysis. Whether you agree or disagree with the concept of global warming, let us at least be willing to gather the data so that our debate in this body grows from knowledge rather than from ignorance.

Sound policy requires us to incorporate sound scientific research and reasoning in order to have any kind of semblance of sound policy. It seems to me the truth is out there and we should not be running from it, we should be, if anything, concentrating our global climate change action in the EPA, which is charged with environmental protection, because it is a matter of greatest possible significance to us in climate change for what our environment is going to be in the future.

So I would hope that we would adopt the amendment by the gentlewoman from California and strike that little clause in paragraph 2, the words climate change action plan.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLVER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to continue the dialog I had with the gentleman from Pennsylvania on the global climate change action plan, and the implications that this has for technology.

My understanding in checking with the staff is that, in fact, when you say that no funds are authorized to be appropriated for this title for the climate change action plan that you are, in fact, cutting $6.2 million that would go for the research on these new technologies and their impact. So I would just like to understand exactly what the gentleman's point is.

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

Mr. OLVER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is correct on the $6.2 million, but if he will look further, he will find that we transferred that money to plus up the account on the stratospheric ozone research, and the attempt here is to be sure that we are doing work in real areas in the EPA. It is a tradeoff. We happen to think that in terms of the immediate priorities the stratospheric ozone question is more important to address.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. OLVER] has expired.

(On request of Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, and by unanimous consent, Mr. OLVER was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. OLVER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I would just point out that there was some confusion in the last interchange that I had with the gentleman from Pennsylvania, because I thought he was trying to suggest the last time around that, in fact, there was not a cut.

Now I am understanding in this present exchange that there is, in fact, a cut, but he has just taken the money and used it for some other purpose. I

understand that he is taking the money and using it for some other purpose, but the truth of the matter is that he cut the program and the gentlewoman from California [Ms. LOFGREN] is attempting to put the money back in the program, which I think has finally been clarified.

There is an attempt in this bill to gut the Global Climate Change Action Plan which will, in fact, hurt the technologies. The gentleman is going to use the money for some other purposes, which I am sure are very, very good and helpful and strong, but we still want some money put into this program.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, as a matter of fact, it is not that we are specifically putting money back into the program, but merely removing the language that requires that no money be authorized for the Global Climate Change Action Plan. I would hope that the amendment by the gentlewoman from California would be adopted.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am trying to work my way through all of this. I started out this morning worrying about the Climate Change Action Plan because I think it is a significant, though not the overall major, part of this plan to study global warming, to study global climate change, which I happen to be a firm believer we need the exact scientific data to produce.

So I have been working my way through trying to figure out where the cuts are coming from, and I was happy to hear that we are not cutting $20 million out of the Global Climate Action Plan, but it is actually $6 million, but it is in an area of research so that the chairman of the subcommittee places the money in this area of research to stratospheric ozone research, which I think is appropriate.

I understand, though, in the EPA's budget in the area of the environmental programs and management, there is tens of millions of dollars for the Climate Change Action Plan.

Now, I want to stand here and agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts and the gentlewoman from California in that we need a significant role to play as far as the Government is concerned to produce more energy-efficient cars, lighting, using fuel. And a number of the Fortune 500 companies in the United States are part of this green light program and a part of many other programs which significantly reduce the costs of their production and at the same time significantly reducing the amount of hydrogen fuels going into the atmosphere which produce global climate change.

But in this particular amendment I urge my colleagues to vote ''no.'' Basically, the $6 million coming out of the action plan is going into solid research so that we can understand the nature of the atmosphere and the nature of how it is changing as a result of human input and how we can further deal with this climate change that is, understandably from all the scientific data that we read, inevitable.

So, the research portion of this $6 million, I think, is being well spent.

Now, the climate action plan is a program that I fully endorse, and while it has taken a bit of a cut here, there still is probably, I am not sure what the exact amount is, but it is probably close to $100 million. And I think we should continue to pursue that climate action plan. It is a solid program that meshes government and the private sector together.

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

Mr. GILCHREST. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the points that the gentleman has made. The fact is that we get accused all the time of being opposed to the Global Climate Change Program. I am sure there are some, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER], for example, is not particularly enthusiastic.

Mr. Chairman, I happen to support the research. I think it does good things too. I think it should be properly prioritized. I thought that when we were dealing with some of the ozone issues, that was also a part of the general pattern here of trying to understand the atmospheric conditions that produce some of the changes that are potential problems for us.

□ 1830

So, in transferring the money around, it is important to realize that we are setting priorities. For instance, only NOAA and EPA, to my knowledge, do stratospheric ozone research. We have 12 different agencies doing the global climate change research. It seems to be the right kind of priority, to me, for us to do it in the way we have done it here. And I would agree with the gentleman. I think he has every reason to be supportive of some of the programs at EPA that move some of these programs forward and does recognize, I am pleased, that what we have done here is simply attempted to utilize research dollars a little bit better.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. LOFGREN].

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to make a point, because I do think that to fail to enact the amendment I proposed would run contrary to the goals that my colleague is espousing that I share. I do not oppose research in stratosphere ozone research. However, we do have much research going on pursuant to our international treaty on ozone. As a matter of fact, we found a number of things already. As my colleagues are well aware, the Nobel Prize was awarded for some of the significant findings in that arena.

But the action plan, the climate change action plan is where we bring together the various components that are all important into our plan. It is not, that function, so far as I can tell as a member of the committee, is not provided for elsewhere in the budget.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, there are still large dollars in the climate action plan.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California [Ms. LOFGREN].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California [Ms. LOFGREN] will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, it is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KENNEDY OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts: Page 118, line 18, strike paragraph (3).

Page 118, line 19, through page 119, line 12, redesignate paragraphs (4) through (11) as paragraphs (3) through (10), respectively.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, the truth is that Americans spend about 90 percent of their lives indoors. While we spend 90 percent of our lives indoors, we spend billions and billions of dollars cleaning up outdoor air. Indoor air happens to be about 1,000 times more polluted than outdoor air. So we have a kind of a crazy situation where, despite the fact that we are living inside buildings, we are working inside buildings, we are living and working in areas that are much, much more polluted than the areas where we end up spending the vast majority of our dollars to clean up.

Now, I just believe that it makes sense for us to get a better handle on exactly the kinds of indoor air pollutants that are potentially causing great harm to the American people and people throughout the world. I know that my friend from Pennsylvania, Mr. WALKER, agrees that this is an important issue and one that we should work together to try and understand, both the causes as well as some of the solutions.

Mr. Chairman, in this very building, if we take a deep breath, we will be breathing in more fungus and bacteria and molds than we want to shake a stick at. So I would not suggest that all of my friends on the other side of

the aisle stop breathing, although from time to time it seemed like a good idea. Nevertheless, I do think that trying to find out some better research and some better understandings about how we can deal with the serious issue of indoor air problems is an area where I hope we can both agree.

Mr. Chairman, if my friend from Pennsylvania has some thoughts on this, I would be happy to yield.

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

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I have talked to the gentleman about his amendment. Also, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DAVIS], on our side of the aisle, has talked to me some about this particular amendment. On behalf of Mr. DAVIS, I am prepared to accept the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I very much appreciate and I want to pay particular thanks to the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] who has been a great supporter of research on indoor air quality for every year that I have offered this amendment for the last 10 years. I appreciate it once again.

We will let him smoke his cigar wherever he wants, but I do appreciate his help.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from California.

(Mr. BROWN of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding.

I do want to rise in support of the gentleman's amendment. I appreciate the willingness of our friends on the other side to accept that effort to move the proceedings along here, which I know is of interest to all of us.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my colleague from Massachusetts. Here we go again. It seems just a short time ago, 7 months ago actually, that we were having this same discussion. Unfortunately, the majority continues to believe that indoor air quality is an area where sound science is no science.

This belief is not based upon any testimony that we received, since we have never held hearings on this program. Ironically, one of our most extensive discussions of indoor air in committee occurred during the markup of H.R. 3322 when a unanimous-consent request was made that committee members refrain from smoking in the committee room during the markup.

In H.R. 3322, the majority is making a request that EPA refrain from gathering information about indoor air contaminants. I object to that request.

Indoor air pollution continues to be identified as a significant health risk and an area worthy of study by EPA's Science Advisory Panel. We all spend significant amounts of time indoors these days, and we all recognize that there have been health problems associated with faulty air-conditioning and ventilation systems. Individuals who suffer respiratory problems as a result of contaminants present in their homes and workplaces would like to know what the contaminants are and how they can be controlled.

The committee will try to tell us that this research program is really part of a plot to regulate the air in people's homes. This is ridiculous. This program's purpose is to empower citizens to make informed choices about products and services available to them to improve air quality in their homes. For nearly 10 years this program has generated information that has been used to disseminate information to State indoor air programs and to building owners and managers on how to avoid and mitigate indoor air quality problems.

The Indoor Air Research Program is an excellent example of how science can be used to achieve environmental quality goals without regulation.

The question is do we want to have the facts about indoor air quality or not? Do we want people to have information to make informed decisions about how they can improve their home and work environments or not? I urge my colleagues to support knowledge over ignorance by supporting the Kennedy amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, poor indoor air causes flu, pneumonia, tuberculosis, and dozens of other diseases.

Air we breath indoors can contain dangerous levels of radon, asbestos, carbon monoxide, lead, and chlorine.

Americans spend an average 90 percent of their time indoors, yet air in homes, schools, workplaces, airplanes, can be 1,000 times more toxic.

This bill would eliminate EPA's nonregulatory indoor air research program—ending important research that would fuel future discoveries enabling us to prevent illnesses related to indoor air contamination.

In 103d Congress, we passed a bill that I have introduced every year, the Indoor Air Quality Act, with bipartisan support. We adjourned before the bill could be signed into law, but support for increased indoor air research was clearly validated by this Chamber.

The Science Committee report that accompanies this bill claims that EPA should not do indoor fair research, but that the research arm of OSHA, NIOSH [National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health], should.

But this seems odd, considering the fact that in the 1997 budget resolution, NIOSH is scheduled to be terminated—the very agency the committee claims should conduct this research.

Who, then, will do indoor air research? The bill, as written, prohibits the EPA from doing the research. And with NIOSH scheduled to be terminated, we end up with a situation where nobody is able to do indoor air research.

At any moment, 21.2 million Americans are working in 1.4 million offices, schools, factories, and other structures where indoor air quality may be a problem. How can we ignore these numbers?

The cost of indoor air pollution is staggering as well. Americans spend an extra $1.5 billion each year in medical bills, and the loss in productivity for businesses translates into tens of billions of dollars more.

We have had plenty of indoor air quality problems in my State.

A statewide 1995 survey by the U.S. General Accounting Office estimated that more than 30 percent of Massachusetts' 1,794 public schools suffer from poor air quality and that about 42 percent of them have ventilation problems.

In February, 26 students at Peabody Veterans Memorial High School in Boston were pulled out of school by parents concerned about the quality of air in the building. Their children had severe headaches, dizziness, sleepiness, and some developed rashes.

My district has had other sick building syndromes recently that stretch from the Boston Registry of Motor Vehicles, to a county courthouse, and to Bringham & Woman's Hospital.

But problems with indoor air quality are not unique to my district. Just yesterday, the Department of Transportation headquarters evacuated 5,500 workers because of the discovery of a toxic airborne mold in the building. The problem of poor indoor air quality is not going to go away on its own.

EPA's Science Advisory Board has ranked indoor air pollution as one of the highest health risks meriting EPA attention. While there is considerable information about some indoor pollutants, scientists know little about the relative magnitudes of the potential risks associated with different indoor environments and exposure levels.

All evidence points to the fact that we need more research on indoor air contamination, not less.

Fortunately, though, my friend from Pennsylvania, the chairman of the Science Committee, Mr. WALKER, has agreed to accept my amendment.

By accepting this change to the underlying bill, we are sending a positive message that we are going to continue supporting the type of research that consumers, homeowners, and builders need to make informed decisions about safeguarding their health.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, it is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 by the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas: Page 118, line 16, strike paragraph (1).

Page 118, line 17, through page 119, line 12, redesignate paragraphs (2) through (11) as paragraphs (1) through (10), respectively.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I solicit Chairman WALKER to accept this one as well because I think it tracks certainly our mutual concern on fiscal responsibility and the combination of commitment to the environment along with an effective partnership with business.

Beyond the science authorization bill, there is language which specifically prohibits any money from being

appropriated for the Environmental Technology Initiative, or the ETI Program, of the Environmental Protection Agency.

Let me emphasize that my amendment is revenue neutral. It simply says that the administrator, if they see fit to implement this program, they must find ways to fund it and offset it by utilization of funds from a particular location and offset it from that location. My amendment would simply strike this language.

Though I cannot speak as to the reasons for the chairman's desire to zero out the program, I can tell how this program has benefited our country and its citizens. As recently demonstrated by speeches and votes on the floor of the House, many of us in Congress are deeply concerned about the environment and what can be done to harmonize human existence within it.

Mr. Chairman, as I am sure my colleagues are aware, many people have voiced their opinions about the EPA and its regulations. As an example, many businesses leaders have said that complying with EPA regulations is expensive.

Here lies the basis of support of the ETI. The goal of the Environmental Technology Initiative is to promote improved levels of health and environmental protection by accelerating the development and use of innovative environmental technologies. Most of these technologies may be put under the better, cheaper label and benefit industry by both being cheaper and exceeding current standards.

Environmental technologies prevent pollution, control and treat air and water pollution, remediate contaminated soil and groundwater, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, assess and monitor exposure levels and management environmental information.

It is the private sector's job to promote innovation, but it is the Government's job to create a climate where technology innovation is rewarded, not penalized, so that the private sector can function free of government interference. However, there are many barriers, both internal and external to the EPA, that limit private sector investment and innovative environmental technologies.

These barriers include: statutes, regulations, policies and procedures, like permitting and enforcement that favor the use of conventional technologies and then essentially lock these technologies into place; insufficient resources at the State level to provide credibility to vendors by verifying the performance and cost of promising new technologies; and lack of established networks and sources of information that provides users access to better, cleaner, safer, lower cost technologies.

Mr. Chairman, many of the 274 ETI-funded projects are beginning to show results, and EPA is disinvesting from direct technology development projects. What more can we ask for?

Mr. Chairman, let me add a note. In the Republican-based task force on the environment, we are told that we must replace the outdated approaches of the past with common sense, flexible, and effective approaches that build on consensus, private property ownership, free enterprise, local control, sound scientific evidence, and the latest technology. Here lies the Environmental Technology Institute.

I would suggest that by disinvesting from direct technology projects except in specific areas where private sector research and development is not available and focusing on reducing policy and regulatory barriers, this is the way for the EPA to go.

ETI funding is an integral part of EPA's research efforts to streamline its regulatory and permitting processes to ensure that new rules and policies do not inhibit the use of better, more effective technology. With my amendment I seek to ensure that the Environmental Technology Initiative continues to direct an appropriate way to ensure an effective partnership between Government and the private sector and to allow the EPA to do its job.

I simply ask that in a bipartisan manner we allow the EPA to do its job with current and new technologies, and that is to support the reinclusion of allowing the Environmental Technology Initiative to continue forward and to allow it not to be stricken and for the Administrator to be able to determine how best to utilize it and to fund it.

This is revenue neutral. I ask for bipartisan support on the amendment.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I include a statement for the RECORD:

Mr. Chairman, with her amendment, my colleague from Texas seeks to remove another of the majority's ill-considered bans on research conducted at the Environmental Protection Agency. Our Republican colleagues, in this bill, deny EPA the authority to continue the Environmental Technologies Initiative. Rather than contest the merits of the program, the majority simply does away with it. This theory of Republican policymaking reminds me of Mencken's famous line: ''There is always a well-known solution to every human problem—neat, plausible, and wrong.''

The environmental technologies initiative has as its goal increasing the speed with which new and better technologies become available to protect public health and environmental quality. The initiative seeks to prevent pollution, or to reduce the cost and increase the speed at which hazards are removed from the environment.

It is passing strange that at the same time the majority complains bitterly about EPA's impact on the private sector, it would here prevent the Agency from learning new ways to reduce the burden of environmental compliance. Republicans complain that EPA does not weigh the costs and benefits of pollution control strategies before issuing regulations, but let the Agency act to gain real-world experience with the costs and benefits of new technologies and the majority cannot interfere quickly enough. The majority once complained about congressional micromanagement of agencies during the Reagan and Bush years. We were harangued again and again about hamstringing the executive branch. But with Republicans in the majority, we find that micromanagement is in the eye of the beholder.

The Environmental Technologies initiative is precisely the sort of action that should be taken to achieve what the majority claims is its intent—to reduce the EPA's impact on business while maintaining environmental protections. EPA is working with business to find new ways to accomplish what the law demands. Rather than encouraging Administrator Browner for her leadership, the Republicans stop her cold. Am I alone in finding something wrong with this picture?

EPA is not alone in supporting the environmental technologies initiative. The Departments of Defense and Energy are searching for faster and more affordable methods of dealing with the overflowing waste pits at military bases around the country and at the Nation's nuclear weapons production facilities. The Government can offer access to facilities such as the National Laboratories and help for small businesses hoping to improve their technologies; in return the Government gets proven techniques for addressing its own problems.

Mr. Chairman, no idea is so dangerous that we can't even talk about it—except in this Republican Congress. We held no hearings on the merits of the environmental technologies initiative, probably because the results would contradict the policy the majority wanted to impose anyway. Banning research on cleanup technologies is hardly a smart move, and so I urge support for the Jackson-Lee amendment.

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

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] will be postponed.

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed in the following order:

Amendment No. 15 offered by the gentlewoman from California [Ms. LOFGREN]; and amendment No. 5 offered by the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. LOFGREN

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California [Ms. LOFGREN], on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by a voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 197, noes 211, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 207]

AYES—197

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Berman
Bevill
Bishop
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Cardin
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Coyne
Cramer
Cummings
Davis
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Durbin
Edwards
English
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Filner
Flake
Ford
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gillmor
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (TX)
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Heineman
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klink
LaFalce
Lantos
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Moran
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Richardson
Rivers
Roemer
Rose
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Salmon
Sanders
Sawyer
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Shays
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Spratt
Stark
Stokes
Stupak
Tanner
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weller
Williams
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates
Zimmer

NOES—211

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Castle
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Cooley
Costello
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Flanagan
Foley
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Frisa
Funderburk
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Geren
Gilchrest
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Greene (UT)
Greenwood
Gunderson
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jacobs
Johnson, Sam
Kasich
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
Laughlin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
Longley
Lucas
Manzullo
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Montgomery
Moorhead
Morella
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce
Quillen
Ramstad
Regula
Riggs
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Royce
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Traficant
Upton
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff

NOT VOTING—26

Barton
Chabot
de la Garza
Engel
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Foglietta
Forbes
Gibbons
Gutknecht
Harman
Hayes
Houghton
Jefferson
Jones
Lincoln
Lowey
McDade
Molinari
Mollohan
Murtha
Payne (NJ)
Peterson (FL)
Quinn
Studds
Wilson

☐ 1901

Messrs. GREENWOOD, FRISA, and GOODLING changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mrs. KELLY and Mr. WELLER changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 207, I was unavoidably detained—had I been present, I would have voted ''no.''

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 192, noes 209, not voting 33, as follows:

[Roll No. 208]

AYES—192

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Berman
Bevill
Bishop
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Cardin
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Cummings
Danner
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Durbin
Edwards
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Filner
Flake
Forbes
Ford
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (TX)
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hastings (FL)
Heineman
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jacobs
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
LaFalce
LaHood
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Longley
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Montgomery
Moran
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Pomeroy
Porter
Poshard
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Richardson
Rivers
Roemer
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Saxton
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Skaggs
Skelton
Smith (NJ)
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Stupak
Tanner
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weller
Williams
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates
Zimmer

NOES—209

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brewster
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Castle
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Cooley
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Flanagan
Foley
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Frelinghuysen

Frisa
Funderburk
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Geren
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Greene (UT)
Greenwood
Gunderson
Hancock
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
Lucas
Manzullo
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Moorhead
Morella
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Portman
Pryce
Radanovich
Regula
Riggs
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roth
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Schaefer
Schiff
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Upton
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Ward
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff

NOT VOTING—33

Barton
Browder
Chabot
de la Garza
Engel
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Foglietta
Gibbons
Gutknecht
Hansen
Harman
Hayes
Hefner
Houghton
Jefferson
Klink
Lincoln
McDade
Molinari
Mollohan
Murtha
Payne (NJ)
Peterson (FL)
Quillen
Quinn
Scarborough
Schroeder
Sisisky
Slaughter
Studds
Taylor (MS)
Wilson

□ 1908

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Browder for, with Mr. Gutknecht against.

Mr. LONGLEY and Mr. STENHOLM changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title V?

If not, the Clerk will designate title VI.

The text of title VI is as follows:

TITLE VI—NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF STANDARDS AND TECHNOLOGY

SEC. 601. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated the following:

(1) For Scientific and Technical Research and Services of the National Institute of Standards and Technology, $280,600,000 for fiscal year 1997, of which—

(A) $38,407,000 shall be for Electronics and Electrical Engineering;

(B) $18,747,000 shall be for Manufacturing Engineering;

(C) $33,939,000 shall be for Chemical Science and Technology;

(D) $28,048,000 shall be for Physics;

(E) $54,589,000 shall be for Material Science and Engineering;

(F) $13,085,000 shall be for Building and Fire Research;

(G) $43,076,000 shall be for Computer Science and Applied Mathematics;

(H) $18,950,000 shall be for Technical Assistance;

(I) $28,772,000 shall be for Research Support; and

(J) $2,987,000 shall be for the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Program under section 17 of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 3711a); and

(2) for Construction of Research Facilities of the National Institute of Standards and Technology, $105,240,000 for fiscal year 1997.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 3322 takes an aggressive stance in title VI of the bill to ensure that the core science programs at the National Institute of Standards and Technology [NIST] are funded at levels which will permit the NIST Laboratories to perform their critical national mission.

I commend the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, for his support. Mr. WALKER has recognized the important work being done at the NIST Laboratories and has recommended a funding level which the laboratories deserve.

NIST is integral to U.S. competition in the global marketplace, through its interaction with industry, and by developing and applying technology measurements and standards. I am pleased that, despite our commitment to achieve a balanced budget, and with tight budget caps in place, the bill authorizes a funding level for the NIST Laboratories above the President's request of $270.7 million.

By not only matching but exceeding the President's funding request for the scientific and technical research services account at $280.6 million, the bill funds projects which we were unable to fully authorize in the previous fiscal year. These added increases will fund projects in semiconductor, metrology, biotechnology measurements, advanced materials processing, and new Government coordinating responsibilities to make NIST the lead agency for standards and conformity assessment activities as mandated by the National Technology Transfer and Advancements Act of 1995.

In addition, the bill authorizes the NIST construction account to provide necessary renovation and modernization of facilities. Without these funds for the state-of-the-art Measurement and Calibration Laboratories to modernize their facilities, NIST cannot adequately fulfill its mission into the future.

Mr. Chairman, I am also pleased that title VII of H.R. 3322 authorizes fiscal year 1997 appropriations for FAA's research, engineering, and development [RE&D] activities; strengthens the role of the FAA RE&D Advisory Committee in setting priorities; and modifies requirements.

Title VII includes sections authored by the distinguished ranking member of the Technology Subcommittee, the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. JOHN TANNER. These sections require the FAA to consider recommendations of the FAA RE&D Advisory Committee in establishing R&D priorities; requires the FAA RE&D Advisory Committee to review FAA's R&D funding allocations and advise the Administrator as to whether they will support FAA objectives; and modifies requirements for the National Aviation Research Plan by changing the time horizon to 5 years and requires the FAA to respond to the recommendations of the RE&D Advisory Committee.

Mr. Chairman, I recommend passage of the titles VI and VII.

□ 1915

The CHAIRMAN. Are there amendments to title VI?

If not, the Clerk will designate title VII.

The text of title VII is as follows:

TITLE VII—FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION RESEARCH, ENGINEERING, AND DEVELOPMENT

SEC. 701. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''FAA Research, Engineering, and Development Management Reform Act of 1996''.

SEC. 702. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds that—

(1) considerable effort and expenditure has been devoted since 1981 to the modernization of the National Airspace System, with limited results;

(2) long-standing management, organizational, and cultural impediments at the Federal Aviation Administration have led to cost overruns, schedule delays, program terminations, and other wasteful inefficiencies;

(3) a lack of coordination between the technology developers and operational sections of the Federal Aviation Administration has led to research, engineering, and development programs that are unbalanced because they either are too technology driven or have operational requirements that are unrealistic or unwarranted;

(4) the research, engineering, and development functions of the Federal Aviation Administration have been carried out without the benefit of critical management education and competencies;

(5) the failure to employ contemporary management techniques and industry best practices has led to inadequate contractor oversight and poor risk management; and

(6) significant improvements in modernizing the National Airspace System will require fundamental changes in the Federal Aviation Administration's acquisition management system and in the orientation of the officials who implement the system.

SEC. 703. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this title—

(1) the term ''affordable'' means having life-cycle costs that are in consonance with the long-range funding and operational design plans for the National Airspace System;

(2) the term ''evolutionary acquisition'' means an acquisition strategy in which a core capability is fielded with a modular structure that allows for changes as requirements are refined;

(3) the term ''life-cycle costs'' means the total costs to the Federal Government of a system over its useful life, including the costs of research, development, acquisition, support, and disposal;

(4) the term ''nondevelopmental'' means not requiring significant further development to be made usefully operational; and

(5) the term ''pre-planned product improvement'' means an acquisition strategy that defers technically difficult or unknown system requirements to mitigate risks or to field a system that incorporates design considerations that facilitate future changes.

SEC. 704. MANAGEMENT PRINCIPLES.

The Federal Aviation Administration shall develop, implement, and maintain a disciplined acquisition management system that facilitates the transforming of broadly stated requirements into affordable, operationally effective and suitable products and services to meet the needs of users of the National Airspace System. Such acquisition management system shall be based on and incorporate the following principles:

(1) The employment and integration of—

(A) a process to establish and validate requirements;

(B) full life-cycle acquisition management; and

(C) planning, programming, and budgeting.

(2) Full involvement of both acquisition and operational Federal Aviation Administration personnel in the processes described in paragraph (1)(A), (B), and (C).

(3) Early and continuous involvement of National Airspace System operators and users, advisory committees, and industry vendors and experts in establishing and stabilizing sound, realistic operational requirements.

(4) Assignment of acquisition officials based on demonstrated leadership, professionalism, and proven acquisition management competencies, consistent with their positional responsibility and authority.

(5) Full life-cycle, event-driven acquisition strategies which explicitly link major interim program decisions and contractual commitments to demonstrated accomplishments in research, engineering, and development.

(6) The balancing of system design requirements and constraints based on cost-benefit sensitivity analysis.

(7) Consideration of maximum practicable use of nonmaterial, nondevelopmental, or commercial solutions before embarking on protracted research, engineering, and development activities by the Federal Aviation Administration.

(8) Consideration of evolutionary acquisition and pre-planned product improvement strategies to mitigate risks and expeditiously field products and services.

(9) Use of contemporary management techniques and industry best practices to—

(A) compare the current status of a program to where it should be;

(B) reassess the goals of a program and the plans for achieving those goals;

(C) assess program risks and strategies for mitigating those risks; and

(D) assess whether the program is affordable.

SEC. 705. DOCUMENT OF APRIL 1, 1996.

The Congress recognizes that the acquisition management system set forth in the document dated April 1, 1996, issued by the Federal Aviation Administration, is substantially compatible with the principles stated in section 704 of this title. The Federal Aviation Administration may implement that proposed system as a suitable compliance with the requirements of this title, and may modify elements of that system to the extent that those modifications conform with the principles stated in section 704 of this title.

SEC. 706. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 48102(a) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (1)(J);

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (2)(J) and inserting in lieu thereof ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) for fiscal year 1997—

''(A) $10,000,000 for system development and infrastructure projects and activities;

''(B) $39,911,000 for capacity and air traffic management technology projects and activities;

''(C) $20,371,000 for communications, navigation, and surveillance projects and activities;

''(D) $6,411,000 for weather projects and activities;

''(E) $6,000,000 for airport technology projects and activities;

''(F) $37,978,000 for aircraft safety technology projects and activities;

''(G) $36,045,000 for system security technology projects and activities;

''(H) $23,682,000 for human factors and aviation medicine projects and activities;

''(I) $3,800,000 for environment and energy projects and activities;

''(J) $1,500,000 for innovative/cooperative research projects and activities; and

''(K) such sums as may be necessary for other research, engineering, and development activities described in the President's fiscal year 1997 budget request to the Congress under the category 'Engineering, development, test, and evaluation' of Facilities and Equipment.''.

SEC. 707. RESEARCH PRIORITIES.

Section 48102(b) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (3); and

(2) by striking ''AVAILABILITY FOR RESEARCH.—(1)'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''RESEARCH PRIORITIES.—(1) The Administrator shall consider the advice and recommendations of the research advisory committee established by section 44508 of this title in establishing priorities among major categories of research and development activities carried out by the Federal Aviation Administration.

''(2)''.

SEC. 708. BUDGET DESIGNATION FOR FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES.

Section 48102(c) of title 49, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(c) DESIGNATION OF ACTIVITIES.—(1) The amounts appropriated under subsection (a) are for the support of all research and development activities carried out by the Federal Aviation Administration that fall within the categories of basic research, applied research, and development, including the design and development of prototypes, in accordance with the classifications of the Office of Management and Budget Circular A–11 (Budget Formulation/Submission Process).

''(2) The President's annual budget request for the Federal Aviation Administration shall include all research and development activities within a single budget category. All of the activities carried out by the Administration within the categories of basic research, applied research, and development, as classified by the Office of Management and Budget Circular A–11, shall be placed in this single budget category.''.

SEC. 709. RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

Section 44508(a)(1) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''and'' at the end of subparagraph (B);

(2) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (C) and inserting in lieu thereof ''; and''; and

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following new subparagraph:

''(D) annually review the allocation made by the Administrator of the amounts authorized by section 48102(a) of this title among the major categories of research and development activities carried out by the Administration and provide advice and recommendations to the Administrator on whether such allocation is appropriate to meet the needs and objectives identified under subparagraph (A).''.

SEC. 710. NATIONAL AVIATION RESEARCH PLAN.

Section 44501(c) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)(A) by striking ''15-year'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''5-year'';

(2) by amending subparagraph (B) to read as follows:

''(B) The plan shall—

''(i) provide estimates by year of the schedule, cost, and work force levels for each active and planned major research and development project under sections 40119, 44504, 44505, 44507, 44509, 44511–44513, and 44912 of this title, including activities carried out under cooperative agreements with other Federal departments and agencies;

''(ii) specify the goals and the priorities for allocation of resources among the major categories of research and development activities, including the rationale for the priorities identified;

''(iii) identify the allocation of resources among long-term research, near-term research, and development activities; and

''(iv) highlight the research and development activities that address specific recommendations of the research advisory committee established under section 44508 of this title, and document the recommendations of the committee that are not accepted, specifying the reasons for nonacceptance.''; and

(3) in paragraph (3) by inserting '', including a description of the dissemination to the private sector of research results and a description of any new technologies developed'' after ''during the prior fiscal year''.

Mrs. MORELLA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for this opportunity to briefly discuss title VII of H.R. 3322. This title authorizes fiscal year 1997 appropriations for FAA's research, engineering, and development [RE&D] activities; strengthens the role of the FAA RE&D advisory committee; and modifies the national aviation research plan.

FAA efforts to modernize the national airspace system have suffered significant cost, schedule, and performance problems and, according to extensive testimony, the issues do not appear to be the appropriated funding or how it's allocated—but to longstanding organizational, managerial, and cultural impediments within the FAA itself. With bold congressional help, the agency began an impressive first step by implementing a new acquisition management plan April 1.

When H.R. 3322 was introduced, it contained language to codify broadly-stated guiding principles—for managing FAA R&D activities long after the tenure of current FAA leadership. To expeditiously get the omnibus science bill to the House floor, we struck these important principles from this title. However, in the days ahead, we must maintain our focus on these critical principles to avoid the costly and protracted problems of the past. We look forward to working closely with Chairman BUD SHUSTER and our good friends and colleagues on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee and Aviation Subcommittee Chairman JON J. DUNCAN and the respected members of the Aviation Subcommittee—not on a partisan

nor jurisdictional mission, but rather to bring discipline and accountability to FAA programs that have drifted too long in the wilderness.

I would like to thank my good friend and distinguished gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. JOHN TANNER, the ranking minority member on the Technology Subcommittee, for his leadership in authoring sections of this title which strengthens the role of FAA's RE&D advisory committee in establishing R&D priorities and reviewing funding allocations, and increase the viability of the national aviation research plan. An additional section, also drafted by Mr. TANNER, would have greatly simplified the analysis of FAA R&D programs by requiring FAA to consolidate all its R&D activities into a single budget account—per OMB guidelines. This section was also withdrawn to expedite consideration of H.R. 3322 before the full House.

Regarding FAA RE&D funding, the President requested $195.7 million for fiscal year 1997. Management reform, based upon sound guiding principles, offers the promise of increased efficiencies and less waste. Accordingly, fiscal year 1997 RE&D budget authority should not be increased above the fiscal year 1996 appropriation—$185.698 million—until improvements in FAA's acquisition management are apparent and efficiencies can be more readily assessed.

In summary, FAA's chronic delays in fielding new systems have not been caused by a lack of funds or their allocation, but can be attributed to legendary organizational, managerial, and cultural impediments to changing its acquisition process. The FAA, with our assistance, has taken an enviable first step and we are cautiously optimistic. But the road ahead is long and formidable. Working together in the Congress, we can help continue the transformation of a bureaucratic agency—long overdue for change—into a world-class standard of excellence for the 21st century.

FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION RESEARCH, ENGINEERING, AND DEVELOPMENT [RE&D] FY 97 RECOMMENDED AUTHORIZATION

[In millions of dollars]

	Fiscal year—		
	1996 appropriated	1997 PB request	1997 authorized
System development/infrastructure	10.000	16.822	10.000
Capacity/ATM technology	37.200	40.570	39.911
Comm/Nav/Surveillance	23.000	20.371	20.371
Weather	6.493	6.411	6.411
Airport technology	6.000	6.000	6.000
Air safety technology	37.978	38.999	37.978
System security	36.045	36.045	36.045
Human factors/aviation medicine	23.682	23.682	23.682
Environment/Energy	3.800	3.800	3.800
Innovative/Cooperative research	1.500	3.000	1.500
Total	185.698	195.700	185.698

Note: Capacity/Air Traffic Management Technology was adjusted upward slightly from the fiscal year 1996 appropriation. For fiscal year 1997, the President requested $2.629 million less for Communications/Navigation/Surveillance and $0.082 million less for Weather than was appropriated for fiscal 1996. These two amounts, totaling $2.711, were used to increase fiscal year 1997 budget authority for Capacity/Air Traffic Management activity from the fiscal year 1996 appropriated amount of $37.200 million to $39.912 million. This budget category, which funds research and development for the free flight concept, was cited as the top priority by the FAA's RE&D advisory committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to title VII?

If not, the Clerk will designate title VIII.

The text of title VIII is as follows:

TITLE VIII—NATIONAL EARTHQUAKE HAZARDS REDUCTION PROGRAM

SEC. 801. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 12 of the Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act of 1977 (42 U.S.C. 7706) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(7) by striking ''and $25,750,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''$25,750,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and $18,825,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997'';

(2) in subsection (b) by striking ''and $50,676,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''$50,676,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and $46,130,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997'';

(3) in subsection (c) by adding at the end the following new sentence: ''There are authorized to be appropriated, out of funds otherwise authorized to be appropriated to the National Science Foundation, $28,400,000 for fiscal year 1997, including $17,500,000 for engineering research and $10,900,000 for geosciences research.''; and

(4) in subsection (d) by adding at the end the following new sentence: ''There are authorized to be appropriated, out of funds otherwise authorized to be appropriated to the National Institute of Standards and Technology, $1,932,000 for fiscal year 1997.''.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to title VIII?

If not, the Clerk will designate title IX.

The text of title IX is as follows:

TITLE IX—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 901. PROHIBITION OF LOBBYING ACTIVITIES.

None of the funds authorized by this Act shall be available for any activity whose purpose is to influence legislation pending before the Congress, except that this shall not prevent officers or employees of the United States or of its departments or agencies from communicating to Members of Congress on the request of any Member or to Congress, through the proper channels, requests for legislation or appropriations which they deem necessary for the efficient conduct of the public business.

SEC. 902. LIMITATION ON APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) EXCLUSIVE AUTHORIZATION FOR FISCAL YEAR 1997.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no sums are authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1997 for the activities for which sums are authorized by this Act unless such sums are specifically authorized to be appropriated by this Act.

(b) SUBSEQUENT FISCAL YEARS.—No sums are authorized to be appropriated for any fiscal year after fiscal year 1997 for the activities for which sums are authorized by this Act unless such sums are specifically authorized to be appropriated by Act of Congress with respect to such fiscal year.

SEC. 903. ELIGIBILITY FOR AWARDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The head of each Federal agency for which funds are authorized under this Act shall exclude from consideration for awards of financial assistance made by that agency after fiscal year 1996 any person who received funds, other than those described in subsection (b), appropriated for a fiscal year after fiscal year 1996, from any Federal funding source for a project that was not subjected to a competitive, merit-based award process. Any exclusion from consideration pursuant to this section shall be effective for a period of 5 years after the person receives such Federal funds.

(b) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to awards to persons who are members of a class specified by law for which assistance is awarded to members of the class according to a formula provided by law.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to title IX?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SOLOMON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendemtn offered by Mr. SOLOMON: Page 137, after line 4, insert the following new sections:

SEC. 904. ROTC ACCESS TO CAMPUSES.

(a) DENIAL OF GRANTS AND CONTRACTS.—(1) No funds appropriated for civilian science activities of the Federal Government may be provided by contract or by grant (including a grant of funds to be available for student aid) to any institution of higher education that, as determined by the agency to which the funds were appropriated, in consultation with other appropriate Federal agencies, has an anti-ROTC policy.

(2) In the case of an institution of higher education that is ineligible for grants and contracts by reason of paragraph (1), the prohibition under that paragraph shall cease to apply to that institution upon a determination by the agency to which the funds were appropriated, in consultation with other appropriate Federal agencies, that the institution no longer has an anti-ROTC policy.

(b) NOTICE OF DETERMINATION.—Whenever an agency makes a determination under subsection (a) that an institution has an anti-ROTC policy, or that an institution previously determined to have an anti-ROTC policy no longer has such a policy, the agency—

(1) shall transmit notice of that determination to the Secretary of Education and the Congress; and

(2) shall publish in the Federal Register notice of that determination and of the effect of that determination under subsection (a) on the eligibility of that institution for grants and contracts.

(c) SEMIANNUAL NOTICE IN FEDERAL REGISTER.—Each agency shall publish in the Federal Register once every six months a list of each institution of higher education that is currently ineligible for grants and contracts by reason of a determination of the agency under subsection (a).

(d) ANTI-ROTC POLICY.—In this section, the term ''anti-ROTC policy'' means a policy or practice of an institution of higher education that—

(1) prohibits, or in effect prevents, the maintaining or establishing of a unit of the Senior Reserve Officer Training Corps at that institution; or

(2) prohibits, or in effect prevents, a student at that institution from enrolling in a unit of the Senior Reserve Officer Training Corps at another institution of higher education, but does not include a longstanding policy of pacifism based on historical religious affiliation.

SEC. 905. RECRUITING ON CAMPUS.

(a) DENIAL OF FUNDS.—(1) No funds appropriated for civilian science activities of the Federal Government may be provided by grant or contract (including a grant of funds to be available for student aid) to any institution of higher education that, as determined by the agency to which the funds were appropriated, in consultation with other appropriate Federal agencies, has a policy of denying, or which effectively prevents—

(A) entry to campuses or access to students on campuses; or

(B) access to directory information pertaining to students,

for purposes of military recruiting. This paragraph shall not apply to a longstanding

policy of pacifism based on historical religious affiliation.

(2) In the case of an institution of higher education that is ineligible for grants and contracts by reason of paragraph (1), the prohibition under that paragraph shall cease to apply to that institution upon a determination by the agency to which the funds were appropriated, in consultation with other appropriate Federal Agencies, that the institution no longer has a policy described in paragraph (1).

(3) Students referred to in paragraph (1) are individuals who are 17 years of age or older.

(b) NOTICE OF DETERMINATION.—Whenever an agency makes a determination under subsection (a) that an institution has a policy described in subsection (a), or that an institution previously determined to have such a policy no longer has such a policy, the agency—

(1) shall transmit notice of that determination to the Secretary of Education and the Congress; and

(2) shall publish in the Federal Register notice of that determination and of the effect of that determination under subsection (a) on the eligibility of that institution for grants and contracts.

(c) SEMIANNUAL NOTICE IN FEDERAL REGISTER.—Each agency shall publish in the Federal Register once every six months a list of each institution of higher education that is currently ineligible for grants and contracts by reason of a determination of the agency under subsection (a).

(d) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term ''directory information'' means, with respect to a student, the student's name, address, telephone listing, date and place of birth, level of education, degrees received, and the most recent previous educational institution enrolled in by the student.

Amend the table of contents accordingly.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, let me be very brief, because this amendment in its two parts has previously passed this House and has become the law of the land. The amendment says that any institution of higher education that prohibits ROTC units on campus or prohibits the recruiters of our military to go on campus and offer honorable careers to the young men and women graduating from these colleges will not be eligible for any of the grants that appear in this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, these institutions just cannot expect to reject the people who defend our country and the public on one hand and dip into the public trough with the other hand. For the last 15 years or so, this country has had to depend on an all volunteer military. These young men and women come from all walks of life from all across this great country, and they are the best trained, the best educated, the best motivated young men and women of any military in the entire world today. But because it is an all-voluntary military, our military does need access to be able to offer these honorable careers to these young men and women.

This amendment, the last time it was offered to the defense authorization bill, received 271 votes, and therefore I would ask the Members accept it here tonight so that we can continue the success of our all-voluntary military today.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to accept the amendment if my understanding is correct of some language that the gentleman has added to the amendment.

As the gentleman knows, I had some concerns about schools that have a historic pattern of practicing pacifism, that are religiously oriented schools, and I wanted to assure that they were not kept from participating in research programs as a result of that historic pattern and those religious beliefs. My understanding is that the gentleman has put language into his amendment to assure that those kinds of institutions can be exempted. Is that correct?

Mr. SOLOMON. That is correct, I say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER]. If he reads on page 3, on line 1 and 2, it says that this does not include institutions who have a longstanding policy of pacifism based on historical religious affiliations.

I understand that with the kind of schools that the gentleman might have in his district, as well as the gentleman from Virginia, who I think is seeking to be recognized here as well.

Mr. WALKER. Just one more clarification, if I could. It is my understanding that that exemption then would be up to the agency that is going to grant the money and the respective Federal agencies to make the determination.

Mr. SOLOMON. The gentleman is obsolutely correct.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment. I think it is vitally important. Campus recruiting is a vitally important component of the military's effort to attract our Nation's best and brightest young people. It is simply sound fiscal policy to deny Federal dollars to schools that interfere with the Federal Government's constitutionally mandated function of raising a military.

However, I have in my district, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania has, religious denominations, Mennonite, Amish and others that have hundreds of years of historical background of not participating in military activities based upon their deeply found religious beliefs, and I think if they are not simply antimilitary based upon a political position of the time but rather have that deep-seated opinion, then they should have that exemption and should still be able to apply for funds for legitimate scientific programs at their institutions. I thank the gentleman for including that language in the bill which will protect those schools.

Mr. SOLOMON. The gentleman is correct, and certainly because of his recommendation and that of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], we have included it.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the gentleman from California, who has been one of the major sponsors of legislation like this ever since he first came to the Congress.

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I rise in strong support of the amendment.

I think that it is an issue of fairness. It is an issue of fairness to our military, to our young people who have chosen a military career. I also believe it is extremely important that in our universities across this country that they make that an option for our students, for our young people, as an option for a career that they should go into if they do choose to accept Federal dollars and grants. I thank the gentleman for offering this amendment and am in strong support of it.

Mr. SOLOMON. It is the Solomon-Pombo amendment. I certainly thank the gentleman for speaking out for it.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, will this include student loans?

Mr. SOLOMON. It has nothing to do with student loans.

Ms. LOFGREN. I am seeking to understand the amendment. Would the prohibition of funds going to a university include Pell grants or student loans or students in universities where ROTC is not offered?

Mr. SOLOMON. No, it would not. These deal only with research grants.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I realize that I may be the only voice against the amendment here today, but I do so because there is a school in my district that for over a long period of time reached the conclusion not to have a ROTC program. I personally think ROTC is a good idea. I wish that ROTC did exist and I know individuals who have had a great experience and a measurable improvement in their future and life because of their participation in the program. However, I would hate to see San Jose State University cut off from all of the fine research that they are doing because of a decision made in another program area, supportive as I am of the ROTC program. I think it is a mistake to tie in our research funds with our ROTC program support, because so much of

what is done by way of scientific research is not done just to benefit the universities that might participate in those research programs but that research is to benefit the entire country, to benefit the future of the United States by forging advances on one or another of critical questions that face us and our future.

So I think although we must take strong efforts to support our men and women in the military, in the long run it will do them no good to cripple those universities that might be doing research in the very areas that could benefit them in the future.

So with a great deal of respect for those who have offered the amendment, I would urge that we not willy-nilly run down this path that may have consequences that are adverse and that we have not fully considered.

As a member of the Committee on Science, I know that this was not considered by the committee. We did not have any hearings on it, at least in our committee, and I think it would be ill-advised to approve the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title IX?

If not, are there further amendments to the bill?

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word to enter into a colloquy with the distinguished gentlewoman from Maryland.

Mr. Chairman, it was my intention to offer an amendment, a new title X which would add to the bill the provisions unanimously reported by the Technology Subcommittee chaired by the gentlewoman earlier this year.

Knowing of her interest in these programs, I would like to ask her what her intentions might be and if she would intend to offer such an amendment, I would allow her to do so.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of California. I yield to the gentlewoman from Maryland.

Mrs. MORELLA. In response, Mr. Chairman, to the ranking member of the Science Committee who is such a dedicated, distinguished gentleman who knows that I do care about the ATP Program, the amendment I am about to offer has to do with the Manufacturing Extension Program. It is an excellent amendment. I know that the gentleman would support it wholeheartedly. I would love to have the opportunity to offer it. We can then see whether the gentleman wants to do something else after that.

Mr. BROWN of California. I understand the gentlewoman's position. I infer that she is constrained from offering the version that was reported out of her subcommittee by unanimous vote; am I correct in that?

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I feel that it would be appropriate to fulfill what the full committee has decided to do, and it was not considered appropriate for the full committee to act on that.

Mr. BROWN of California. Did the full committee take some action that I am unaware of?

Mrs. MORELLA. No, the full committee did not act on that.

Mr. BROWN of California. In other words, the gentlewoman is doing what the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] says he is willing to accept?

Mrs. MORELLA. No, no, no, no, no, no. The ATP bill, which was authorized by our Technology Subcommittee, was approved, did not come to the full committee. And I am not offering it today, but I am offering an amendment that was offered at full committee and then was withdrawn with a significant sum attached to it.

Mr. BROWN of California. As much as I respect and admire the gentlewoman, I am constrained to say that her answer does not satisfy my requirements and I am going to offer, and I do offer at this point an amendment to the bill which had been approved unanimously by the subcommittee but was objected to by the chairman of the full committee.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROWN of California: Page 137, after line 4, insert the following new title:

TITLE X—INDUSTRIAL TECHNOLOGY SERVICES

SEC. 1001. INDUSTRIAL TECHNOLOGY SERVICES AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Commerce for the Industrial Technology Services activities of the National Institute of Standards and Technology for fiscal year 1997—

(1) for the Advanced Technology Program under section 28 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278n), such sums as may be appropriated; and

(2) for the Manufacturing Extension Partnerships program under sections 25 and 26 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278k and 278l), such sums as may be appropriated.

SEC. 1002. NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF STANDARDS AND TECHNOLOGY ACT AMENDMENTS.

Section 28 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278n) is amended—

(1) by striking ''or contracts'' in subsection (b)(1)(B), and inserting in lieu thereof ''contracts, and, subject to the last sentence of this subsection, other transactions'';

(2) by inserting ''and if the non-Federal participants in the joint venture agree to pay at least 50 percent of the total costs of the joint venture during the Federal participation period, which shall not exceed 5 years,'' after ''participation to be appropriate,'';

(3) by striking ''provision of a minority share of the cost of such joint ventures for up to 5 years, and (iii)'' in subsection (b)(1)(B), and inserting in lieu thereof ''and'';

(4) by striking ''and cooperative agreements'' in subsection (b)(2), and inserting in lieu thereof '', cooperative agreements, and, subject to the last sentence of this subsection, other transactions'';

(5) by adding after subsection (b)(4) the following:

''The authority under paragraph (1)(B) and paragraph (2) to enter into other transactions shall apply only if the Secretary, acting through the Director, determines that standard contracts, grants, or cooperative agreements are not feasible or appropriate, and only when other transaction instruments incorporate terms and conditions that reflect the use of generally accepted commercial accounting and auditing practices.''; and

(6) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(k) Notwithstanding subsection (b)(1)(B)(ii) and subsection (d)(3), the Director may grant extensions beyond the deadlines established under those subsections for joint venture and single applicant awardees to expend Federal funds to complete their projects, if such extension may be granted with no additional cost to the Federal Government and it is in the Federal Government's interest to do so.''.

Amend the table of contents accordingly.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania reserves a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, as I indicated earlier, this amendment was considered in the Technology Subcommittee of the Committee on Science and adopted unanimously as an extremely innocuous indication of support for two of the vital programs of the National Institute of Science and Technology. These two programs were the Advanced Technology Program and the Manufacturing Extension Partnerships, as set forth in the amendment.

There is not a specific amount authorized for these programs but only such sums as may be appropriated. In other words, this leaves it up to the Committee on Appropriations to determine the level of funding. But, if adopted and signed into law by the President, it continues an authorization for these two excellent programs which are an integral part of the work of the National Institute of Science and Technology.

□ 1930

Now, it turns out, of course, that the bill, as reported out of the Subcommittee on Technology, was never taken up by the full committee. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] has many good reasons why he does not want to continue authorizing these two programs, and his method of doing this, of course, was merely not to take them up in full committee, not to have them debated and marked up in full

committee, and then not, therefore, to be included with the other matters within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Science and this so-called omnibus science authorization bill.

Now, I am offering something that I feel is the easiest, simplest, least controversial, and least expensive way to go. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] has frequently argued that we must never in our authorizations go beyond the levels which the appropriators are going to go. As a consequence, of course, we many times end up going far below what the appropriators are going to go.

Last year, for example, the appropriators continued these two programs at levels which did not satisfy me, but they were continued on the books. I am now, at this point, offering this amendment as a nominal way to maintain the authorization for these two existing programs, at the level that the appropriators in their wisdom fit within the budget, so that we cannot have the argument argued so often by the gentleman that we are busting the budget.

We cannot bust the budget in an authorizing committee, as all of those who have served in this body know. It is only the appropriators who can bust the budget, and by passing the ball to them we will allow them to decide what the budget allows and we will maintain the authorization for these two finally important programs, which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], the chairman of the committee, considers to be corporate welfare. So he is bitterly opposed to them.

Mr. Chairman, I very much hope that the Members will see the logic of my offering this minimal type of authorizing amendment and will support it.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my point of order.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. This is an interesting point in the debate. The gentleman from California has essentially decided to bring an amendment to the floor to authorize one of the favorite programs of the administration, and there is no doubt this administration loves corporate welfare. The gentleman has offered the ultimate corporate welfare amendment by reauthorizing the ATP program.

Now, as the gentlewoman from Maryland had said, we were prepared to try to reauthorize the manufacturing extension program but the gentleman from California was not satisfied with that. He wants to go further and go well beyond that and go into the ATP program. The ATP program is, in fact, industrial policy defined. It is all of the things that people are concerned about when they hear about their tax dollars being spent.

For middle class Americans who are concerned about where their tax dollars go, here is a program they should love because this particular chart talks about those largest awards and where they went last year. Now, when we think about $25,000-a-year working families in my district having taxes taken out of their pockets and brought to Washington and then given to people, who do we think they should have the money given to? Well, in this program where the money goes is to General Motors, Ford Motor, AT&T, GE, IBM, Hewlett-Packard, Motorola, United Technologies, Bell South, MCI, Allied Signal, Texas Instruments.

This is a list of the Fortune 500 that are getting money that is being taken out of the pocketbooks of working families and handed over to corporations.

Now, if Members think that results in good science, think a little bit about what we were told when the GAO took a look at these programs. What we will be told is, oh, well, we have to have these cooperative arrangements with these big companies in order to get development of new products. The fact is that we do not get development that is generic to all products, we get a few hand-picked corporations singled out that then get the money.

Now, I realize the administration loves that because these are hand-picked corporations that just happen to give big political contributions according to research done by one of the foundations in town. They looked at the ATP program and found that there was this surprising similarity between those who gave money to political campaigns and those who got money from the ATP program. So it fits a very, very nice pattern for those who think that corporate money into political campaigns is a great idea, but I am not so certain it serves the needs of science.

The fact is that what we have attempted to do is reprioritize spending by going away from some of these programs that give money to big corporations and put money into industrial subsidies and put the money into some of the places that we think are high priority research.

So the gentleman from California is offering an amendment which is, in fact, an amendment to continue the pattern of corporate welfare. Despite the fact suggested that the government ought to be backing out of corporate welfare, this administration, and now the minority, has decided that corporate welfare is the wave of the future. That is the way in which we have to go in order to assure a better climate for science in the country.

I just disagree. I think industrial policy science makes no sense. It in fact impedes our competitiveness. It does all the wrong things. It has us picking winners and losers in the marketplace. It does all the bad things in terms of how we want to proceed ahead with both research and development and the science of the country.

So if Members are for the gentleman's amendment as presented to us at the present time, they are for taking money out of the pockets of middle class Americans and giving it to General Motors, Ford Motor, AT&T, GE, IBM, Hewlett-Packard, Motorola, United Technologies, Bell South, MCI, Allied Signal, Texas Instruments, Apple Computers, Sun Microsystems, and a whole bunch of other people. That is what Members are for doing.

I think it is a bad deal and I suggest we should reject the amendment of the gentleman from California.

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

Mr. Chairman, in the 5 minutes I have I will try to give the facts on this amendment and what it was meant to do. It was unanimously, Democrat and Republican, passed out of our subcommittee last year. Because of the comments of the previous speaker, one knows where the bias of the chair on our committee is toward these programs, and I do not need, I do not think, to elaborate on that anymore.

Let me simply say this. Trying to separate fact from fiction, these are not corporate welfare grants, these companies put up 50 percent of the money as these ATP programs, Republican-administered, throughout the country. And let me further say this. In an independent Silber & Associates report, talking about the Advanced Technology Program, they said that it does indicate the program is achieving its objective; that there is no evidence that there is any linkage to any kind of political campaign, and that, furthermore, over half of the ATP cost-shared awards have gone to small businesses and more than 100 universities have participated in more than 157 projects.

Now, we went through this in the subcommittee at great length. I am sorry that the chairman of the subcommittee did not choose to try to bring our bill that we thought was so good in a unanimous vote to the floor. The full committee never took up the unanimously passed bill in the subcommittee for reasons that have heretofore been expressed, and I would just simply say this. All we are asking for is a vote on this.

Every person who has looked at these programs who is not an ideologue or has a bias of some kind has said the wave of the future, and I cited earlier when I was talking about the Council on Competitiveness, hardly a liberal claptrap organization, said that the wave of the future is to get away from this business of applied versus basic science. The wave of the future is to make government an ally of business in this country because the businesses in this country, because the vagaries of the marketplace are not going to be able to invest in blue sky research without some thought of a product that can be marketed to come back to them in the future for commercialization.

Therefore, it behooves us all, government, industry, universities and Federal labs, to work together. That is exactly what these two programs do. They allow for industry to participate in blue sky research with the help of the Federal Government, so that if

there is a technological breakthrough sometime down the line, American businesses will be able to take advantage of that in this worldwide marketplace. That it all it is.

Furthermore, this amendment does nothing more than authorize these programs at whatever sum the appropriators deem necessary, because we cannot get in our authorization committee a hearing on this bill in the full committee, notwithstanding the fact it was passed unanimously by the subcommittee.

Be that as it may, we do not run the committee, I understand that, but we have at this time an opportunity to let the Congress speak their will, not costing one dime, not one single cent, not a budget buster, only to say these programs ought to be authorized because unbiased experts have said they are working.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TANNER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I want to briefly comment, and I very much appreciate the gentleman's statement, and it illustrates exactly the reason I appear to be a little irked here on the floor.

This was the most arbitrary action I have ever seen a chairman take when he rejected a unanimous subcommittee report and refused to take up the bill. And then to categorize that as corporate welfare or industrial policy or as the grants going to, I gather, Democratic contributors is the most ridiculous, absolutely false statement, which he has never been able to substantiate, that I have ever heard.

A combination of arbitrariness, dictatorialness and a misuse of facts is what is ruining the activities of this committee and of the Congress as a whole to the degree it is infected by the gentleman from Pennsylvania's positions.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. MORELLA AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF CALIFORNIA

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as a substitute for the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. MORELLA as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. BROWN of California: Page 137, after line 4, insert the following new title:

TITLE X—FURTHER AUTHORIZATIONS

SEC. 1001. FURTHER AUTHORIZATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated $90,000,000 for the Manufacturing Extension Parternships program under sections 25 and 26 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278k and 278l) for fiscal year 1997. None of the funds authorized by this section may be used to establish a new Center.

Amend the table of contents accordingly:

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, the substitute that I propose will also add a new title X to the bill. It is for the purpose of authorizing the Commerce Department manufacturing extension partnership program, managed by the National Institute of Standards and Technology.

□ 1945

This program is one which I, and many Members of this body on both sides of the aisle, consider to be not only valuable but essential to our national competitiveness. MEP's State and regional centers provide consultation and guidance to manufacturers, both large and small, in the development and implementation and advanced management techniques designed to enhance efficiency and manufacturing expertise.

Mr. Chairman, the substitute that I propose would provide an affirmative authorization only for the manufacturing extension partnership program, and it would allocate to it $10 million more than was appropriated for fiscal year 1996. The amount would be $90 million.

This money would provide the funding required for support of the centers that have now been established and also for those that are planned during the period of fiscal year 1997. So that would bring the total number of centers to 75 at the conclusion of fiscal year 1997.

Mr. Chairman, I understand from the information that we have been provided during the course of our committee's consideration of these spending authorizations that that figure would represent the full complement of centers, 75, that are planned by the present administration and that no new centers are planned for startup after the conclusion of the fiscal year 1997 period.

I am persuaded in any event that at the conclusion of this 1997 fiscal year, it will be appropriate to pause and evaluate the performance of these centers before considering the creation of any new ones.

Congress should consider, after gathering the requisite information, the record of the centers in achieving their goals and the implementation of criteria for continued Federal funding. Thus, the amendment also contains language that would preclude the opening of any new centers after fiscal year 1997. This is not intended to be a permanent prohibition but merely to ensure that there be a pause in expansion until Congress has an opportunity to review and affirmatively make a decision about the need for any additional centers.

I know, however, that we do have preliminary information on the impact of the MEP program in the form of two GAO studies which collected extensive assessments of customer opinion on the value of the work done by the centers. Those customer reports were positive, spoke well for the fine work that is being done by the dedicated participants and the work of the centers.

So, Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of my substitute to the Brown amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] insist on his point of order?

Mr. BROWN of California. Having read the amendment, I withdraw my point of order, and I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I must, to begin with, suggest my very great admiration for the gentlewoman from Maryland. She has been a stalwart of the committee for many years. I know of her dedication to all of the programs at the National Institutes of Standards and Technology and to the general policies of technology development, technology transfer and dissemination. She is one of the leaders in this House, and I have the very highest regard for her.

Mr. Chairman, I do not understand why she does certain things in this substitute. Of course, if she can explain it, I would be happy to listen to it. But what she has done here is to offer a substitute which takes a small part of the programs included in my amendment, the Manufacturing Extension Partnership, and eliminates the major program, the Advanced Technology Program.

She authorizes a specific sum, $90 million, here. I see nothing in the amendment which accords with the Chairman's frequent admonition that there must be offsets whenever an amendment is offered that increases the amount of money. Perhaps he has in mind how she is going to offset this $90 million. But until he does offer such an offset, then I am constrained to feel that his previous admonitions that we could not consider amendments that did not have offsets was slightly disingenuous, to coin a phrase that I have sometimes used.

Mr. Chairman, there is, also, despite the strong protestations by the gentlewoman as to the excellence of this program for manufacturing extension partnerships, and I thoroughly concur with her, that this is a prohibition against extending this program. None of the funds authorized shall be used to establish a new center. If these centers are, in fact, as good as they are purported to be, and which we agree they are, they are generally funded for a fixed term of years. When they have finished that, they are supposed to transition to, if possible, 100 percent private sector financing. The money that is released should be used to continue the work by establishing other centers.

In the gentlewoman's substitute, she prohibits this. Not that it requires more money; it could be done with existing stream of funds, but she prohibits it. This denies the earlier statements that she made that these centers are making a contribution to improving the quality of performance of our great small business community in this country, which is our goal.

Now, for these reasons, and others, having to do of course with the fact that it does not include the Advanced Technology Program, I am going to

ask that we reject the substitute offered by the gentlewoman and pass the original amendment which contains everything that her amendment, her substitute, offers, plus additional benefits which I have already described in my earlier remarks.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in support of the substitute.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] has gone on a couple of emotional tirades, and I think we ought to clear up the record.

The gentleman from California has suggested that, in talking about the ATP Program, that this is ideologically driven by the chairman of the committee. I would suggest that just the opposite is true of the ideology. Let us correct the record with regard to whether or not any responsible observers have suggested whether there may be a connection between the ATP grants and politics.

It was done by the Cato Institute. I quote,

> Many of the top recipients of technology research grants awarded by the Clinton administration were also substantial contributors to the Clinton campaign or the Democratic National Committee.

Mr. Chairman, that is where I get the information. It was not made up. It is, in fact, very clear.

The next thing is, if this is a huge philosophical issue with the gentleman from Pennsylvania, then I do not know how I have gotten so far into the sack with Robert Shapiro, with director of economic policy at the Progressive Policy Institute, which is, in fact, not ideologically associated with me. But in looking at the ATP Program, he expressed some of the same concerns that I did.

Mr. Chairman, he says with regard to a grant that went to the Philips Corporation under ATP, he makes the statement:

> However, the Federal Government should not be helping Philips, the largest lighting company in the world, develop new commercial applications for technology already used in street lights.

That is the kind of thing that is going on in the program, and even people at the Progressive Policy Institute in fact are finding some concerns with those kinds of questions.

So we have a lot of lobbyists and big corporations that support this program, but the fact is that there are real concerns.

What the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA] has done is she has said, okay, she has a strong faith in some of these programs such as the MEP Program. She says, let us single it out and make sure that it gets all the money that it needs to fund the 75 centers that the administration says are necessary; and the administration has requested no more than 75.

The $90 million in the gentlewoman's amendment totally funds all 75 centers plus some administrative expenses. She is making the case that that is the right direction to go, but let us not continue down this road of funding industrial policy through ATP that gives money to big corporations out of the pockets of poor and middle-class wage earners.

Mr. Chairman, that is what the whole issue will be about here as we consider this: whether or not Members are for extending the MEP programs and probably getting an overwhelming vote in favor of the MEP, or whether or not what they are wanting to do is go the route of corporate welfare by ensuring that the ATP Program is that which is funded, and it is funded at a huge level at a cost to the taxpayers and going to big corporations.

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

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I thought the gentleman would give me the courtesy of allowing me to complete my statement, but I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I just would like to ask the gentleman, he likes to quote the Cato Institute report a lot and says that these are contributors to Democratic causes. Only five of the corporations, AT&T, Boeing, Chevron, Shell and Texaco, received ATP awards, and each of those companies gave more heavily to Republicans than they gave to Democrats.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman too about corporate welfare that he supports like the National Weather Service, NIST in-house R&D, energy supply R&D, FAA, S&T. The Cato Institute defines all of this as corporate welfare.

If the gentleman is agreeing with Cato's definition that corporate welfare is any program that involves government cooperation with industry, then why is the gentleman supporting hydrogen R&D, which he supports? Is that not corporate welfare?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, does the gentleman want a response or is he just interested in pejoratives?

Mr. Chairman, the hydrogen R&D Program that I supported was a basic research program. If the gentleman wants to go back and look at the bill, we supported a basic research program from hydrogen. We did not support any industrial policy to research to that. And the gentleman from Pennsylvania does not accept the Cato Institute's definition of corporate welfare. There are many different definitions around here that the gentleman can come up with.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, that is the report the gentleman cited.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I did not yield to the gentleman. Is he going to let me answer?

Mr. Chairman, the fact is that the way I define corporate welfare is when we are taking money from hard-earning, middle-class Americans and putting it in the hands of corporations through subsidies.

Now, that is exactly what we do here. And so, in fact, this is one of the biggest programs we have in the entire Federal Government that takes money out of the pocketbooks of Americans and hands it to big corporations.

So, Mr. Chairman, in my view, this is a definitional corporate welfare program. It is certainly a corporate subsidy program. It is certainly an industrial policy program, all the things that I think are bad.

The fact is we have had a recent report on U.S. competitiveness in USA Today. In USA Today they in fact say that the best things that we do in this country are when we have entrepreneurship and when we do the job of having better investment, not with huge corporate subsidies.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Morella substitute, and I yield to the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA].

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to respond to the wording in this particular amendment. There are 75 centers that will, we understand, be fully funded, including administrative costs. Of the 75 centers, 15 are new. Fifteen are new, already contracted for, and we are providing the money for them for fiscal year 1997.

We are asking that it is appropriate at the end of that period of time to simply look and review the 75 centers to see how effectively they are operating. I think this is good accountability, good responsibility, good oversight on the part of this Congress.

The MEP program is one that our committee has demonstrated a desire to continue. We are budgeting it. We are offering in the authorization $10 million more than what was in the budget authorization for the last fiscal year that had been appropriated, and we feel it is a good amendment. I do not think it has any criticism. That is adverse. And I say to this Congress, pass it.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I would just add, in support of this, that this House addressed the ATP program last year, zeroed it out. The gentlewoman from Maryland's strategy is to come back and try to get something for the MEP program. I think it is a realistic way that we can get the appropriate money for it, and I am happy to support it.

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

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to comment briefly on this because I have heard some of the same things that I have heard now for 18 months in the Committee on Science. I think there is a philosophical difference, and I think it is fair that we discuss it. It is not about money to corporations. I was here and voted against the agriculture bill. We shovel money at farmers, and they are corporations; that does not seem to bother anybody. It bothered

me. So the problem is not about taking tax money and giving it to others apparently. It is about industrial policy. And I have heard the Chairman use that word over and over again.

I think there is a difference.

□ 2000

I know that we are in a vicious economic global competition. If we look at what others around the world are doing and compare them to what we will do it this bill passes with the Morella amendment to the Brown amendment, I think we will agree, at least I believe, we are in trouble.

Mr. Chairman, Europe is accelerating its investment in commercial technologies through just the same kind of programs that the ATP program represents for America through the European Union joint R&D initiative. Japan is doubling their government science and technology budget in the next 4 years. China is tripling its investment in joint projects. Korea is also boosting its R&D efforts in key areas.

They realize, as we should, that precompetitive, precommercial research is part of getting ahead in the really rather strident and tough competition that we face internationally.

I would like to note that some people who I do not think the very political, like the American Chemical Society, has said, and I quote: ATP is a vital component of our Nation's technology and competitiveness portfolio.

I would like to give just a couple of quick examples of how this actually works. One example from San Jose is Spectra Diode Laboratories, which joined with Xerox in 1991 in a project to develop integrated arrays of high-powered multi-wavelength laser diodes. Now the ATP funds that were provided, and I would add in partnership; industry puts at least 50 percent of the money up and oftentimes more; enabled this firm, SDL, to move ahead of where they otherwise would have been.

It is true one of the three technologies they developed might have been developed anyhow, but would not have happened in the time frame in which it did. In Silicon Valley and high tech, time is very important. We are talking about products that have a life cycle of 12 months, 13 months, 14 months. If you miss a step, pretty soon you have got your competitors abroad just killing you in the business.

Mr. Chairman, I would note that SDL's early applications have tripled their business in 2 years, and note that in some measure their success has added to the 46,000 jobs that were added in 1 year in Silicon Valley, CA.

None of us want to squander tax money, but there are things such as squandering and then there are investments for the future. My voters tell me for the most part that, if we can do something to invest in science and technology that boosts our economy, that provides high-tech, good-paying jobs, that is a good investment.

Mr. Chairman, I would add just one other example, and that has to do with something that I think is going to be a critical matter for our country and whether we prosper or fail in the next generation of computers. That is flat panel display. There are several competing technologies being pursued at this point. It is not yet clear which of them will emerge as the winner. We have one ATP program located in Silicon Valley pursuing very sophisticated approaches using photons as a base for the technology.

We have very little going on other than the ATP program in the United States. Our major competitors are in Japan, in Singapore, in Korea.

If we were to pull out of this technological research, we would be doing great damage. For those who have laptops, you cannot build a laptop unless you can get a flat panel. When all the flat panels are owned, when all the flat panel technology is owned by our economic competitors, our folks will not have a guaranteed supply of the key components for something that is going to be a growth industry.

Mr. Chairman, let us not shoot ourselves in the foot. I strongly urge that we vote against the Morella amendment. It kills the ATP program, and it does damage to our country's future.

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

Mr. Chairman, I know it is getting late, and I am not going to take a lot of time. I just think it is interesting to note that, while the chairman of the Committee on Science likes to talk about Boeing receiving $2 million on the ATP program and labels that corporate welfare, he conveniently overlooks the $6 billion contract Boeing gets on the Space Station, which he supports. So I think there is just a little bit of a double standard going on here.

There is some corporate welfare apparently that is good, and then there is other corporate welfare that is not so good.

I would say to the gentlewoman from Maryland that we support MEP. All of us over here support that program, and we have tried to work in a bipartisan way to make sure what is clearly a success story continues. I would like to see the MEP program funded at $105 million, at full funding.

I would like to see other areas have MEP centers, like I enjoy in western Pennsylvania. The Southwestern Pennsylvania Industrial Resource Center, I believe, has saved the manufacturing base in Pittsburgh and is a program that not only needs to continue but should be expanded because it is doing good things, too.

Similar good things have been happening in the ATP program, and I think it is interesting to note that, when we held hearings on ATP, most of these so-called expert witnesses that were presented were not from members from the private sector or from industry. They were these so-called experts from these inside-the-Beltway think tanks that talked negatively about this program.

Every private sector, every company representative, even those that did not receive ATP awards, spoke favorably about this program. So I think, if we were serious about addressing this issue of so-called corporate welfare, that we would have done it in a much more substantial way rather than the very narrow focus that the chairman has taken in this program.

In closing, I think the Brown amendment is a far superior amendment because it takes care of two programs that are a success story. We do support the MEP program and certainly are going to support funding for that.

Certain elements within the Science Committee have tried to bury NIST's technology and manufacturing support programs without ever having to endure the political inconvenience of debating their merits or voting on the record to kill them.

Our amendment is designed to correct this situation and allow flexibility for the Appropriations Committee to find funding for these supposedly controversial programs.

What are the functions of these disputed programs?

First, let's look at NIST's Manufacturing Extension Program. The MEP, which originated during the Reagan administration, has been a salvation to many American small manufacturing businesses. Faced with increasing direct global competition in the mid-1980's, small American manufacturers needed to become more efficient, but objective sources of modernization advice were costly or nonexistent. Abroad, countries like Japan, Germany, Singapore, and Italy all launched manufacturing extension programs to help their small manufacturers innovate, renovate, and compete. The Manufacturing Extension Partnership program [MEP] was NIST's response to the efforts of our global competitors to seize control of the international market for technology.

The MEP demonstrates that the Federal Government, in partnership with local business groups, educational institutions, and State governments, could provide small manufacturers with modernization services worth several times the Federal investment. Today, the MEP program serves 32 States through a network of 44 nonprofit centers. Federal funds are awarded on a competitive basis with States and local partners matching Federal funds. Each MEP center is tailored to meet the needs of regional industries by assisting small and medium size firms employing fewer than 500 workers—381,000 manufacturers employing 12 million workers—to modernize in order to compete in the demanding marketplace of the 1990's and beyond. To date, MEP centers have reached 25,000 customer firms. Each MEP project on average adds or saves 5 jobs, increases sales by $360,000 and saves $430,000 in labor and investments. Total benefits to manufacturers amount to $8 for every Federal dollar invested.

The MEP in my region, SPIRC, the Southwestern Pennsylvania Industrial Resource Center, has made meaningful improvements in numerous manufacturing plants throughout Allegheny County. It's safe to say SPIRC is directly responsible for maintaining our manufacturing base in western Pennsylvania.

The MEP program's benefits have been widely recognized. The House and Senate have agreed on language that was included in

the debt ceiling extension bill reaffirming the importance of MEP centers in helping business comply with Federal and State-level environmental regulations. The language reads,

Nothing in this Act in any way affects or limits the ability of other technical assistance or extension programs to perform or continue to perform services related to compliance assistance.

This clearly covers current MEP activities, which provide significant environmental assistance to small and medium-sized manufacturers. This has been a recent point of emphasis within the MEP program. For example, the Tennessee MEP Center was awarded $900,000 to develop a prototype program for environmental compliance that can be emulated by other MEP centers.

Let's also look at another Reagan administration effort, the Advanced Technology Program, which addressed another market failure. Technology partnership programs, such as ATP, were crafted in direct response to the concern that too much of the scientific knowledge resulting from research projects was not finding its way into our companies, where technology could be turned into the products and services, the profits and jobs that drive our economy. Many factors, including the globalization of markets, the rapid pace of technology cycles, and the focus on short term investment, have led to the short term and narrow R&D focus in most companies.

As a result, U.S. industry tends to avoid investments in enabling technologies with broad economic benefits, and focuses almost exclusively on narrow mission-specific research with short horizons. Technology partnerships were conceived as a means to create some bridges to better connect basic research with the companies who can move ideas into the marketplace.

The ATP, based on previous Government experience in fostering technology transfer, is a cost-shared partnership between Government, industry, and universities. With funding of $341 million in fiscal year 1995, it represented less than 1 percent of total Federal civilian R&D investment. It is too early to determine the full economic benefits from a program like ATP, which began in 1990, but has at least a 10-year horizon for payoff. Already, there is substantial evidence that the ATP is catalyzing unique, new enabling technologies and thereby creating new economic opportunities that would not have existed otherwise.

Also, I want to mention that in spirit of bipartisan cooperation, Congressman BOEHLERT and I circulated a letter of support for MEP. Well over 90 Members signed onto this letter, including such notable Members as Congressman HASTERT, the majority's chief deputy whip, Chairman SPENCE of the Armed Services Committee, Chairman MEYERS of the Small Business Committee, and many others. I have a copy of the letter here, which I hope Members will look at before voting.

Thanks to more thoughtful consideration of these programs than that of the Science Committee, Congress provided adequate funding for the NIST laboratories and provided subsistence funding for the Manufacturing Extension Partnership. Unfortunately, funding for the Advanced Technology Program was eliminated for fiscal year 1996.

Authorization levels for the MEP and the ATP were not the result of any objective analysis of the merits of these programs, but were based solely on political considerations. From the beginning days of the 104th Congress, both the MEP and ATP programs were targeted as corporate welfare by certain Members.

What is the basis for my assertion that the attacks made on the ATP and MEP are political rather than any rational evaluation of the program? In a hearing before the Technology Subcommittee this past year, the only witness who spoke against the ATP and MEP were expert witnesses with no technical business background—their only experience was working for inside the beltway think tanks. Every other private sector witness supported these programs and programs like them, regardless of whether their company received an ATP award.

According to a July 1995 Congressional Budget Office [CBO] report, Federal Financial Support of Business, the ATP and MEP represent less than 4 percent of the $12 billion the Federal Government will spend on programs that support industrial technology commercialization. If the cities of these programs were truly interested in rooting out this so-called corporate welfare, why are they silent regarding the majority of programs, such as the almost $1 billion Small Business Innovation Research Program [SBIR], or $3.7 billion at the National Institutes of Health [NIH] for applied biomedical research? If they were serious, we would be debating the entire range of technology commercialization programs which the Government funds. The Science Committee has not done this and the House has not done this.

The elimination of the ATP and attempts to eliminate the MEP are using the corporate welfare label to further another agenda. To be frank, the ATP and MEP were targeted, despite their initiation by a Republican administration, because they were enthusiastically endorsed by Bill Clinton—both as a candidate and as President. Eliminating ATP and MEP does not mean that Congress is making hard choices, it says Congress is making political ones. Rather than listening to the experts and building a Federal investment S&T that is based in economic reality and looks to the future, opponents of these programs have only used rhetorical arguments as justification for attacking the ATP and MEP for purely political reasons.

I want to emphasize that until this Congress the question of support for MEP and ATP has not been partisan. It is the effort to make this a partisan debate that many of us on both sides of the aisle are working to counter. Even in the mark-up of this bill, Members of both parties supported this amendment, which failed on a tie vote. I have the utmost respect for my colleagues in the majority who have not succumbed to the misguided effort to handicap our competitiveness.

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

Mr. Chairman, I will not take all of my 5 minutes. I just feel compelled to answer some of the charges, I guess we would call them, that have been made on the floor here today, all without any foundation, from the benefit of the standpoint of a hearing in our committee on these matters.

Let me tell Members what industry says about the Advanced Technology Program, just a few things. The Institute of Electrical and Electronic Engineers continues its strong support for the ATP program. A significant amount of progress in technology transfer is the direct result of the ATP programs. These programs illustrate that government participation in the R&D arena can be both efficient and productive.

The American Chemical Society: As the gentlewoman from California [Ms. LOFGREN] alluded to, ATP support of market incentives encourages companies to invest for the long term in high-risk, high-payoff technologies.

The American Electronics Association: ATP is based on government and industry cooperation and the development of technologies critical to America's long-term ability to compete in the global marketplace.

The South Carolina Research Authority in Columbia, SC: By supporting research in high-risk, leading-edge technology, the ATP is advancing the state of the art, contributing to the growth of our economy.

Finally, from a company in Valley Forge, PA: ATP is one vital approach to maintaining our science and technology leadership. These projects will never be undertaken without government support to challenge industry to take the higher technology risk. This could double or triple our R&D efforts on projects that are beyond our current core business and which we would otherwise never undertake.

That says it better than any politician, Mr. Chairman. That says exactly what this amendment that the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] has offered is all about. And that is why this almost, well, I do not know the word to use, amendment, to mask what is happening here that has been offered by the chairwoman of our subcommittee to just limit it to MEP and then to cut that off saying no new centers, that is why it should be rejected. We ought to really and truly support American business in this country.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, the ATP program was established in 1990 by President Bush. It seems to have worked very well. I do not know what has caused the chairman of this committee to just turn against it and seem like to have closed his mind on it. When the amendment was offered in committee, the majority of the committee members bipartisanly supported it. But he literally went over in committee and intimidated a Member to change his vote. It failed because it was a tie vote.

It really says that most of us on this committee really do think about what the future is all about. We really do understand that we have to be a partner in creating these jobs and getting technology that saves money. You know, there are a lot of success stories of the ATP program. They are many, they are varied. But in the health care industry,

for example, the ATP program for information infrastructure is assisting the industry in laying the foundation for the efficient use of technology in doctors' offices, hospitals, and clinics by cost-sharing with industry in the development of technologies, to reduce paperwork and bring better health care to rural areas. Many of our rural hospitals are at risk for closing.

Mr. Chairman, this is the kind of technology we need. Health care costs about $1 trillion a year in the United States, and the process of information accounts for about 20 percent of that total cost, or about $200 billion annually. If we can get technology to reduce that cost, thereby reducing the cost to individual patients, it is worth that small investment.

There are other examples of the ATP process. In Plano, TX, just outside my district but in the district of the gentleman from Texas, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, there is Microfab Technologies that hired 18 people. But they have come up, a very small company. I do not think you consider 18 people a large company, a big corporation. They have come up with product development from major, other companies. This new technology will significantly reduce hazardous waste. That is significant because soon we will be talking about Superfund reform and reauthorization.

I should think we want to save dollars when we have that technology. I think it is not penny-wise but it is pound-foolish for us to just decide arbitrarily, almost single-handedly that we must not partnership for developing technology, bringing about more jobs and reducing costs on things that are done in a way that could be improved with technology. I really regret that we have forgotten that we hold the trust of the people in this country, and we ought to try to bring about these changes because other countries will pass us by and we will pay more for it.

Rather than reducing ourselves to personality battles to show who is bigger than the other, that is irresponsible. I think that it is time for us to stop that and decide that we are here with the trust of people. We ought to stand and be responsible for what we are here about, and we cannot do it without these partnerships.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am extremely disappointed that a procedural maneuver may prevent a clean vote on the Tanner amendment, now called the Brown amendment, which I have enthusiastically cosponsored. Instead we will vote on a watered-down compromise, much less than we need.

NIST technology programs never used to be political hot potatoes. Both the MEP and ATP were established, as we just heard, during the Reagan and Bush administrations. Both programs are embraced by Members on both sides of the aisle because they make our Nation's businesses more competitive worldwide. Both programs are visionary and prove that government can be an effective partner with industry on technology development.

Mr. Chairman, let me just spend a few moments discussing the MEP and, in particular, California's Manufacturing Technology Center in Southern California's South Bay. Last year, 51 small manufacturers hired 442 additional employees after implementing improvements recommended by the CMTC. These same manufacturers saw their sales increase by a total of $5.8 million. Those are private-sector dollars, not taxpayer dollars.

It is all the more intriguing to me why the Committee on Science majority has decided to turn the Federal Government's back on small manufacturers, which have accounted for the majority of manufacturing-sector job growth in the Nation during the last 25 years.

Equally important to our Nation's high-tech development is the ATP, the Advanced Technology Program, a unique partnership between government and industry to accelerate the development of high-risk technologies. That promises significant commercial payoffs and widespread benefits for our economy. Industry drives the ATP by setting the program's research priorities. Industry must keep its part of the partnership by adhering to strict cost-sharing rules. We must keep up our end of the bargain by maintaining investment in high-technology industries.

Mr. Chairman, we must drive technology forward into the 21st century. Government must be a partner with industry in this effort. This amendment is too little and very late.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, there has been a longstanding debate on this House floor that one party over another is good for small businesses. I rise to support the Brown substitute that really does support small businesses and creates jobs.

We realize that the MEP program, in fact, has kept thousands of smaller companies in business by giving them the technology and the understanding to maintain their business and to keep their doors open. But we have heard a very striking and unfortunate debate revolving around the ATP program.

☐ 2015

Might I, Mr. Chairman, simply call the roll?

Plano, TX, an ATP program; Harris County, TX, an ATP program; Farmington Hills, MI, an ATP program; Danbury, CT, an ATP program; Yorktown Heights, NY, an ATP program; Valley Forge, PA, I might add in the great State of Pennsylvania, ATP program; Hopewell Junction, NY, ATP program; Wilmington, DE; San Diego, CA; Potomac, MD; Columbia, SC; Washington, DC; Santa Clara, CA, among many.

This is not a corporate welfare program. What it is is an effective partnership between business and government. It says to business, ''Where there is a great risk and we realize that you will not be taking the opportunity to explore these technologies, we will come in in competition with Japan and Germany and France and England and stand alongside of you so that you might be successful.''

I am somewhat disappointed that the distinguished chairman of this committee would continue to call this corporate welfare. Is he aware that when he sees the names of AT&T and IBM and Xerox, that they are, in fact, a partner with some 12 to 15 smaller companies that wind up on the grant from the Advanced Technology Program? Again a helping hand.

The chairman likes to always cite Cato as the expert on what is corporate welfare, and of course the Cato Institute suggests that the Advanced Technology Program is corporate welfare. Well, if they are so wise, let me offer to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] that Cato also says that his favorite projects are welfare, corporate welfare; the National Weather Service, the NIST in-house research and development, general science at DOE, energy supply R&D, U.S. Geological Survey, the FAA, the Office of S&T Policy, cooperative R&D agreements, technology transfer, high-performance computing, R&D university researchers, and the Space Station.

Might I say that we as a body have a bipartisan responsibility to insure that the science of America becomes the jobs of the 21st century? I have said it yesterday, I say it today, and I say it tomorrow. The MEP program, along with the Advanced Technology Program, are effective partners, want to emphasize small businesses, but as well to emphasize partnerships between the government large corporations and smaller businesses to insure that risky scientific investigation and research is carried on so that we can be competitive worldwide.

This is a bad amendment that excludes the ATP program. I would ask my colleagues to join me in supporting the substitute offered by the ranking member, the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN], for the committee offered in committee a bipartisan support short of that one vote. I will simply ask, Mr. Chairman, that we do that today and be victorious on behalf of research and businesses of America, particularly our small businesses.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA] as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN].

The amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN], as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to the bill?

If not, under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GOODLATTE) having assumed the chair, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3322) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1997 for civilian science activities of the Federal Government, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 427, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

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

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 3322, OMNIBUS CIVILIAN SCIENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1996

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of the bill, H.R. 3322, the Clerk may be authorized to correct section numbers, punctuation, and cross references, and to make such other technical and conforming changes as may be necessary to reflect the action of the House in amending the bill.

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

There was no objection.

EXCHANGE OF LETTERS BETWEEN COMMITTEES REGARDING JURISDICTION

Mr. WALKER. Mr. speaker, further, I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD include the exchange of letters between the Committee on Science and the Committees on Natural Resources, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Natural Security regarding the respective jurisdictions of the committees.

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

There was no objection.

The letters referred to are as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE,
Washington, DC, May 2, 1996.

Hon. BUD SHUSTER,
Chairman, House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR BUD: On April 24, 1996, the House Committee on Science marked up and reported out H.R. 3322, the Omnibus Civilian Science Authorization Act of 1996. Title VII of the bill contains provisions relating to the authorization and administration of the Federal Aviation Administration's Research, Engineering and Development Program

Several sections of title VII fall within the jurisdiction of your committee and as such your committee received a sequential referral of the omnibus bill upon introduction.

Given the short time frame before the omnibus bill will be considered on the Floor of the House. I realize that the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee will not have sufficient time to consider those provisions within your committee's jurisdiction. In order to expedite Floor consideration of H.R. 3322, I will drop Sections 702, 703, 704, 705 and 708 of H.R. 3322 which mainly pertain to the management of the Federal Aviation Administration. I also understand that you also object to Section 706(k) of the omnibus bill, and I will therefore not include that provision when the omnibus bill is considered on the House Floor.

I appreciate your willingness to work with us to expedite the consideration of H.R. 3322. I look forward to continuing to work with you on these issues.

Cordially,

ROBERT S. WALKER,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE,
Washington, DC, April 30, 1996.

Hon. FLOYD SPENCE,
Chairman, Committee on National Security, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Committee on Science has marked up and introduced H.R. 3322, the Omnibus Civilian Science Authorization Act of 1996. The following provisions may be within the jurisdiction of the Committee on National Security: Section 128, Science Studies Institute and Section 453, National Oceanographic Partnership Program.

The Committee on Science acknowledges the Committee on National Security's jurisdictional interest in these provisions. It is my understanding that similar language to Section 453 will be included in the FY 1997 Department of Defense Authorization bill. Nevertheless, I ask that your committee waive any request for sequential referral with respect to the provisions described above so that the House can consider H.R. 3322 without undue delay. I would of course support the inclusion of your Committee as conferees should H.R. 3322 go to a House-Senate conference.

Thank you for your cooperation and I look forward to hearing from you.

Cordially,

ROBERT S. WALKER,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE,
Washington, DC, May 1, 1996.

Hon. DON YOUNG,
Chairman, Committee on Resources, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR DON: I am writing to follow up on our conversation of May 1, 1996 about the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) title of H.R. 3322, the Omnibus Civilian Science Authorization Act of 1996. With one exception, the title's programmatic scope is identical to the NOAA title passed by the House last year as part of H.R. 2405, the Omnibus Civilian Science Authorization Act of 1995.

The one exception is a new section dealing with ocean research partnerships. It is my understanding that your staff has taken part in every step of the drafting process of the ocean research partnership language. In deference to your concerns, however, I will be pleased to drop the provision from the bill. Likewise, I am willing to drop language worked out between our two Committees last year, and passed by the House, on the NOAA Fleet and NOAA Corps as well as related program support accounts. I also am willing to drop language authorizing the National Sea Grant College Program as well as all National Ocean Service (NOS) programs and the Ocean and Great Lakes Programs of the office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research (OAR).

As with last year, I am pleased to work out any differences our two Committees may have over the substance of authorization language covering the NOAA programs we share. If we cannot agree, however, I will oblige your desire to strike the authorization for the programs I have outlined above.

I look forward to continuing our close working relationship on legislative matters our two Committees share.

Cordially,

ROBERT S. WALKER,
Chairman.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE,
Washington, DC, May 2, 1996.

Hon. ROBERT S. WALKER,
Chairman, House Committee on Science, Washington, DC.

DEAR BOB: Thank you for your letter of May 2, 1996, concerning H.R. 3322, the Omnibus Civilian Science Authorization Act of 1996. I appreciate the work your committee is doing in this bill on matters of civil aviation research and development within the jurisdiction of the Science Committee. I look forward to working with you on these matters as we proceed to reauthorize the Airport Improvement Program and as we continue to pursue FAA reform.

Because you have agreed to drop provisions within the Transportation Committee's jurisdiction from H.R. 3322, I have no objection to its consideration in the House.

With warm personal regards, I remain

Sincerely,

BUD SHUSTER,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY,
Washington, DC, May 1, 1996.

Hon. ROBERT S. WALKER,
Chairman, Committee on Science, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I understand the Committee on Science has recently marked up H.R. 3322, the Omnibus Civilian Science Authorization Act of 1996. This legislation includes two provisions within the legislative jurisdiction of the Committee on National Security—section 128, Science Studies Institute, and Section 453, National Oceanographic Partnership Program.

In recognition of your committee's desire to bring this legislation expeditiously before the House of Representatives, the Committee on National Security will waive referral of H.R. 3322, without, of course, waiving this committee's jurisdiction over the provisions in question. This committee also will seek to have conferees appointed for these provisions during any House-Senate conference.

I would appreciate your including this letter as a part of the report on H.R. 3322 and as part of the record during consideration of this bill by the House.

With warm personal regards, I am

Sincerely,

FLOYD D. SPENCE,
Chairman.

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES,
Washington, DC, May 2, 1996.

Hon. ROBERT S. WALKER,
Chairman, Committee on Science,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter of May 1, 1996, agreeing to delete portions of Title IV, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), of H.R 3322, which are within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Resources.

I have memorialized our agreement in the form of an amendment to the bill. As you can see, it deletes authorization sections for the National Ocean Service (NOS) and the Ocean and Great Lakes Programs of the Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research (OAR). It also removes provisions affecting the NOAA Corps, NOAA Fleet, the National Sea Grant College Program and the National Oceanographic Partnership Program. The amendment also eliminates from the program termination list contained in Subtitle D those programs funded under the programs and offices listed above.

In addition, the amendment removes a limitation contained in section 442, Limitations on Appropriations, which could foreclose the Resources Committee (or any other Committee) from authorizing funds for the many NOAA programs not authorized under H.R. 3322, like the Coastal Zone Management Act, the Magnuson Fishery Conservation and Management Act and the National Marine Sanctuaries Act.

Finally, the amendment makes technical conforming changes to the remaining text of Title IV.

If the Science Committee plans to make a manager's amendment for H.R. 3322 in order, I ask that these changes be contained in that amendment. If no such amendment is contemplated, I ask that you request the Rules Committee to make this amendment self-executing upon the adoption of the Rule for consideration of H.R. 3322. Of course, I assume that you would not offer or support any amendments adding back the provisions deleted per our agreement.

I also look forward to continuing our close working relationship on legislative matters our two Committees share during the remainder of this Congress.

Sincerely,

DON YOUNG,
Chairman.

Amendments to H.R. 3322

Page 90, line 11, through page 93, line 13, strike subtitle B.

Page 93, line 14, redesignate subtitle C as subtitle B.

Page 94, line 4, through page 97, line 13, strike subsections (c) and (d).

Page 97, lines 14 and 21, redesignate subsections (e) and (f) as subsections (c) and (d) respectively.

Page 98, line 1, redesignate subtitle D as subtitle C.

Page 98, lines 6 through 11, strike paragraphs (1) through (4).

Page 98, lines 16 through 21, strike paragraphs (8) through (12).

Page 99, lines 5 through 9, strike paragraphs (17) and (18).

Page 98, line 12, through page 99, line 10, redesignate paragraphs (5), (6), (7), (13), (14), (15), (16), and (19) as paragraphs (1) through (8), respectively.

Page 99, line 19, through page 100, line 7, strike subsections (c) and (d).

Page 100, lines 11 and 12, strike ''and any other Act''.

Page 100, line 20, through page 103, line 24, strike section 443.

Page 104, line 1, redesignate subtitle E as subtitle D.

Page 106, line 9, through page 116, line 9, strike section 453.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks in the RECORD on H.R. 3322, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MCNULTY. Last Thursday, Mr. Speaker, I was attending my daughter's graduation back home, and I missed rollcall No. 195 on the minimum wage bill, which I strongly support, and I want the RECORD to reflect my support for that bill. Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye.''

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 178, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 1997

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1 of rule XX, and at the direction of the Committee on the Budget, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res 178) establishing the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for fiscal year 1997 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for the fiscal years 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. SABO

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SABO moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the House and Senate on H. Con. Res 178, the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal years 1997 through 2002, be instructed—

(1) to agree to the Senate-passed levels of discretionary spending, as set by the amendment offered by Senator DOMENICI;

(2) to agree to section 325 of the Senate-passed resolution, relating to ''balance billing'' of Medicare patients by health care providers;

(3) to agree to section 326 of the Senate-passed resolution, relating to Federal nursing home quality standards; and

(4) to agree to section 327 of the Senate-passed resolution, relating to protection under the Medicaid program against spousal impoverishment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO].

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, in light of the fact that there are some flights at 9:30, that we limit debate on each side to 15 minutes. I have talked to the gentleman from Minnesota. It is okay with him. I would hope it would be okay with the gentleman from Ohio, too.

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

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not know whether this would then be a standing rule against the generally long-winded exhortations of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER], but if he wants to set a precedent here for brevity, I would be more than happy to accept this recommendation.

Still reserving the right to object, I have not heard the gentleman respond to that.

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

Mr. KASICH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, I will try to be as brief as I can.

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

Mr. KASICH. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. SABO. For the sake of my friend from Ohio, the gentleman from New York is not scheduled to speak.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, we will accept that.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO].

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, Members, the motion to instruct does four very important things: It asks the House to agree to the Senate discretionary levels as set by an amendment offered by Senator DOMENICI in the Senate and agreed to by a 3-to-1 vote in the Senate. This is to insure that we do not head to another Government shutdown in a long, dragged-out fight over appropriation bills. It is also about making sure that we adequately fund our programs for education, environmental and safety protection, research and development, and vital programs such as in agriculture.

We also instruct the House to agree to three Senate sense of the Senate or sense of the Congress resolutions. Budget resolutions are about numbers,

but it is ultimately also about policy. The Senate, through a sense of Congress, said that we should not be making changes in laws as they relate to spousal impoverishment and nursing home standards in Medicaid. I can think of no more fundamental policy that we should sustain in the Congress than those two basic priorities as we make modifications in Medicare, in Medicaid.

And we also say, and accept, a resolution from the Senate saying, that when we deal with changes in Medicare, we should not change the protections for seniors as it relates to balanced billing. In plain language, we should not let providers charge more than they are currently allowed to charge to seniors. Most of our seniors are very vulnerable, low-income people, and to change the Medicare system so that we ask higher payments from them, as proposed by the majority, is simply wrong.

So I urge the House to adopt this motion to instruct.

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

Let me first of all suggest that we cannot accept the motion to instruct for the simple reason that we really do not want to have our negotiating position dictated to us in a motion to instruct. In simple language, we do not intend to spend the $5 billion in additional spending that the Senate has asked for.

□ 2030

But in all likelihood, we will agree to a somewhat higher level of spending in an effort to reach agreement with the Senate. We will probably spend a little bit more money than what we spent when we passed our House resolution.

Second, however, we do not take, really, exception to the idea of having Federal nursing home quality standards. We, in fact, adopted that language in our proposal when we were in the Committee on the Budget, to make sure that we had the kind of protection for our seniors that we want as it relates to nursing home quality. We also have a change in the way in which we do the qualifications for Medicaid.

Let me just say that there are large pieces of this motion to instruct that we not only agree with, but we have solved in our resolution; but the idea that we ought to just spend this $5 billion extra is something we are not prepared to commit to because while we want to emphasize the programs for the environment, in which we have full funding of Superfund, and while we want to emphasize the programs of education, where we have real increases in title I funding, we also, however, want to make sure that at the end of the day we stay on track toward a balanced budget, that we are in a position where we are going to eliminate waste, fraud, and abuse and wasteful Washington spending. We believe we have an excellent resolution. We think we probably will add a little bit more money to it, but this is just too much to be able to pass tonight here on the House floor.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman from Minnesota, I respect his efforts. Some of them I happen to agree with. But at the end of the day we need to stay on track, we need to balance the budget, we need to provide robust funding for education, the environment, a variety of areas, and to show real compassion.

Furthermore, let me also say, of course, the thrust of our budget resolution is designed to take power, money, and influence from this city and put it back into the hands of the American people in every town and city and village across this country. We intend to do that.

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

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this motion to instruct, so that we can rein in some of the excesses of the Republican budget, and stand up for working families for change.

The fact is, when we talk about the budget, we're not talking about a bunch of numbers and spreadsheets. We're talking about real people's lives.

We're talking about the elderly woman in my town of St. Louis, scraping by on Social Security, counting pennies at the end of the month—and already hard-pressed to survive the deep Republican cuts in Medicare.

We're talking about the young couple that is trying desperately to save for their children's education, and for their own retirement.

We're talking about the families that can no longer care for their parents and grandparents, but can't afford the $40,000-dollar-a-year price tag of a nursing home without any help.

It's no secret that I strongly opposed this Republican budget, because it heaped all the budget cuts on those seniors and families—carving up Medicare and jacking up the premiums; cutting into education and college loans; paring back nursing home assistance to lavish more tax breaks on people who don't need them.

But today, we have a chance to help the seniors, children, and families who should be the foundation of any budget proposal: To prevent some of the deep cuts in education, at a time when we need more education, not less of it; to protect seniors on Medicare from being overbilled by their health plans and providers, when many of them just don't have that extra money; To preserve the standards that say your whole family doesn't have to go bankrupt to put your parents in a nursing home; and to do more to protect the clean air and clean water and environmental decency that are central to America's health and safety.

This bill would tell the Committee on the Budget negotiators that they have to back away from the House Republicans' radicalism on those crucial issues, and toward the greater reason and moderation of the U.S. Senate.

The point of this bill is very simple: America's hard-working families matter more than any special-interest lobbyist.

The House Republicans' dangerous budget policies and Medicare cuts—already vetoed twice by the President—don't deserve another revival.

And together, we can start to make this a budget that actually works for working people.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to vote for this motion—to protect seniors on Medicare, and preserve nursing home standards, and secure education and the environment. Even these changes won't make the Republicans' budget perfect, but it will send an important message.

That today, this Congress votes for families, for a change.

Support this motion to instruct.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to, for the one-billionth time, explain that Medicare continues to go up. We do not have any cuts in Medicare, we have real increases in Medicare. Student loans go up dramatically; in fact, nearly a 30-percent increase in funding for student loans. These are the things we are doing to set priorities for programs we really believe in, but at the same time get rid of those programs that do not make sense, that waste money, so families in fact can have a future.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE].

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

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I do rise in opposition to this motion to instruct conferees. From a procedural standpoint, this is a little bit like the poker player who, two poker players come to the table and one says, you put all your cards down on the table and show me what you have got there and I will decide whether I am going to raise the ante here or I am going to call you or not.

Let us not do that. Let us not put all our cards down on the table here. We are going into negotiation next week, a conference committee, with the Senate. We should not go into it with with all of our cards out on the table.

Let us leave the procedural stuff aside. I listened to this motion to instruct being read here tonight. There are four parts of it, but I want to concentrate on the first one: to agree to the Senate-passed levels of discretionary spending. Sometimes I think my colleagues over on this side of the aisle are a little like the moth that goes to the flame. The flame is more spending, and they just cannot resist it, more spending, no matter where you find it, no matter where it comes from; if it is more spending, we have to do it. It does not matter that the budget resolution that we passed in the House of

Representatives protects such things as title I, protects such things as Head Start, gives more money to veterans' health care, gives more money to Superfund.

But this has $5 million more in budget authority, $4 billion more in outlays, it is more spending. Let us not worry about where it is, let us just spend more money. That is all it seems to be that we hear about over there; not how can we reduce the deficit, how can we get the budget balanced, how can we save our children's future, but just how can we spend more money. Quick, we have something over here that is more money. Let us spend this money. Let us go and advocate spending these additional dollars.

We are past that. Mr. Speaker, that is passé. That was the past. That was what we used to do. The time has come to say, where can we reduce spending, how can we do government more efficiently, how can we reduce the size of government, how can we send government functions back to the States and local people. That is what we should be talking about, not how can we find another $5 billion to spend.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that this motion be defeated.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, 7 months late and two Government shutdowns later, this Congress finally got together and passed a bipartisan continuing resolution or a bipartisan series of appropriation bills just a few weeks ago. Now the Committee on Appropriations last Thursday agreed to an allocation of resources which is going to walk away from that agreement and take us right back to some of the same old arguments we had all of last year. We should not do that. This vote tonight is a test.

Some of our friends on the Republican side of the aisle have made it quite clear through the last year and a half they want to eliminate the Department of Education, they want to make deep cuts in education, they want to make deep cuts in our ability to protect the environment, they want to savage job training, but then we had another set of our Republican friends who said, oh, no, we are not like that. We are moderates. We want to protect education, we want to protect job training, we want to protect health and protect our seniors.

Tonight is the night they can do it, Mr. Speaker. What we are asking the Members to choose is whether or not they are going to vote for a budget put together by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], which will still require major departures from that bipartisan consensus we reached just a few weeks ago, or whether or not Members are going to buy a different Republican version, that one being proposed by Senator DOMENICI and his allies in the other body.

It seems to me the choice is clear. If Members really are moderates, if they really do care about solving these problems in a bipartisan way, rather than putting us in the same old fights all over again, they will vote for this resolution tonight. This is not a radical left-wing resolution. We are asking Members to accept the judgment of their fiscal leader in the other body, from their own party. I do not think that is asking too much, if Members are really moderate and really do want to see bills signed, and do not want to see the Government shut down again.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN].

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this motion to instruct. I would like to correct what was just said.

Mr. Speaker, what we are being asked to do tonight is we are being asked to support the concept of the deficit going back up again in fiscal year 1997. I repeat, if we go along with this motion tonight, we will have the deficit going back up again in 1997. I do not think there is a single American out there who wants our deficit going back up again. The Senate bill asks us to spend $5 billion more than the House-approved plan.

I did something special for tonight, I went and dug out our original blueprint to a balanced budget that we passed last year. Guess what, the House-passed plan already has $7 billion more in spending than our original blueprint, and now we are back here asking for more spending yet. I thought it was time we got spending in line so we could get to a balanced budget to preserve this Nation for our children.

It is about time that we recognize that balancing the budget means more opportunities for our families, more job opportunities for our families, and more opportunities for them to live the American dream. That is what this is about. It is about choosing if we are going to head back off in the wrong direction again, let the deficits go back up again, start spending more money, watch this thing go back in the direction that led us down to this $5 trillion debt in the first place. I, for one, am opposed to that.

Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to strongly encourage the House conferees to hold the line on spending, stick with the House-passed numbers, and get us to a balanced budget so we can preserve this Nation for our children.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Florida, Mrs. CARRIE MEEK.

(Mrs. MEEK of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, here we go again. We are in the same circle of errors that we started the first time on the budget. It is almost like a pattern of dissent and disgust.

First of all, we keep saying we are going to take care of our seniors, but that is just a pious platitude around here. They really do not want to take care of the seniors, because of they wanted to take care of the seniors, they certainly would keep the nursing home safeguards where they were, because Members have heard of all kinds of abuse, we have heard of all the horror stories about what happens to seniors in nursing homes. If Members do not believe it, come to my State of Florida, and we can see this abuse happening to these elderly people.

Do Members know who these people are? They are our parents. They are our aunts and our uncles who get in a nursing home, and if we do not straighten our this Medicare situation, where the majority budget is trying to cut it, now they have a golden boy in the Republican party budget, he is just as golden as he can be, our champion, and he knows what he is doing, but he is not treating the seniors right. He is not treating them right.

What he is doing with this budget, he is going to lower the nursing home standards. They cannot keep it, and they do not have the money. They are going to go back to make the same mistakes. Why can we not keep the protection for senior citizens that we had all along against these excess charges, billing for things that are not even authorized? We are going to see that again. Why can we not protect these families, people who are being ruined as they pay for this care? They are being ruined. Their whole families are being wiped out. It is spousal impoverishment. They are making them citizens of poverty, and they have worked all their lives.

I appeal to the people to let us instruct the conferees in a way that is sound. It makes sense, and it is something that this Congress should do. It is not any fly-by-night, it is no way to spend, spend, spend. It is just like setting your priorities in such a way that you keep senior citizens well. The seniors of this country are hearing this, so we had better be sure that we look out for them, Mr. Speaker. Let us pass this to instruct the conferees.

Mr. Speaker, neither the House version of the budget resolution nor the Senate version is the correct way for Congress to balance the budget.

But the Senate version is clearly preferable in the protections it gives to our elderly citizens and disabled people who are in nursing homes. These protections are, of course, also important the children and other relatives of these patients.

The Senate adopted two amendments offered by Senator KENNEDY dealing with nursing home care. One amendment proclaims the sense of Congress that we retain the current law preventing the impoverishment of spouses by forcing them to pay for nursing home care. It also retains the current prohibition on liens on the home of a nursing home patient if it is being occupied by the patient's spouse or dependent children. This amendment passed the Senate by a vote of 94 to 6. I am happy to

learn that the majority's new Medicaid bill complies with this Senate amendment. So I hope that the House budget conferees will readily agree to this Senate amendment.

The other amendment offered by Senator KENNEDY was adopted by a vote of 99 to zero. It proclaims that it is the sense of Congress that the Federal Government should continue to establish and enforce the Federal standards relating to the quality of care in nursing homes. While the majority party in the House is apparently willing to accept Federal standards, they have been unwilling to retain the current law that there should be Federal enforcement of these standards.

Some Members of the majority may not remember the nursing home scandals that arose when we left protection of the elderly solely to the States.

We tried that policy once. It failed. Don't try another experiment with the elderly. Do not sacrifice them on the ideological altar of States' rights.

Support the motion to instruct the conferees.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I recommend to my friend, the gentlewoman from Florida, that she refer to page 177 of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives, where it has the language that protects our seniors. I would just recommend to the gentlewoman tonight, before she goes to sleep, that she gets the book and reads it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BROWNBACK].

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

□ 2045

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this motion to instruct conferees. I just make a point at the very outset that the past speaker from Florida, who I agree with on some things, and she is a wonderful lady, I particularly agree with her point that she says we have a golden boy that chairs the Budget Committee. He is a golden boy because he is doing what is right. It is to balance the budget. That is what the American people want.

Here we are talking about $5 billion on top of $494 billion that we are already spending, and we start breaking down the path toward balancing the budget. This is doing what is right. When you do what is right, you are a golden boy when you do that, and that is what the American people want. We need to do that.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this. We are protecting the seniors, and we are protecting the kids.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, how much time is left on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOODLATTE). The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] has 6 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. PAYNE].

Mr. PAYNE of Virginia. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this motion to instruct. It is consistent with our coalition, our blue dog budget that moves to balancing the budget in a straightforward manner. But this motion also prohibits cost shifting to seniors under the Medicare program.

The Republican budget resolution would allow many doctors to bill the Medicare program as much as they wanted and the patient would pay the difference. What does this mean for patients? Under the current law, if a patient visits his doctor for a checkup, Medicare would pay about $50, the price that Medicare has determined to be fair and equitable, and the doctor could not bill the patient for any extra amount.

Under this Republican plan, Medicare would still pay the $50, but the doctor could than bill any additional amount, $15, $25, $50 above that amount that Medicare is already paying. The extra charge then would have to be paid by our seniors. These extra charges could cost our seniors as much as $40 billion during the next 6 years, yet they do nothing to ensure the solvency of the Medicare trust fund.

The current prohibition on balance billing is solid policy for two reasons. First it has reduced extra charges to our seniors by over $18 billion since 1985 and, secondly, it ensures the fiscal responsibility of the Medicare program and forces providers to be more efficient. All of us agree that the Medicare trust fund must be strengthened and that the program must be made more efficient.

Ledt us reform the Medicare program in a constructive and thoughtful manner. Repealing balance billing protections for seniors is just bad policy. It damages the trust fund's health, it potentially damages our seniors' health, and damages our seniors' pocketbooks. I urge my colleagues to support this motion to instruct.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE], the former Governor.

Mr. CASTLE. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I answer to the call of being a moderate. I am someone who has worked hard here, I think, for adequate funding for education, for the environment, for housing and other important domestic programs, and I believe that the Budget Committee and the Appropriation Committee in this year are acting in good faith to provide funding for these programs. I believe that our seniors, I believe that our children, I believe that our education programs, I believe that our environmental programs are going to be protected by the budgeting which we have this year.

So I rise in opposition to the motion to instruct. I believe we must balance the budget. Earlier in this year, as the appropriation process went forward dealing with the 602(b)'s, 28 of us over here on the Republican side signed a letter to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] asking them to be expansive with respect to Labor-HHS-Education bills and the VA–HUD and Independent Agency bills, and they have responded to that, I think, differently than last year.

I think we are in a situation now in which we can support the budget which is going ahead, but we must never forget that ultimately if we are going to help these children and these families and these senior citizens, we must balance the budget of the United States of America. That is what this is all about. We cannot add spending back into it, but we have to deal with the good faith efforts which have come forward so far.

I believe that it is unnecessary and unfair to demand that our conferees accept the entire $5 billion Senate increase for domestic discretionary spending. This has been laid out very carefully this year in a way in which we can all manage. So I would urge all of us here tonight to hold the line on spending, and I would urge all of us to oppose the motion to instruct conferees.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 seconds to the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. MEEK].

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted 10 seconds so that my chairman would understand my point.

The Republicans accepted the language concerning Federal protection in these standards but they did not say that they would enforce them. So just accepting the language without enforcement leaves a zero.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. CARDIN].

Mr. CARDIN. I want to thank my friend from Minnesota for yielding me this time and thank him for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I support this motion, but let me just give one reason, one part of the motion that deals with Medicare that I think is particularly important. The House budget resolution takes away the protection that our seniors have today, certain seniors, on their doctor or hospital being able to bill more than Medicare permits. That will require many seniors to pay a lot more for their health care as a result of that provision.

Last year the Democrats pointed out to the Republicans in their budget resolution the mistakes that they were making in Medicare, that it would cost our seniors more, it would take away their choice, being done in order to give tax breaks to basically wealthy people. Let us not make the same mistake again this year.

This motion gives us a chance, one chance, one part dealing with balance billing, to go along with the wisdom of the other body and to make sure that our seniors have the protection against

balance billing. I urge my colleagues to take advantage of this and vote for the motion that is accompanying the conference report.

We have heard from the Republicans, we have heard from the Democrats. Let me quote, if I might, from two nonpartisan private commissions that report to Congress that work for us. These are nonpartisan commissions that look at the health care system. Both have evaluated the Republican Medicare proposal.

PPRC has said ''The absence of balance billing limits for services delivered in private fee-for-service plans and plans associated with MSA's could leave beneficiaries exposed to substantial out of pocket liability.''

And PROPAC said ''PROPAC is concerned that beneficiaries who choose the Medicare Plus fee-for-service option will be subjected to unanticipated out-of-pocket liabilities.'' But then the commission goes on and says ''The Commission is also concerned about provider behavior resulting from these arrangements: Some providers may decide not to see those with traditional Medicare coverage by limiting their practice to patients who can pay high charges. This phenomenon could limit access of Medicare beneficiaries, particularly those with low incomes.''

The provision that is in the House budget resolution will lead to different levels of care for our seniors. Those that are wealthy will have one system. Those that have limited income, most of our seniors, are going to be denied full access and are going to be asked to pay more with less choice.

That is not what we want. Our seniors already have the highest out-of-pocket health care cost of any group of Americans. The Republican budget resolution will add to that cost.

The Senate, the other body, at least recognized on balance billing that we must maintain a provision that has been in the Medicare system for a long time, that protects against extra billings by doctors and hospitals that our seniors just cannot afford. I urge my colleagues to support the motion that is accompanying the conference report.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS].

Mr. SHAYS. I thank the gentleman for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to correct the facts stated on the other side. They are simply not accurate when they say that we will charge seniors more.

The fact is on Medicare, we are going to have spending go up from $196 to $284 billion. That is a 45-percent increase. On a per-person basis, it is going to go up to 34 percent, from $5,200 to $7,000.

I really believe in our proposal. The bottom line is very simple. We do not increase copayments, we do not increase the deductible, we do not increase the premium, and we say that under the fee-for-service system, you cannot have balance billing.

Furthermore, we allow individuals to have choice. If people do not want the traditional fee-for-service, they can have choice, or a whole host of different programs. Under those different programs, they may get eye care, they may get dental care, they may have a rebate in their copayment, their deductible, they may even have their MediGap paid for.

The bottom line is when they are in their fee-for-service system, they get what they get now. If they get into private care and choose to, if they get into it and they do not like the plan, they can leave. They have 24 months, each and every month, to leave. So we give them choice, we do not increase copayment, the deductible or the premium. It stays the same. It seems to me like a very good plan. Plus we add 45 percent more to the spending on Medicare, from $196 to $284 billion.

We do the same thing with Medicaid. That goes up 46 percent, from $95 to $140 billion. That is a significant increase in spending. Only in this place when you spend more is it called a cut.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio has 2¾ minutes remaining, the gentleman from Minnesota has 50 seconds remaining and has the right to close the debate.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH].

Mr. HAYWORTH. I thank the chairman for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this motion to instruct our conferees for three very simple policy reasons, and for three additional personal reasons.

The major differences are these. Our plan of the new majority brings the deficit down. To change course, to embrace this big spending the other side is so enthralled with, would drive the deficit up.

Second, our plan is real. The President and the guardians of the old order would need huge, unspecified cuts to finally deal with the deficit and eventually achieve balance.

And, third, our plan begins to control the explosive growth in entitlements, saving those programs by controlling the growth, not by cuts but by growth control.

Mr. Speaker, I said there are also three personal reasons and I wear them here on my lapel, Nicole, Hannah, and John Micah, my 3 children. I will not leave them saddled with a debt. It is immoral. Reject this motion. Embrace our budget. Embrace our future.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, to close the debate, it is really kind of simple. We have a real budget that uses real numbers. It lowers the deficit and it balances the budget by 2002.

The alternative, the President's budget. It got barely a majority of support of the people on the other side of the aisle. Why? Because it does not lower the deficit. It uses smoke and mirrors. In fact in the last year it has a tax increase.

Every time we pull the Democrats, and not all the Democrats, but we pull the people on the other side that like Washington, we pull them to the drinking fountain, they take a little drink and they buy into less spending, it is only about 24 hours later when they are trying to figure out how to get us to spend more.

We have a good plan, it has got the right priorities, it lowers the deficit, it protects our children and it also transfers power, money and influence from this city. The fundamental difference between Democrats and Republicans today is that we want to give people power back in their communities, in their villages, in their towns across this country, and the Washington spenders and liberals believe that people at home cannot get it right.

Well, as Republicans, we are going to fight, and it is going to be a long road but at the end of the day we are going to pry people's power and money and influence out of Washington bureaucrats and put it back into the hands of Americans across this great country and trust that they will get it right at the end of the day to solve local problems with local solutions and to protect their children.

Vote against the motion to instruct.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Speaker, the motion to instruct simply says, let us adopt some simple basic protections for the seniors and vulnerable in our society as it relates to health care. As it relates to the investments we make in domestic discretionary spending, we simply say, accept the Domenici amendment which BOB DOLE voted for. You can do it. You can do it within the context of a balanced budget which we agree that we need to achieve. But let us do it in a fair fashion. Let us move in the direction and not closing down Government again. Just simply accept the proposal offered by the Senate Budget chairman, a very Republican person, the last I heard, supported by BOB DOLE.

Let us be reasonable. Let us move on a course that gets the session ended. Let us not vote to close down the Government again.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Sabo motion to instruct conferees on the budget resolution. The motion instructs the conferees to agree to the Senate levels for nondefense discretionary spending. Let me explain why this is important.

As we know, the President and the Republican leadership have both proposed plans that the Congressional Budget Office says would reach balance in 2002. Clearly, the President's budget illustrates that a balanced budget does not necessitate extreme and excessive cuts in programs of vital importance to millions of Americans.

The House budget resolution is worse than the Senate, making it harder to finance important domestic priorities in education and training, the environment, science and technology, and law enforcement.

The allocations to the appropriations subcommittees reflected in the House budget resolution have created the same basic conflict

that led to two Government shutdowns and 13 continuing resolution in the battle over 1996 spending. Why would we knowingly do this again?

Specifically, the House allocations are $19 billion less than the President's request for nondefense programs, while at the same time adding nearly $13 billion above the Pentagon's request in funding for defense and military construction programs.

For example, the allocation to the Labor-HHS—Education Subcommittee is $6.7 billion below the President's request and $2.5 billion below the levels necessary to sustain the 1996 program level. This allocation would likely result in significant cuts to such programs as Title I Education for the Disadvantaged, Pell Grant college scholarships, and the Summer Youth Employment Program.

The chairman of the Budget Committee in the other body clearly recognized that we were once again engaging in a train wreck scenario. Rather than push this to the brink again this year, he wisely proposed to add $5 billion to the Senate domestic discretionary spending level to make whole the allocation to the appropriations subcommittees necessary to avoid unnecessary vetoes and further gridlock.

Although the Sabo motion would not even meet the President half way on priorities, it would allow funding at a freeze level for most program, funding at current services level for some priority programs, and allow modest investments in a very limited number of priority domestic investments such as biomedical research.

The Sabo motion does not fully address the fundamental differences between the Republican leadership and the President with regard to budget priorities. For example, the budget resolution would still assume a cut of $61 billion from the President proposed spending level for education and training. Nonetheless, the Sabo motion would allow us to get through the 1997 spending bills with a much higher level of bipartisan support. In the short and long run, this would be a good thing for the American people.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, this is a classic example of the thinking that we sometimes hear from across the aisle. Instead of focusing on the policy goal, they focus on the bureaucratic program. Instead of measuring results, they measure resources and effort expended.

Over the past year and a half the Science Committee has witnessed a growing dispute about global climate change. There is perhaps even greater dispute about whether Mission to Planet Earth is the right way to study climate change. But there is 100-percent dispute—nobody agrees—that the original baselined Earth observing system is the most cost-effective way to collect the data required for Mission to Planet Earth.

Only the gentlewoman from Texas—plus a few contractors and bureaucrats—seem to think that we should do this project the old and expensive way.

Several weeks ago the Space Subcommittee heard testimony from multiple witnesses that using small satellites to collect Earth science data would be cheaper and easier than the larger satellites currently planned for the Earth observing system. We have also heard testimony that the new commercial remote sensing industry should be able to save us a great deal of money in collecting and distributing data.

So it seems clear that we can achieve the scientific goals of this program much more cheaply than is currently projected. But only if we allow budgetary necessity to be the mother of programmatic invention and reform.

Now it's no secret that I'm not a huge fan of this program, or of the scientific theories it may help to test. But that's not what's at issue here. The issue is whether we do this research affordably, within the context of a balanced budget, or whether we try to do it unaffordably, and break the budget and probably fail to do the science.

So why would anyone want to hang on to the old ways of doing things when that's not only more expensive, but in fact not as good? If we followed that logic—the logic of the gentlewoman from Texas—then Houston wouldn't be the hometown of the largest personal computer company in the world because we would all still use giant mainframe computers instead of PC's, we wouldn't have the benefits of using the new technology, and, of course, none of those jobs would exist in Houston.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Nation's science programs and the international space station. Over the past several years, the Boeing Co. and its employees in my home state of Washington have been working to help design and build the international space station. Currently, the space station is on schedule and on budget. In addition, Mr. Speaker, the space station holds great promise in the research of cancer and cell development, human physiology, biotechnology, fluid physics, combustion science, materials science, telecommunications, and new pharmaceutical products. With all these great promises in mind, I applaud the efforts of the Boeing space station employees for helping to advance our country's leadership in space technology. I look forward to witnessing the success of this technology and urge my colleagues to support the space station for countless generations to come.

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Chairman, I have some very serious concerns about the legislation before the House today, H.R. 3322, the Omnibus Civilian Science Authorization Act of 1996. This bill cuts NASA's Mission to Planet Earth [MTPE] Program by $261 million from the fiscal year 1996 estimated funding level and $373,700,000 from the President's fiscal year 1997 request.

Mission to Planet Earth is NASA's long-term, coordinated research effort to study the Earth as a global environmental system. This program will expand our knowledge of the Earth and its environment, the solar system, and the universe through observations from space. The end product of Mission to Planet Earth will be the ability to develop and implement environmental policies based on a better understanding of how our environment works.

There are many reasons that global environmental change is important to our society. A single climate change event can cause global effects. For example, one major climate event, El Niño in the Pacific Ocean, has been occurring for hundreds of years on a fairly regular basis. When it does occur, it has a tremendous effect on weather patterns, causing floods and droughts in different parts of the world. Many researchers believe that the 1993 Mississippi and 1995 California floods were caused by El Niño. In the last decade, the pattern of El Niño occurrences has increased tremendously, though we have not yet learned why.

The U.S. Government estimates that natural disasters cost the United States an average of about $1 billion each week. Improving our ability to understand, predict, and respond to these events could allow us to find ways of reducing these costs and the loss to human life.

By using satellites and other tools to study the Earth, NASA hopes to expand our understanding of how natural processes affect us, and how we might be affecting them. Such studies will yield improved weather forecasts, tools for managing agriculture and forests, information for fishermen and coastal planners, and, eventually, an ability to predict how the climate will change in the future.

I would also like to make it clear that Mission to Planet Earth has always enjoyed bipartisan support. The largest budget element for Mission to Planet Earth is the Earth observing system [EOS], which will make two dozen different measurements over at least 15 years to provide the first long-term, integrated observations of the global environment. The program is estimated to cost approximately $7.6 billion through the year 2000, and has already been reduced by 60 percent since its original approval by Congress in 1990.

This project was originally designed during the Reagan administration to study the full range of issues associated with changes in the global environment. President Bush formally proposed the build EOS in 1990 and Congress approved a new start for the program later that year. Since 1990, EOS has undergone three restructuring efforts, designed to focus objectives and approaches and reduce the overall program budget.

NASA has worked hard to reduce the costs of its programs, and I think those efforts should be commended. I support full funding for Mission to Planet Earth, and hope that my colleagues will join me in meeting the administration's funding request. In the long run, the knowledge we gain through this program may save a great deal of money and a great many lives. In my opinion, that is a fairly significant return on investment.

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to share my views on the Omnibus Civilian Science Authorization Act. I would like to state my support for NASA's space station. NASA has played a vital role in America's development, both in the advancement of scientific innovations and the implementation of technological breakthroughs. Often times, technology that is produced from these breakthroughs becomes integrated into our Nation's industrial sector. The United States receives a direct dual benefit from the space program, both in the fields of scientific discovery and commercial technological transformation. I envision great things in America's future scientific discovery. The space station will be the heart of our Nation's great innovative zeal.

I would also like to express my support for title IV of the bill which authorizes the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to implement its National Weather Service Program [NWS].

The NWS furnishes the entire United States with forecasts and other weather information. This past year we experienced unusually severe weather conditions and the NWS readily provided protection for our everyday lives.

If the NWS does not receive sufficient funds, the agency would simply amount to a

data collection center. I am pleased to see that the bill increases funding for the NWS by $19.8 million from fiscal year 1996. Nevertheless, the American people could still stand to lose out on the crucial services offered by the NWS. To that end, I support the various amendments which would bolster the NWS's ability to execute its responsibilities in a sound manner.

I support Mr. BROWN and Mr. WAMP's amendment which would increase the authorization for the National Weather Service. Additionally, I support Mr. CRAMER's amendment which modifies the agency, which, for example, would require the Department of Commerce to notify Congress on its decision to close, consolidate, or relocate any field office.

Mr. HILLEARY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to encourage the House members to vote for H.R. 3322, Omnibus Civilian Science Authorization Act. It is a good bill that authorizes vital programs and includes helpful language that effects the whole country.

This bill has provisions to update the language of the Unitary Wind Tunnel Act of 1949 which originally declared that the NASA Administrator and the Secretary of Defense should jointly develop a plan for construction of ''wind tunnel facilities for the solution of research, development, and evaluation problems in aeronautics at educational institutions within the continental limits of the United States for training and research in aeronautics, and to revise the uncompleted portions of the unitary plan from time to time to accord with changes in national defense requirements and scientific and technical advances.''

The field of aeronautics has received many advances since this act was last amended in 1958—almost four decades ago. Unfortunately, as we heard from expert testimony before the Science Committee, the wind tunnel facilities in this Nation are showing their age. The European countries, in a consortium, recently opened a new transonic wind tunnel which is technologically superior to any in the United States. This will have a direct effect on improving the competitiveness of European aircraft in the global market.

Mr. Chairman, the aerospace industry is the second largest exporting industry in this country, second only to agriculture. While just a few short years ago, the U.S. aerospace industry accounted for around 70 percent of the global market, recent reports show that we may have dropped below 50 percent. This loss of market share costs us billions of dollars in our trade deficit and each percentage point of global aerospace market lost by our domestic companies translates into about 44,000 Americans losing their jobs.

A study conducted by the National Research Council [NRC] in 1992 identified that our current wind tunnel facilities are inadequate for maintaining aeronautical superiority into the next century.

In 1994, NASA was directed by Congress to conduct a study of the needs and requirements of a national wind tunnel complex.

NASA currently is in the process of concluding this study of the technical, business, and related issues concerning the feasibility of developing the national wind tunnel complex. I fully support and encourage NASA to complete this study process, to assure that America's national security and international competitive interests in civil and military aeronautics will be sustained over the long term.

I am disappointed that President Clinton has chosen not to build the facility and provided no funding for construction.

In my view, the NWTC study takes on added importance at this time, in light of continuing budgetary pressures on NASA and other agencies engaged in aeronautics research and test activities, including the Department of Defense and the Federal Aviation Administration. Congress should also consider economic conditions in the aviation manufacturing sector of America's national industrial base constraining large-scale capital investment in research and test facilities along with the need to effectively integrate the NWTC with existing NASA, DOD, and FAA aeronautical research and test facilities and activities.

With this background, I believe that the integrated planning and organizational framework envisioned in the Unitary Wind Tunnel Plan Act of 1949, as amended, is a suitable and appropriate vehicle for the planning, development, and operation of aeronautics research and test facilities and activities in subsonic, transonic, supersonic, and hypersonic flight regimes, since all regimes influence performance, cost, and competition for civil aviation directly undertaken in whole or in part by NASA.

Congress has already made it very clear that before the first spade of dirt can be turned, there must be an agreement in place which includes substantial financial participation from both the private aerospace industry and the Department of Defense as they will be the primary users and beneficiaries of the project.

Any decision by the Congress to move beyond the phase 1 study is contingent upon NASA executing a memorandum of agreement with both the Department of Defense of the U.S. aviation industry, both commercial and military, regarding cost shares for construction and utilization of the complex.

With regard to the NWTC study, in light of the budgetary pressures, general economic conditions impacting the U.S. aviation industry and other factors noted above, I would hope that NASA will place special emphasis on the development and operation of additional wind tunnels at existing NASA and DOD research and test facilities.

I encourage my colleagues to support this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time has expired.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct the conferees offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO].

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 187, nays 205, not voting 42, as follows:

[Roll No. 209]

YEAS—187

Abercrombie
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Beilenson
Bentsen
Berman
Bevill
Bishop
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Cardin
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Coyne
Cramer
Cummings
Danner
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Durbin
Edwards
English
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Filner
Flake
Flanagan
Ford
Fox
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (TX)
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Holden
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jacobs
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klink
LaFalce
Lantos
Leach
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meek
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Moran
Morella
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Riggs
Rivers
Roemer
Rose
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Spratt
Stenholm
Stockman
Stokes
Stupak
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weller
Williams
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn

NAYS—205

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Castle
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cooley
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Funderburk
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Greene (UT)
Greenwood
Gunderson
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman

Herger	McHugh	Schaefer
Hilleary	McInnis	Seastrand
Hobson	McIntosh	Sensenbrenner
Hoekstra	McKeon	Shadegg
Hoke	Metcalf	Shaw
Horn	Meyers	Shays
Hostettler	Mica	Skeen
Hunter	Miller (FL)	Smith (MI)
Hutchinson	Moorhead	Smith (TX)
Hyde	Myers	Smith (WA)
Inglis	Myrick	Solomon
Istook	Nethercutt	Souder
Johnson (CT)	Neumann	Spence
Johnson, Sam	Ney	Stearns
Jones	Norwood	Stump
Kasich	Nussle	Talent
Kelly	Oxley	Tate
Kim	Packard	Tauzin
Kingston	Parker	Thomas
Klug	Paxon	Thornberry
Knollenberg	Petri	Tiahrt
Kolbe	Pombo	Upton
LaHood	Porter	Walker
Largent	Portman	Walsh
Latham	Pryce	Wamp
LaTourette	Radanovich	Watts (OK)
Laughlin	Ramstad	Weldon (FL)
Lazio	Regula	Weldon (PA)
Lewis (CA)	Roberts	White
Lewis (KY)	Rogers	Whitfield
Lightfoot	Rohrabacher	Wicker
Linder	Roth	Wolf
Livingston	Roukema	Young (AK)
Longley	Royce	Young (FL)
Lucas	Salmon	Zeliff
Manzullo	Sanford	Zimmer
McCollum	Saxton	
McCrery	Scarborough	

NOT VOTING—42

Ackerman	Gutknecht	Nadler
Barton	Hayes	Payne (NJ)
Becerra	Houghton	Peterson (FL)
Buyer	Jefferson	Quillen
Chabot	Kennedy (MA)	Quinn
Costello	King	Richardson
Davis	Lincoln	Ros-Lehtinen
de la Garza	McCarthy	Shuster
Dunn	McDade	Stark
Engel	Meehan	Studds
Fields (LA)	Molinari	Taylor (NC)
Fields (TX)	Mollohan	Vucanovich
Foglietta	Montgomery	Wilson
Gibbons	Murtha	Yates

□ 2118

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Ackerman for, with Mr. King against.

Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. GORDON changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion to instruct was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. GOODLATTE). Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees: from the Committee on the Budget, for consideration of the House concurrent resolution and the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. KASICH, HOBSON, WALKER, KOLBE, SHAYS, HERGER, SABO, STENHOLM, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. COYNE.

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the motion to instruct conferees on House Concurrent Resolution 178, the House concurrent resolution on the Budget for fiscal year 1997.

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

There was no objection.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3540, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1997

Mr. GOSS from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104–601) on the resolution (H.Res. 445) providing for consideration of the bill (H. R. 3540) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. BONIOR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I would inquire of the distinguished majority leader regarding the schedule for the rest of the evening and week and the following week.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, I am pleased to announce that the House has completed legislative business for the week. On Tuesday next, the House will meet at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

We will consider the number of bills under suspension of the rules. I will not read through that list now, but a complete schedule will be distributed to all Members' offices.

Members should note, however, that if any recorded votes are ordered on the suspensions, they will be postponed until 12 o'clock noon on Wednesday, June 5.

On Wednesday, June 5, and Thursday, June 6, we will consider the Foreign Operations Appropriations bill which, of course, will be subject to a rule.

Mr. Speaker, we should finish legislative business by 6 p.m. on Thursday, June 6.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I have just two quick questions to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY]. Does he expect to have the conference report on the budget resolution next week?

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, it is our hope that we would be able to do this possibly even by Thursday. Obviously, we have to see what we can accomplish when the Senate is back in town, but we are hopeful.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, the other inquiry I would make to my friend from Texas is that we on this side of the aisle have heard rumors that the gentleman may be considering adding a suspension concerning welfare reform. We are obviously concerned, since it is not on the gentleman's list, at least the list that we are aware of, and we have not seen this legislation.

So, my query to my friend from Texas is, will we be considering a welfare bill on Tuesday, a day which I might add, that Members will not even be in town?

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, that bill has not yet been written, but the gentleman should expect that it will be added to the Suspension Calendar for Tuesday.

Mr. BONIOR. For Tuesday?

Mr. ARMEY. For Tuesday.

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

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I am confused about that response from the majority leader, because when our staff met with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN] today, he indicated that neither he nor anyone involved in putting that bill together had read the waiver request submitted yesterday and he said he was simply operating on trust.

Since my understanding is that the governor himself exercised some 70 item vetoes on the legislation that was passed by the legislature covering some 27 different subjects, whether or not the Congress is going to be allowed to at least fully understand what is in that package, and how those item vetoes have changed the package as it was originally passed by the Wisconsin legislature. Are we going to have adequate understanding of that before we asked to vote?

I mean, if this is going to be debated on a day when Members are not even here, and then voted on a subsequent day, I would venture to say that there will not be three Members of the Congress who know what is in the bill which they are passing on to the Senate.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would continue to yield, in light of the President's ringing endorsement just given recently of the Wisconsin welfare plan, we have the relevant committees in discussions with the State and they are preparing a resolution which, frankly, will not be that lengthy or complex or difficult to understand.

I am confident that Members who find themselves keenly interested in this subject will be able to make their way back to the floor in time to participate in the discussion on Tuesday next.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman suggesting that this is going to go through the appropriate committee before it is brought to the floor of the House?

Mr. ARMEY. No, if the gentleman would continue to yield, it is being prepared by the appropriate committee

and it will be on the agenda next Tuesday.

Mr. BONIOR. But, Mr. Speaker, I gather from the gentleman's answer that, in fact, there will be no markup in the committee. So this is an example of a welfare bill not yet written brought directly to the floor of the House of Representatives without adequate attendance on Tuesday, when there are no votes scheduled, and to be debated. That seems to be a pretty, if I may say so to my friend from Texas, a pretty outrageous thing for the majority to do next week.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would continue to yield, I reiterate we are acting in response to the President's enthusiastic endorsement of the Wisconsin welfare plan and we want to give the President every opportunity to act in accordance with the very, very public position he has taken demonstrating the enthusiastic support, and it will be on the schedule next Tuesday.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I would simply like to observe that this seems to me to be nothing but a blatantly political act. The question is not what the President has said he will or will not do. I hope he will provide ample opportunity for Wisconsin to get what it is asking for, after he has met his responsibilities and we have met ours, to understand what it is we are helping to support.

But as I understand it, the legislation to be brought before the Congress has nothing to do with the President. It simply provides a congressional waiver without, at this point to my knowledge, a single Member of the House having read what it is that is supposed to be waived.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would continued to yield, clearly a single Member of the House will have read it if a single Member of the House will have written it. That being an academic point, it will be on the floor and the gentleman will have ample opportunity to debate it on Tuesday.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me, I would say to my friend from Texas, that 20 minutes of debate is hardly ample time to debate one of the most important issued that this country is facing, and that is welfare.

And it just, if the gentleman will pardon my vehemence, I say to my friend from Texas, to bring this out to the floor without the committee having marked it up, without attendance here, to debate it for 20 minutes, is not the proper way to conduct the business of this House.

□ 2130

While the President may have endorsed it and while many of us on the other side of the aisle agree with many of the features of it, we have a responsibility as Members of this institution to look at it, look at it carefully to make sure that it meets the standards that we think are appropriate for the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT].

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, do I understand then that we will be taking up on Tuesday, a day when many Members will not be here, I certainly plan to be here personally, that a piece of legislation that has not yet been written and that we will have only 20 minutes per side to debate that piece of legislation? Are those the circumstances that we will face on Tuesday?

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I do appreciate the fact the gentleman from Texas will be here because then the 40 minutes of debate, which is so much more than is usually given by Congress to a presidential waiver, will be that much more enlightening and I do appreciate it.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman's interest in confining this debate to 40 minutes on a bill that has not yet been written that will be presented on a day when most people will not be here an indication of his disinterest in getting a welfare reform bill passed or just his wry sense of humor?

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, this is an endorsement of the President's stated public intention to give a waiver to the State of Wisconsin due to his enthusiastic support for what it is the State has done. I do not understand why those on the gentleman's side of the aisle are so reluctant to stand by their man. That being what it is, they will have their opportunity to do so on Tuesday next.

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLECZKA].

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, would the majority leader give the Members of the body some feel as to what these waivers include? I am told that there are 75 separate waivers. Could the majority leader possible share with the Members what some of them might be?

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN].

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Speaker, I would just point out on a radio address Saturday about a week ago, the President said that he had received what he needed in that radio address. He said to the American public that he supported the Wisconsin plan, and I can quote directly several of his words. He said we should get this done in terms of approving the waivers.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, since the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN] is going to be the author of the bill, maybe he could relate to and enlighten some of the Members here as to maybe 3 or 4 or maybe 5 of the 75 waivers. Could he share that with us?

Mr. NEUMANN. I can share what is in the bill we are drafting. I would certainly be happy to do that, and I would also like to say we have been working for the last 48 hours or more getting that bill prepared. There has been a lot of discussion back and forth on the preparation of the bill.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, let us talk about for a moment what we are doing here. The legislature passed a bill called W–2 in the Wisconsin legislature some 6, 8 weeks ago. About 5 weeks ago, the Governor signed the bill, and it has taken him 6 weeks, 5 weeks to come to Washington, DC to request the waivers to implement this piece of legislation.

When the Republicans in the House talk about a waiver, know full well it is not a single waiver. It is 75 separate waivers doing everything from eliminating the fair hearing, which is currently provided for under the law, to making provisions for those working in Wisconsin to work at a subminimum wage.

I happen to do a radio show with my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. PETRI], and we discussed this very same issue last Friday. At that point in time, I had before me a list of 42 of those waivers, and they are from soup to nuts. They are lengthy and some are complicated, but they are 42. Now our Governor comes to town, has a press conference at the Press Club and all of a sudden enlightens this person from Wisconsin that magically there are now 75 waivers.

So what we are going to be asked to do on Tuesday is to grant carte blanche all 75 waivers. I as one Member from Wisconsin, which does have some interest in this subject matter, do not even know what the 30 have to do, do not know anything about the 30. But I should also state that I have received numerous letters in my office from very, very interested Wisconsinites who do not know what the 75 waivers are, either, and have requested the Secretary of Health and Social Services and those in charge around here to provide for a 30-day public comment period.

They want to be heard. Something very unheard of in this new Congress, the public wants to be heard. I think the people from Wisconsin who this will directly affect have a right to approach this government and say I do not like number 75, I like 68.

Why are we rushing this through on a day when Congress is not going to be here? I will say there is not a Member, there is not one of nine of us, there is not any of the nine of us from Wisconsin who knows anything about these waivers, including the author of the bill. I asked him to give me a feel for one, two, three, four, five. He does not know. He has not seen them. At least I saw 42 of them and raised questions on 2 of those items.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues are going to be asked to rubber stamp 75 major waivers for welfare in the State of Wisconsin. There are not any of my colleagues, including ourselves, who will know what we are doing. Is that how to run a Congress, Mr. Minority Whip?

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield for a response from the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY].

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, first of all let me say we have already had more debate in these past few minutes announcing the schedule on a Presidential waiver than Congress usually has on such things.

Second, I might say, clearly I am sure the gentleman from Wisconsin must acknowledge that the President must have known very well what these waivers would be before he so publicly promised that he wanted to give them. Even though the gentleman from Wisconsin may not have known, I am sure the President did. In any event, the debate that the gentleman so richly wants to engage in is scheduled for Tuesday next week. That is the time to have that debate. This is a discussion of the schedule.

Mr. KLECZKA. I cannot speak for the President, but I as a Member of this body have a right to know and the gentleman is not affording that right.

Smile, very funny.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I would simply like to make one additional point. The issue is not what the President knows, because the legislation that is being brought before us asks for a congressional waiver, not a Presidential waiver. So the issue is not what somebody on the other end of the avenue knows. The issue is what the gentleman knows. The issue is what the gentleman knows. The issue is what I know.

The fact is right now, nobody in this room knows diddly about the details of what is being asked to be waived.

The other point I would simply make is that the public has a right by law to comment. What we are asking the Congress to do is to make a summary judgment before the public has a right to comment about any of those waivers being proposed.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out some of us in this room do have a pretty good handle on what is being proposed.

Mr. OBEY. That is not what the gentleman said in a meeting today.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN].

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that a lot of us in this room do have a pretty good handle. Even if we did not have a pretty good handle on it, I personally do. Even if we did not, I would like to point out that our State legislature did pass this. I for one have more faith in the great people in the State of Wisconsin, and I think they know better for the people in the State of Wisconsin than anybody in this city does. I for one trust their judgment.

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BARRETT].

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I think we need a little history on this measure if we are going to talk about the legislature in Wisconsin. The legislature in Wisconsin did pass this measure. This was a measure that Governor Thompson publicly embraced long before the Wisconsin legislature passed it. But once the Wisconsin legislature passed it, he exercised his line item veto 97 times; 97 times he used his partial veto on this piece of legislation affecting 27 areas. And he did it consistent with his statement earlier that he embraced this legislation.

Now he comes to Washington, DC. He presents it to the President of the United States. He does not give it to us. I called the Governor's office yesterday looking for a copy of this waiver request. I still have not received one from the Governor's office. Yet the gentleman is coming before the Congress of the United States asking us to vote on something.

I certainly think that the President has every right to embrace this proposal, but that does not mean we take away the 30-day period for the public to comment. All the politicians in this body will have a chance to comment on this, but what is wrong with letting the American people have an opportunity to have their say on this issue? Why are we squelching them? If this is such a good proposal, let us give it a little sunshine. Let us the American people look at it.

Let us just not ram it through here because all this is an attempt to embarrass the President. Let us debate it. Let us talk about it. The gentleman says he knows what all the details are. I bet he does not know what the details are. There are 250 pages.

There is one last statement I just want to point out because this piece of legislation affects my district more than any other district in this entire country. It requires mothers who have given birth to a child to go back to work within 12 weeks. Now, that might be something that people support here. But I represent those areas, and I have talked to the child care providers. They say they do not exist. We are telling women to go back to work after 12 weeks. Where are they supposed to put their children? That is what I want to know.

We have all these pro-life legislators here but, once that child is born, you are on your own. I want to know what is going to happen to those children? Those are real people. They are alive now, and I want to know what happens to them.

Mr. Speaker, I think just to come in here for political purposes to say we are going to try to ram it to the President, that is good Presidential politics. But there are people involved in this action, and this body should not abdicate its responsibilities to the people who live in my community.

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NUEMANN].

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to point out to the gentleman from Wisconsin, to my colleague, my neighbor to the north, I would just like to point out that this welfare reform bill is not about a welfare reform bill for the United States of America. It is about a welfare reform bill for the State of Wisconsin. I am not quite sure what all the people here are so afraid of. The great people in Wisconsin have figured out a way that people that have been on welfare all of their lives are going to go back into the work force once again, instead of looking forward to welfare for the rest of their lives. They are going to look forward to again living the American dream. They are going to look forward to the opportunity to return to the work force and improve their lives and improve the lives of their families.

I do not know what this body is so afraid of. This is not a welfare reform plan for the United States of America. This is a welfare reform plan for the State of Wisconsin that the President has said he will grant the waivers for. All we are doing, all we are asking for here is to go ahead and grant those waivers so the people in the State of Wisconsin can do what the people in the State of Wisconsin believe is best for their own people in Wisconsin, not for the whole country, just for the people in Wisconsin.

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I would simply take note of the fact that we have had a great many claims made about W–2 by the Governor and by various members of the legislature. I think the test that ought to be followed is that, before this Congress votes on this legislation, that it knows that the legislation measures up to each and every claim made for it by the Governor of the State of Wisconsin. That is the test by which we ought to determine whether the Congress, rather than the executive branch, ought to exercise its responsibility and provide this waiver.

If the Congress does not meet that test, then this is nothing but a cynical, crass, political maneuver aimed at going after the President of the United States without any intent to provide a constructive movement forward on the complicated, important issue of welfare reform.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I guess I am stunned. I just cannot believe the President of the United States did not give consideration to all of these ailments described here on the floor. I cannot believe the President of the United States would have taken such callous disregard when he went to Wisconsin just a few days ago and so enthusiastically endorsed this Wisconsin plan and pledged that he would grant these waivers.

It strikes me the gentleman's complaint might be with the President. In any event, we will further air this out on Tuesday.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I would say to my friend that the President of

the United States will not be voting next week on this floor, but 435 Members will. They have an obligation and a duty and a responsibility to understand what is brought before them. Hopefully it will be done through the system which we have established here through the committees and with adequate time for Members on both sides of the aisle to debate this.

I think the gentleman understands from the debate we have had here tonight how serious we view this, not so much on substance but the procedures that are being laid out here to consider this important issue. I would hope that the distinguished majority leader and the leadership on his side of the aisle would reconsider the time, the time of debate, and the whole manner in which they hope to carry this out next week. We consider it a very serious matter.

I would say to my friend from Texas, we will act accordingly with respect to how this is performed in the days ahead of us.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY TO HAVE UNTIL 5 P.M. FRIDAY, MAY 31, 1996, TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 2650, MANDATORY FEDERAL PRISON DRUG TREATMENT ACT OF 1995

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may have until 5 p.m. tomorrow, Friday, May 31, 1996, to file a report on H.R. 2650, to amend title 18, United States Code, to eliminate certain sentencing inequities for drug offenders.

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

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, MAY 31, TO TUESDAY, JUNE 4, 1996

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Friday, May 31, 1996, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, June 4, for morning hour debates.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

□ 2145

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NEY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

TEENAGE PREGNANCY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker the month of May has been set aside as teenage pregnancy prevention month. Although May is coming to an end, it is imperative that legislators and the American people continue to focus attention on creating policies and programs to reduce the growing number of teenagers who become pregnant each year.

This is critical because, unfortunately, the United States has the highest rate of teen pregnancy among the industrialized nations of the world. The result is the devastation of the lives of millions of young girls and the loss to our country of their talents and potential contributions. This loss weakens our country's future, because in order to compete in the ever expanding global economy, we must utilize the full talents of all our young people.

In my State of California, for example, 8 out of 10 teen mothers never finish high school. The result? Thousands of uneducated and untrained young girls forced onto welfare with little hope for a better future.

Furthermore, moneys that could be used to help improve the quality of life for all Americans are diminished by the expenditure of billions of dollars on health care and cash assistance programs for families with teen parents.

For example, the average AFDC and Medicaid costs for just one teen pregnancy through the first year of support total more than $10,000 per child; and the total spent in California for teen pregnancies is between $5 billion and $7 billion annually.

Tragically, this pattern is often repeated from mother to daughter, creating a vicious cycle of despair and dependency on public assistance.

It is therefore in the best interests of all Americans to do what is necessary to help end this national tragedy of teenage pregnancy. To succeed however, we must be fair and humane in our solutions. We must not advocate policies that hurt innocent children or punish teen mothers by denying them assistance to care for themselves and their children.

Instead we must invest in comprehensive programs that have a proven track record of success. One example is the Teen Outreach Program, known as TOP.

TOP, which has been chosen as a model program for California's Teen Pregnancy Prevention Initiative, is a comprehensive program focused on preventing adolescent pregnancy and fostering overall youth development. This program incorporates both a classroom-based curriculum focused on adolescent reproductive health and a community service component which offers young people the opportunity to help others while helping themselves.

A recent 10-year evaluation found that students who participated in TOP had an 18 percent lower rate of suspension from school, a 60 percent lower dropout rate, and a 33 percent lower rate of pregnancy than nonparticipating students.

The Teen Outreach Program is just one example of the effectiveness of prevention and education programs. Further, statistics support the fact that money spent on prevention programs saves billions of dollars in future costs to society.

As May comes to an end, let us remain vigilant in our effort to end teenage pregnancies. In so doing, we save more than dollars; we save our Nation's children and strengthen our country's future.

REPORT FROM INDIANA: MEMORIAL DAY HEROES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCINTOSH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to give my weekly report from Indiana.

Every weekend, my wife Ruthie and I travel across Indiana.

So often we are blessed to be included in very, very special ceremonies.

Last Memorial Day weekend we participated in two unforgettable events honoring veterans for Memorial Day.

They reminded me that 220 years ago, the signers of the Declaration of Independence took a solemn oath:

> And for the support of this Declaration, with a firm Reliance on the Protection of divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our Lives, our Fortunes, and our sacred Honor.

Last weekend as we celebrated Memorial Day, Americans reflected upon the grand project to which those men, our Founding Fathers, pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor.

That grand project was the United States of America.

It was not merely a territory, was not a treasure, and was not an allegiance to a king.

No, that grand project was an idea. It was the idea of freedom.

The first event was held last Friday in Indianapolis where awe-inspiring half-oval limestone memorials were dedicated for Indiana's Vietnam and Korean war veterans.

These memorials were dedicated thanks to George Busirk, president of the Indiana War Memorial Commission; and Gerald ''Dutch'' Bole, the director of the Indiana Department of Veterans Affairs.

On the limestone is carved the names of those men and women who died in those conflicts.

In many of our communities veterans of past wars are no longer remembered on Memorial Day.

But in Indianapolis, over 6,000 people came to honor those who sacrifice in defense of this country. And it was also a day, to honor those who have taken their place.

My colleague, Mr. JACOBS, who served in Korea, set the tone for the event, when he said:

> We gather not in triumph and glory, but in sorrow. We must never forget the young Americans that sacrificed their lives, so that we may live in liberty.

I saw sorrow and pride in the face of Sgt. Sammy Davis, who received a Congressional Medal of Honor for gallantry during an enemy attack during his tour in the Vietnam war. And Adrian Cronauer shared with us the original ''Goooooooood Morning Vietnam.''

Captain Scott O'Grady joined in the ceremony. He is the soldier who captured America's heart, when he was shot down over the skies of Bosnia and through his faith in God made his way to freedom, in June of last year.

Captain O'Grady shed a tear at the playing of ''Taps'' to honor those who did not come home from Vietnam and Korea.

The second ceremony that Ruthie and I participated in was a special memorial service in Centerville, IN—a small, quite town in Wayne County.

There, folks gathered from miles around at the Crown Hill Cemetery, to lay wreaths, place flags and honor our brave men and women who served in our Armed Forces.

Post Adjutant Earl Dingworth and members of the American Legion Post 287 were on hand to honor those who had made the ultimate sacrifice for their country.

Chaplain Roy Brown, from Richmond's Veterans of Foreign Wars [VFW] Post 1108, asked God's blessing for those who serve, and for their friends and family.

It was both an honor and privilege for me to salute those brave Americans who sacrificed and will sacrifice their lives on behalf of this country.

I would like to commend our brave servicemen and women, our veterans and their families as Hoosier Heros, Hoosier Heros because they have taken the ultimate oath in defense of our liberty.

I would like my colleagues and all Americans listening today to join me in taking that same sacred oath our forefathers took over 200 years ago.

To pledge in the defense of America our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor.

Those are the kind of American values our Country stands for.

Because the men and women who take this oath are not only Hoosier heros, but America's heros.

And that Mr. Speaker, is my report from Indiana.

REPORT FROM INDIANA: TONY STEWARD

Mr. Speaker, I rise today, to give a Report from Indiana.

In my home State, we gear-up for the Indianapolis 500 during the month of May.

It is a cherished Hoosier tradition celebrated across the State since 1911.

Many young children, grow up, dreaming about someday racing in the 500. Few, have been so lucky.

But this year, Hoosier racing fans were able to cheer for a home-town boy.

Tony Steward, a 25-year-old of Rushville, IN, and from my district, was that young man.

Tony Steward is to be commended for his courage and dedication to reaching one of his life-long goals.

Tony is a 1989 graduate of Columbus North High School.

And this year, he participated in ''The Greatest Spectacle on Earth'' * * * The Indianapolis 500.

Race-fans across the State, cheered for the Columbus native and Rushville resident.

He earned one of only 33 slots on race day.

He qualified with the fastest time and earned the prestigious pole position.

And for the first 31 laps, he led the race.

He bravely challenged the 2½ mile oval at speeds of up to 230 miles-per-hour.

During the 82d lap, his engine blew and he finished the race in 24th place.

But his performance earned him the 'Rookie of the Year Award.'

His participation in this historic auto racing event made us all very proud.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. VENTO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereinafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

USE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to use the time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO]. I would like to make a few comments on what just transpired here a few minutes ago.

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

There was no objection.

TAKE POLITICS OUT OF WELFARE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, in my view, welfare reform is one of the most serious problems facing this country. I do not honestly believe that the American people will have any confidence in the ability of their Government at any level until they are convinced that we can reform welfare, get rid of the existing dead-end system and create a real opportunity to move people from welfare to work. I think for that to occur, and I have been here quite awhile and I have seen previous welfare reform attempts fail because they become politicized, I think that if you want welfare reform, to succeed you have to have serious people trying to do serious things to work out serious disagreements and come to a serious compromise on how we approach the problem. That is what we ought to be doing.

Instead, in my view, by scheduled this blatantly political proposal before the Congress next Tuesday, when no one is scheduled to be here, we are simply seeing a situation in which the majority party evidently is more interested in going after the President than they are in dealing seriously with welfare reform; at least that is my view.

☐ 2200

If we were serious and if we really did want Wisconsin to receive the waivers that are being requested, then we would ask the President to, to the maximum extent possible, cooperate with Wisconsin in bringing about the acceptance of those waivers. That, in fact, is exactly what the President said when he was in Wisconsin, that he would work with Wisconsin to try to provide the waivers that were necessary.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that given the fact that the chief executive of the State of Wisconsin, Governor Thompson, exercised some 90, I thought it was 79, I am now told it is 90 separate item vetoes on 27 different subjects, it appears to me that the Governor used his brain and thought about some of the problems that he has thought were in the package that was passed by the legislature.

It comes with considerable ill grace for anyone in this body to suggest that the President ought not be able to also use his brain and evaluate honestly whether or not this package measures up to the claims made for it by the Governor of the State of Wisconsin. If it does, the waivers should be granted. If it does not, the Federal Government ought to work with the State until those matters are worked out. That is what we would do if we were serious people.

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

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

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, I think what is at issue here is under current law there is a 30-day comment period. Those members of the public who are interested in the proposal can come forward to either support or to oppose.

In my office, I have received numerous letters and petitions from residents of the State of Wisconsin who watched the bill pass the State legislature, watched the Governor sign it, and now they want to have their say as to whether or not these 75, not 1, but 75 waivers, should be granted. Mr. Speaker, they run from soup to nuts.

Even if the President supports this, and I cannot speak for him, nor can he speak for me, regardless, the law would

still provide that 30 days will be used for a comment period, and then the President can decide and the Secretary of HHS and everyone else. So that is what we are asking be done here.

This is being foisted upon us on a day when the Congress is not in session. We have six bills up when Congress is not in session, this is the seventh, which has not even been printed yet. The purported offeror, the gentleman from Racine, Kenosha, he himself, when asked on the floor tonight, did not know himself what the waivers were all about. He is being used as some kind of pawn here. It is really sad what is going on. The only thing we are asking is let us let the people of Wisconsin, on an issue that greatly affects them, be heard. That is what they are asking me to provide for them.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution, this action, cuts off the 30 days.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I would simply make the point that unless we give the people that 30-day waiver, this will be a supreme act of arrogance in which only politicians are allowed to voice their opinions.

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, welfare reform is a serious issue. The welfare reform of Wisconsin attempts to put people back to work, but that does not mean that people in Congress should stop doing our work. I think it would be a gross abdication of our responsibilities to, sight unseen, approve these waivers.

I called Governor Thompson's office yesterday to get a copy of his waiver request. I still have not received it. If they are asking 435 Members of Congress to vote on his waiver request, sight unseen, that is bad public policy. It shuts out the American people, and this Congress should debate this issue.

WHAT THE 104TH CONGRESS HAS BEEN DOING FOR CHILDREN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, as we know, this Saturday, Washington will be the site of a rally for children, called the Stand for Children.

I commend the organizers of this rally for their commitment to helping children. I hope this rally will be a balanced presentation on how best the Federal Government can help our children, and more importantly, make our children's future brighter.

I am taking this special order tonight to let the American people know what the Congress has been doing for children.

The truth is that the 104th Congress is the most prochild Congress in the last 40 years.

What is a prochild Congress? What does that mean for people outside the beltway, people who struggle to raise a family, people who want to pass on a better America to their children?

A prochild Congress must meet three tests.

First, it must be fiscally responsible.

Passing on a bankrupt nation is the surest way to undermine our children's future.

This Congress passed the first balanced budget in a generation. It tried to restrain the growth of entitlement programs that will bankrupt the country in 10 years unless action is taken now.

Our children, individually, already owe hundreds of thousands of dollars in debt, because of the profligate spending habits of past Congresses.

We must stop spending our children's futures. This Congress has succeeded in reigning in wasteful Washington spending, and that is probably the best thing we could do, to stand for children.

Second, a prochild Congress works to strengthen the family.

Villages do not make the best parents. Parents make the best parents. It does not take a village to raise a child. It takes a family. It takes parents.

Allowing parents to keep more of their money to spend on their children is the quickest way to take the strain off the family structure.

Our $500-per-child tax credit is real relief for parents to help them meet the higher costs of raising children.

Welfare reform is another way we have worked to strengthen the family. Our current welfare system has destroyed too many families. It has actually made it harder for two-parent families to stay together.

We have worked to change that system, by requiring work, by removing the disincentives for marriage, and by making it harder for fathers to abandon their kids.

A prochild Congress also promotes adoption.

I read with interest the First Lady's recent discussions of adoption, and the President's endorsement of our adoption reform bills.

Getting children into safe, loving, and permanent homes should be the paramount concern, not political correctness.

I hope the President's words match his deeds and that he continues to support our efforts to promote adoption and remove the barriers to adoption.

Finally, a prochild Congress is a prolife Congress.

We have been the most prolife Congress in the last 20 years.

Some on the liberal left will make the argument that you can be both prochild and proabortion.

I disagree. You cannot speak on behalf of children on one hand wile promoting policies that kill them on the other.

I am proud of the work of this Congress, and I am proud of the work they have done to help children have a brighter and more prosperous future.

The 104th Congress does stand for children and for that we should all be proud.

WEAVING THE FABRIC OF A STRONG COMMUNITY MEANS DEVOTING MORE RESOURCES TO PREVENTING TEEN PREGNANCY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I disagree with the last speaker, that this Congress has been a prochild Congress.

It certainly has not acted on behalf of children when it refused children the opportunity to have a decent lunch so they could learn better. It certainly has not acted in the good interests of children when they refused to allow them to have food stamps, where indeed their families were suffering. It certainly has not acted well on behalf of children where they were denied Title I educational funds that go to disadvantaged children to learn better, so they can make a contribution. Finally, it certainly has not acted in the best interests of children when it denies its family or wants to deny its family a liveable wage so they can provide for their families.

Mr. Speaker, I want to join the debate today by saying this is May, and May is, indeed, a month when we want to advocate about children, about Teenager Pregnancy Prevention Month. This is a time that we should look at that.

I want to speak maybe a little more philosophically.

Mr. Speaker, the fabric of our society is woven from numerous threads. Threads from the Federal Government's policies and services are interwoven with threads from State government policies and services, along with threads from county and municipal governments, civic organizations and private sector efforts.

These threads form an intricate pattern of policies, programs and services, all interconnected, that in turn effect the lives of all our citizens.

To achieve a strong community fabric, the Federal Government must carefully consider the length, the strength, the flexibility, the vibrancy, and the quality of threads that we contribute to the weave of policies, programs, and procedures.

The goal of teen pregnancy prevention efforts should be to assist teens to achieve social responsibility and long-term economic self-sufficiency. Achievement of this goal depends on the efforts of the participant, the service provider, and the administering governmental agencies. The primary role of the Federal Government should be to facilitate the success of each parties' efforts.

Our current teen pregnancy crisis evolved over several generations when the social fabric became worn and tattered and began to unravel. Consequently, we must realize that we cannot break this intergenerational cycle or eliminate the crisis over night.

We must carefully examine the fabric of our programs to determine where

the strength is, where the wear and tear has occurred and where the frayed edges and holes have occurred.

The mending occurs when we revise current policies and implement new ones. To create an effective policy and weave a durable social fabric we must add the appropriate thread in the correct proportions.

Just as the textile industry weaves nylon thread to create a more durable cloth, to break the cycle of teen pregnancy and poverty, we must implement pregnancy prevention programs that educate and support school age youths [10–21] in high risk situations and their family members through comprehensive social and health services, with an emphasis on pregnancy prevention.

I strongly support abstinence education and feel that it is critically important to fund abstinence programs for preteens as well as teenagers. Within 5 years, a concentrated abstinence program for preteens should bring about a decline in the number of teenagers who are sexually active.

However, we cannot ignore the fact that today, so many of our teenagers are already sexually active. It is therefore imperative that we also provide funding for comprehensive prevention programs including contraceptive use.

We must also weave a comprehensive policy to address the numerous factors that contribute to the number of teenagers having babies. We currently have a patchwork of different policies which has been created by patching the holes in our social fabric.

Every time a problem began to tear the social fabric, it was patched by creating an individual policy to address each individual problem.

This patchwork includes the obvious differing policies: Encouraging abstinence, preventing unintended pregnancies among the sexually active, alleviating the problems associated to adolescent parenthood, and attempting to ensure that teen pregnancy does not lead to welfare dependency.

However, there are big holes in the fabric that have not been patched. These include establishing paternity and holding fathers financially responsible, enforcing child support laws, protecting young teenagers from sexual abuse, and enforcing States' statutory rape laws that are currently on the books.

We must weave a comprehensive policy into the social fabric at the federal level to prevent teen pregnancies.

The first thread is a policy that allows state and local agencies to implement concentrated, organized contraceptive intervention programs.

The second thread is to enact cohesive policies and laws, at the Federal, State and local levels.

The third thread is sufficient Federal funding to implement them.

Devoting more resources to preventing teen pregnancy will not only save us money in the long run, but it will strengthen the social fabric by improving the health, education, economic opportunities and well-being of our Nation's youth.

IN RECOGNITION OF COACH ELVIN J. JAMES, GOLDSBORO, NC

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize the accomplishments of an outstanding individual from eastern North Carolina, Elvin J. James.

Elvin James is the head football coach at Goldsboro High School, in my district in North Carolina. Recently, USA Weekend Magazine honored Coach James with its ''Most Caring Coach Award, 1996.''

Without a doubt, education is an issue that is critically important to the future of our country. Though we spend more money on education than any other country in the world—$27 billion to be exact—our students' test scores and literacy levels have steadily declined.

It is becoming more and more clear that we must return education to parents, local communities, and especially to teachers. Mr. Speaker, it is a teacher like Coach James, who goes that extra mile, who dedicates so much of himself to his students, that brings this message home.

Coach James is a living example of where hard work and dedication can take you in this world. Coach James grew up in Beaufort, NC, and was adopted by his grandmother, Jennie James, who supported him and eight other children by working as a maid.

She admits to this day that the family had very little, but Jennie James taught her children right from wrong.

Her continuing message, ''Get an education, work hard, be respectful,'' had a great impact on Coach James' life.

Coach James excelled in football and other sports during his school years. In 1974, he was awarded an athletic scholarship by Elizabeth City State University in North Carolina, to play football and to pursue a college education.

Unable to pay for his expenses, James left school and joined the U.S. Army. After serving 4 years, he returned to college and earned a degree in education.

He has been teaching ever since. Coach James currently lives with his wife Mary Kay, their daughter, Ashelyn and their son, Elvin Jarrod.

Mr. Speaker, Elvin James is worthy of our recognition for more than just this. During the past 10 years, Coach James had helped more than 50 students earn college scholarships, and helped numerous students stay in school.

He spends countless hours on the phone talking with college coaches about potential candidates. Many times a year, Elvin James travels from State to State, taking students on campus visits and trying to introduce them to opportunities, they never dreamed were possible.

Since he began, Coach James has put more than 80,000 miles on his car. He has spent more than $3,000 of his own money, and given up more than 45 of his sick and vacation days to take these players on recruiting trips.

Less than a half-dozen of these players would have received scholarships if it had not been for these trips.

Coach James doesn't stop here. James is there for each student, literally, every step of the way; helping them prepare for the SAT or helping them fill out their college applications.

On several occasions, when parents were unable to take their children to college, Coach James was the one who took them and helped them move in. He has even let students with family troubles move in for a while, until things at home got worked out.

Coach James works in a school that serves many disadvantaged students. Many of his students come from broken homes. By many of society's standards, the odds are against these children's success.

However, Coach James is a great motivator, who encourages students to believe in themselves, even when no one else does. When Coach James looks at these children, he sees wonderful young men and women, who, if given the opportunity, will become outstanding and productive citizens.

Mr. Speaker, for more than 14 years, Elvin James has been touching the lives of young people. He deserves this award and our praise tonight.

Coach Elvin James, USA Weekend Magazine's Most Caring Coach, 1996, is an example of what is truly right with our education system. Our country and especially our children need more teachers and parents, just like Coach James.

I am proud to recognize Coach James, as a symbol of all the men and women who have dedicated their lives to education, and who care so much about our children's future.

□ 2215

THE 1997 REPUBLICAN BUDGET: THE STAND AGAINST CHILDREN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NEY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. FILNER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, this coming Saturday, June 1, thousands of families, schools, churches, synagogues, and other organizations will gather at the Lincoln Memorial for what is aptly being called the Stand for Children. Stand for Children is a national day of commitment to children that has been convened by the Children's Defense Fund and endorsed by more than 3,000 national, State, and local organizations.

From my hometown of San Diego, CA, alone more than 120 people organized by the Children's Advocacy Institute at the University of San Diego will be attending this event.

The Stand for Children will address the critical issues facing America's children, including drugs, violence, and poverty.

Ironically, children in America are also under attack by the very institution that should be protecting them from these evils, the U.S. Congress. This 104th Congress is waging a stand against children.

The Republican majority, with the so-called pro-family agenda, has pretended to extend its protective hand toward America's youth, when in reality it has not given our children a fair shake. This majority has voted repeatedly to slash funding for children's programs, including education, student loans, child nutrition, health care for children, child protection services such as foster care, and aid for disabled children.

This agenda threatens not only the education and well-being of our Nation's children, it puts the future of America at risk. If our children do not receive a quality education, proper nutrition, and a nurtured upbringing, then American businesses will not be able to compete in the global economy.

Congressional Democrats have worked with President Clinton to fend off the onslaught of these cuts. This year we successfully restored most of the education cuts proposed by Republicans in their 1996 budget, and the President vetoed many damaging cuts in children's programs contained in the so-called welfare reform and budget reconciliation pills.

I would have hoped that Republicans learned a lesson from their failure to cut children's programs in this year's budget but, sadly, they have not. Their proposal for fiscal year 1997 would cut many of the same programs that were on the chopping block last year. This month 221 House Republicans voted for the 1997 budget resolution which would cut funding for education and training programs by 22 percent over the next 6 years.

Here are the specifics of what the majority whip called the pro-choice or the pro-education or the pro-child Congress:

A 6-year freeze in title I funding for aid to local schools, resulting in a 20 percent cut by the year 2002.

A 6-year freeze for Head Start, resulting in a 20 percent cut by 2002.

Elimination of the Goals 2000 public schools reform which currently helps 5 million students in more than 8,000 schools across the country raise their academic achievement.

Their proposal eliminates all Federal funding for bilingual and immigrant education.

It eliminates new funding for Perkins student loans which provide low-interest financial assistance to thousands of college students, and eliminates the direct loan program which helps 2.5 million students receive college loans more quickly and less expensively than traditional loans.

It eliminates AmeriCorps, the national service program that gives 200,000 young people the chance to serve their communities while earning money for college.

And it cuts 20 percent in funding for our Nation's libraries.

This is what the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY] called the pro-children's Congress. Republican cuts in other programs would also threaten the well-being of our children.

By cutting Medicaid by $72 billion over 6 years, they jeopardize the Federal guarantee of coverage to thousands of low-income children. And by allowing the wealthy to opt out of the health care system through the use of medical savings accounts, they risk causing a further decline in coverage and services for poor families and children.

The Republican budget would also cut spending for school lunches, foster care, aid to disabled children and youth crime prevention programs.

It is time for Republicans to realize that the American people will not tolerate massive, irresponsible cuts that failed earlier this year. Our children deserve better. We must give our children the assistance and support they need for a successful future.

Mr. Speaker, let us all stand for children.

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

Mr. FILNER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. VENTO. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to commend him for his statement. I also want to point out that under the rubric of welfare reform the Republican proposals cut SSI, programs that go to children with various types of disabilities such as cystic fibrosis and multiple sclerosis, actually cutting those benefits by 25 percent. This is all under the rubric of welfare reform.

This welfare reform is a good bumper sticker slogan, but when we peel off that bumper sticker and look at what is behind it, we have got cuts in school lunches, we have got cuts in terms of various types of nutrition programs. We have got cuts in terms of child care. This, mind you, all under the rubric of welfare reform.

Of course under welfare reform we all know the proposals that have been put forth for a teenage parent that has another child. That child would get no support. Some help in terms of a child-friendly Congress, taking it out on the child that is born to a teenage mother.

Mr. FILNER. Let us all, again, stand for children.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

NOMINATING LEONEL MOREJON ALMAGRO FOR NOBEL PEACE PRIZE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow morning approximately 60 members of this House, including the Speaker, will be sending a letter to the Nobel Committee of the Norwegian Parliament, the entity that designates the winners of the Nobel Peace Prize, to nominate Leonel Morejon Almagro, the National Delegate of the Concilio Cubano, the Cuban Council, an umbrella of over 140 pro-democracy groups in Cuba, for the Nobel Peace Prize.

Mr. Morejon Almagro is at this time a political prisoner at the State security prison at Villa Marista in Havana. Mr. Morejon Almagro is a 31-year-old attorney who was dismissed from his position as a lawyer because of his defense of numerous political prisoners in court. In 1986 he founded NaturPaz, Nature Peace, a peaceful environmental group that was prohibited by the Cuban dictatorship. Shortly after its founding, NaturPaz supported a ban on all nuclear weapons testing in the world. In 1991 he was detained by Cuban State Security for organizing a peaceful demonstration in front of the UNESCO office in Havana to protest the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait and the environmental destruction that it caused.

In 1986 and 1987, Mr. Morejon Almagro, at great personal risk, taught ecology and pacifism to students in school and criticized Cuban involvement in the Angolan and Ethiopian conflicts.

He played a decisive role this year in the formation of Concilio Cubano, as I stated, a coalition of over 140 peaceful pro-democracy organizations in Cuba. And he was elected a National Delegate of Concilio Cubano on February 10, 1996. He was arrested 5 days later, charged with resisting authority, and sentenced to 6 months in prison. He began a hunger strike after his arrest and his mother told independent journalists in Cuba that she feared for his life and believed that he was being subjected to psychiatric torture, including electroshocks. Upon appealing his sentence, Mr. Morejon Almagro was resentenced to 15 months instead of 6 months imprisonment. He has been declared a prisoner of conscience by Amnesty International. The National Vice-Delegates of Concilio Cubano also remain in prison to this day, Lazaro Gonzalez and Mercedes Parada Antunez, the latter in a hospital. The regime stated that she would be subjected to surgery and has not specified what it has meant by that.

Just as Aung San Suu Kyi, the Burmese dissident leader, received the Nobel Peace Prize in 1991, and before

that, Desmond Tutu in 1984 and Lech Walesa in 1983 and Andrei Sakharov in 1975 and Martin Luther King in 1964, Mr. Morejon Almagro at this time deserves the Nobel Peace Prize. He represents, Mr. Speaker, an entire new generation of Cubans which is fighting from within the totalitarian nation to achieve freedom and the reestablishment of democracy. That is why Castro fears Leonel so much.

By awarding him the Nobel Peace Prize, not only would the great work of Mr. Morejon Almagro be duly recognized, in this way hopefully contributing to his physical protection at this extraordinarily difficult time of political imprisonment, but also the important work of the entire internal opposition in Cuba would be honored. The importance of all who risk their lives by being members of Concilio Cubano as well as the rest of the internal opposition and the independent journalists in Cuba would all be recognized by the awarding of the Nobel Peace Prize to Leonel Morejon Almagro.

With regard to the independent press, Mr. Speaker, just a few days ago, perhaps the most well known independent journalist in Cuba, Rafael Solana, was put on an airplane and expelled, sent to Madrid where he very reluctantly arrived, vowing to continue his work and of course to return as soon as Cuba is free.

Olance Nogreras, another well-known independent journalist, was picked up just hours ago by State Security. The repression is intensifying in an extraordinary manner within Cuba.

We must fight and with this nomination of Leonel Morejon Almagro for the Nobel Peace Prize, we are fighting against the great conspiracy of silence that exists in the international community against the Cuban tragedy, Mr. Speaker. This conspiracy of silence will be grasped in all its magnitude only when Castro is history and all the political prisons are opened.

The true story of the Cuban tragedy is really not being focused upon. Humberto Real, a Cuban patriot, has been sentenced to death by the dictatorship in the last weeks but the Cuban people continue to struggle.

That is why I am proud of my colleagues who joined me in signing this letter today in nomination of Mr. Morejon Almagro for the Nobel Peace Prize, and of course our struggle will continue because it is very just and necessary.

□ 2230

ECONOMIC SECURITY FOR FAMILIES

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, as has been mentioned earlier by our colleagues, on Saturday, the Children's Defense Fund will hold a Stand for Children event where people from all over the country will be traveling to Washington to participate. I, myself, am proud to say that from San Francisco and from all over California, indeed, we will have a very large contingent participating.

That stand for children is one that we must make every day of the year in the Congress of the United States. As a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Health, Human Services and Education, I have been actually bowled over by the size of the cuts in the budget for children's initiatives that had been put forth both last year and which we anticipate because of the budget resolution allocations to come down this year.

I rise tonight, Mr. Speaker, to talk not just about children, but the families that they live in, because when we talk abut children, we not only talk about their health, education, and well-being, but we also talk about the economic security of their families. We talked about this last week when we made the fight successfully to increase the minimum wage, dragging this House kicking and screaming to a place where we could hold our head up a littler higher to pay fair wages to the American worker.

But also part of the economic security of American families are the issues of Medicare and Medicaid, which once again take severe cuts in the budget proposal that passed the House tonight. That is why our colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. MARTIN SABO, put forth a motion to instruct. His motion to instruct was for us to instruct conferees to accept the higher discretionary levels in the Senate bill in order to avoid another government shutdown; to accept the higher levels in the Senate bill. He is talking about the Domenici numbers, Republican numbers in the Senate side. Even the Senate Republicans reject the severe cuts that are being proposed on the House side.

Another part of the Sabo motion to instruct was to retain protection for seniors against excess charges by health care providers in Medicare and also to retain Federal standards for nursing homes. Of course, and sadly, our Republican colleagues voted down this motion to instruct to agree to the Republican Senate numbers and, instead, to retain the House severe cuts.

The budget resolution allocations have created the same basic conflict that led to two Government shutdowns and 13 continuing resolutions in the battle over 1996 spending. Why would we want to do that again?

In regard to protecting health care for seniors, the House version of the budget resolution retains essentially the same Medicare policies that were vetoed by President Clinton in the reconciliation bill. Further, the House budget resolution does not protect seniors from the draconian Medicaid policies that were passed in the House last year.

I would like to review, Mr. Speaker, some of the provisions that we are fighting. The Republican record on senior citizens in the 104th Congress includes eliminating doctor and hospital choice by forcing seniors into Medicare managed-care plans. The GOP plan would allow doctors to charge extra out-of-pocket costs to seniors who remain in Medicare fee-for-service. The GOP plan would severely cut Medicare and Medicaid hospital funding, forcing many to close their doors on seniors. And the Republican plan would eliminate coverage guaranteed for over 4 million elderly Americans who need nursing home care. The Republican plan further erodes Medicare solvency by creating wealth-healthy plans, leaving many seniors with higher costs and less care.

Does this sound familiar? We fought this fight last year. The Democrats in the Congress and the President of the United States stood firm against this assault on the economic and personal security of America's seniors and, therefore, America's families.

The Democrats prevented the Republicans last year from doubling Medicare part B premiums, from attempting to eliminate doctor choice, from cutting Medicare premium assistance for low-income seniors, from repealing Federal nursing home quality standards and putting homes and family farms of elderly couples at risk for nursing home care, and we kept them from forcing adult children to be financially liable for their parents' nursing home bills.

This is important because all of the seniors that we talk about have contributed to the strength and the success of our country. How many times have we seen our colleagues come to the floor, including this evening, sing the praises and the contributions that have been made by various senior citizens in their districts and turn right around and cut Medicare and Medicaid to assist those seniors in their older years?

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to pay close attention and the American people to pay close attention to these cuts which will affect their lives very directly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NEY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MILLER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. MILLER of Florida addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

WELFARE BILL THEATRICS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, the theatrics in which the majority leader engaged in the few minutes before the closing of this Congress tonight again provide America an indication of what is wrong with this Congress.

The majority leader, you will remember, outlined a schedule for next week, and he conveniently omitted one piece of legislation from that schedule. This particular bill will be considered on a day when most of the Members of Congress are not present here in Washington. This particular bill will be considered under a procedure that limits debate to 40 minutes, with no amendments, and it can be actually defeated by one-third of the Members of this body.

This bill, the majority leader finally conceded, has not yet even been written, much less discussed and considered by a committee in Congress and presented to the American people for their debate, which is the normal approach in a democratic society.

Now, this particular bill is not a bill to name a post office in Podunkville after DICK ARMEY or to declare National Apple Pie Week. No, this particular bill deals with a subject that most Americans are concerned about, and that is our welfare system. It is a welfare system that is broke, that is not working for the taxpayer, quite clearly, but it is also not working for the people that it is designed to benefit.

I know that those of us on the Democratic side, from our unanimous vote in the last session of this Congress, expressed our view that we want to place an importance in welfare reform on work, on the value of work, on teaching the value of work, on helping families that have been torn apart get back into the work force and provide for their families. But if anyone would have thought we would deal with such a serious matter with the kind of stunt that we saw tonight, the notion that this Congress would take up a matter of such importance without any real debate, without the Members even knowing what was in the bill.

We did have one gentleman who thought he knew something about the bill. We learned that there were 97 line item vetoes by the Governor of Wisconsin in this bill. Under the debate procedure, we will have less than 30 seconds per line item veto to consider this.

One would think that this is, as I asked the majority leader, just another example of his very strange sense of humor; that this stunt is all a joke. But one who thought that would not have observed the way this Congress has been conducted for the last year and a half, for it has been one stunt after another like this that has created the greatest failure of any Congress in recent American history.

It all started last year when these Republicans decided that they were going to provide a tax break for the richest members of our society and make those who were now on Medicare pay for it. And so they set up a series of secret task forces, and those forces were out there figuring out how much more they could hike premiums, how much more they could increase the cost of health care for our seniors, all to provide tax brakes for those at the top of the economic ladder. And they did it all in secret, and then they came out here and presented it as essentially a ''take it or leave it'' plan, originally to our Committee on the Budget and finally to the House.

It is the same kind of extremism that caused this Government to be shut down last year for weeks at a cost of $1.5 billion. Frittered away. Totally and completely wasted American taxpayer money by these folks in their Government shutdown fever.

It is the kind of political theatrics that instead of coming in a sensible bipartisan moderate way to see how we change this welfare system and make it work and change this Medicare system and make it work better.

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

Mr. DOGGETT. I will not yield at this time. Perhaps at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. KINGSTON. I will be happy to yield back to the gentleman.

Mr. DOGGETT. I thank the gentleman for his comment. In fact, what I would like to do is to have an opportunity to yield and discuss and debate at length this whole subject of welfare reform instead of handling it in the same shabby way that the Republicans did Medicare reform last year, which was designed to provide those tax breaks for the people at the top of the economic ladder and make those people on Medicare bear the cost of those tax breaks.

Now we are going to approach this other tough issue in our society that needs to be attacked in a bipartisan way to try to get at the heart of making welfare work and making it work fair, but to do it in this kind of fashion, when even the Republican Members do not know what is in their bill, is the kind of extremist approach that America has rejected.

I think that it is time for this Congress to get down to business in a true Democratic spirit, not in terms of party but in terms of a process that does not come around with the kind of arrogance that we have seen here tonight, of saying we will present you something and you can take it or leave it, because that kind of approach is not going to produce any legislation.

That is why this Congress has nothing to show but political rhetoric and nonsense and wasted taxpayer money for most of the last year and a half, because these folks have not been interested in trying in craft legislation in a bipartisan way to deal with the true problems of this country. They have been interested in scoring political points.

They do not care next week whether one welfare mom goes back to work, because they are not interested in jobs for welfare moms. They are interested in protecting their own political job, and America is going to see through this kind of nonsense.

REQUEST OF PRESIDENT TO USE STATUTORY AUTHORITY TO SUSPEND DAVIS-BACON ACT FOR REBUILDING EFFORT IN OKLAHOMA CITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. LUCAS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend from Georgia a few seconds.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for yielding.

Had the gentleman from Texas yielded, what I wanted to point out is that the Republican Party, acting in a spirit of bipartisanship, is taking the President of the United States at his word on the Wisconsin waiver and we are going to have that bill on the floor of the House.

I am surprised, as I listen to these Democrats, that they are against it because it was President Clinton's idea. I wanted to make sure that folks know we are doing exactly what President Clinton called for and that no Democrats have expressed any outrage until suddenly tonight.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LUCAS Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman's point is well taken.

Mr. Speaker, on July 27, 1995, President Clinton signed Public Law 104–19 which appropriated $39 million in Community Development Block Grants [CDBG] to assist citizens of Oklahoma City with meeting the financial hardships created by the bombing of the Alfred P. Murrah Federal building. This truly was the proper Federal response to a presidentially-mandated national emergency. Never before had Congress passed, and the President signed, legislation utilizing CDBG funds in this manner. An act of terror of this magnitude forces all of us to reflect on the standard operating procedures under which we, as a government, react to national emergencies. At this time, I am asking the President and the rest of the Federal Government to diligently reflect on how best we can restore Oklahoma City to where it was before 9:02 a.m. of that fateful day.

Mr. Speaker, as millions of people around the Nation joined the city of Oklahoma City on April 19 to remember those killed and injured in the bombing of the Alfred P. Murrah Federal building, they may have noticed the number of buildings that remain as damaged today as they were immediately following this tragic event.

On April 17 of this year, I sent a letter to President Clinton pointing out that there are major obstacles to fully utilizing the CDBG funds in the rebuilding effort and asking for his assistance in freeing up these funds to rebuild Oklahoma City. Specifically, I asked that he use his statutory authority to suspend the Davis-Bacon Act for these funds. It is my belief that in a unique situation such as what occurred in Oklahoma City, this authority

should be used. In fact, FEMA appropriations are not subject to Davis-Bacon to ensure that relief efforts can be accomplished in an expeditious manner so that the focus can be on rebuilding the communities affected. The funds appropriated to Oklahoma City should be seen in this light, which would warrant the suspension of Davis-Bacon.

To date I have received no response from the White House; by not responding to this request, President Clinton has ignored the request of Oklahoma City which has appealed to me for assistance in this matter. Last week, armed with specific case examples from Oklahoma City, I sent a second letter which again asked the President to exercise his authority to suspend this act. One example stated Davis-Bacon raised the costs of the project by 75 percent, and the city estimates that all project costs rise by an average of 25 to 40 percent. These are dollars that do not go toward disaster relief, but which are badly needed by the people of Oklahoma City.

According to title 40, section 276a–5 of the U.S. Code, ''In the event of a national emergency, the President is authorized to suspend the provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act.'' On the day of the bombing, the President issued a release stating that the bombing was a national emergency. I agreed with him and welcomed his pronouncement.

Mr. President, I ask you to take the next step and suspend the Davis-Bacon Act today. The sooner this is done, the sooner Oklahoma City will be able to fully utilize the money appropriated them last year.

I understand that Davis-Bacon is a politically charged issue and that this is a campaign year, but I maintain to the President that my motive for this request is not to repeal the Davis-Bacon Act, but to utilize the act to its fullest.

My point is that, in disaster situations, like what happened in Oklahoma City, the primary role of the Federal Government is to ensure that the fewest number of restrictions are placed on relief workers and small businesses. Had Oklahoma City received money from FEMA instead of from HUD, as disaster relief funds normally are, Davis-Bacon requirements would not have applied. Therefore, I feel this is a reasonable and nonpartisan request. I stand here today, as a representative of the people from Oklahoma City, who simply want to use the Federal relief funds in the matter that relief funds have historically been used.

Presidents Roosevelt, Nixon, and Bush, used this section of the law to suspend Davis-Bacon. Though there clearly is a precedent for suspending Davis-Bacon, there is no precedent for what occurred in Oklahoma City.

My question is simple: Mr. President, what will it be, yes or no?

Mr. Speaker, the letters of the President referred to earlier are included for the RECORD.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 17, 1996.

Hon. WILLIAM J. CLINTON,
President of the United States,
Washington, DC.

DEAR PRESIDENT CLINTON: As we approach the one year anniversary of the tragic bombing of the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City, I want to take the opportunity to relate to you certain problems that have slowed down the utilization of the $39 million in Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds by businesses and individuals. A similar letter has also been sent to Secretary Reich and Secretary Cisneros.

First, I want to emphasize that the people of Oklahoma, myself included, will forever be indebted for the federal response to this unprecedented act of terrorism. In fact, it is because of this rapid response that I feel that this issue must be addressed. As you know, Oklahoma City received $39 million in CDBG funds through the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Secretary Cisneros worked closely with myself and others to find offsets in this section of the budget and worked very hard to assure that the City would have flexibility in its use of this money.

At present, this money is subject to The Davis-Bacon Act, which requires small businesses to comply with Davis-Bacon reporting requirements and pay local prevailing wages for work associated with cleaning up and rebuilding the devastated area. The City of Oklahoma City has estimated that Davis-Bacon increases the cost of these projects by 25–40 percent and produces long delays. Even employees who want to help rebuild their workplace have to be certified under conditions of the Davis-Bacon Act and be paid as though they were general contractors. Like you, I want maximum utilization of the CDGB funds to rebuilt the City. Under these conditions, I fear that the $39 million will not be sufficient to rejuvenate Oklahoma City.

In Title 40, Section 276A–5, United States Code, the President has the authority to suspend the Davis-Bacon Act in times of national emergency. As you are aware, the Oklahoma City bombing was declared a national emergency on April 19, 1995. I am requesting that this authority be used. I am not advocating any statutory changes to be made to this Act, nor do I want this request to be seen as a testament to Davis-Bacon; however, in times of national emergency, appropriated funds should solely be directed for relief efforts. I'm afraid that currently that is not the case.

If this action is not desirable to the administration, I would recommend substantially increasing the threshold for Davis-Bacon projects so that small contractors can bid on this work. This would also allow small businesses to use their own employees to clean up and rebuild their stores. Again, this would only apply to the CDBG funds in Oklahoma City.

If this is done, I believe we owe it to the businesses and the community to set up an on-site verification process to immediately certify workers so that these relief projects can be expedited. This would not address the higher costs for these projects, but would allow them to commence work.

I believe that a solution to this problem can be achieved. The aftermath of the Oklahoma City bombing is a tremendous illustration of how federal, state, and local officials can work together and work with the community to address a disaster. I hope that this cooperation continues, and I thank you for your consideration of my requests.

Sincerely,

FRANK D. LUCAS,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 23, 1996.

Hon. WILLIAM J. CLINTON,
President of the United States,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On April 17, 1996, a request was made for your further assistance in rebuilding Oklahoma City after the bombing of the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building. As a unique and tragic event, the bombing has no parallel or precedent, which requires vigilance among citizens and public officials to continue our efforts to heal our broken community.

To date, I have not received a response from you regarding the City of Oklahoma City's request for a suspension of the Davis-Bacon Act (the Act) requirements as it relates to the CDBG funding for bombing relief. Title 40, §276a-5 (U.S.C.), provides the President authority to suspend the Act's requirements in times of a national emergency. On April 19, 1995, you declared a national emergency for Oklahoma City. Based on your tour of Oklahoma City on April 5 of this year, you know firsthand the extent of the damage that still exists one year later. Thus, quick action to our request will accelerate the recovery effort.

Recently, I received an interim response from Assistant Secretary DeCell of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, which was lacking in relevance and understanding of our problem. Hopefully, HUD's cursory examination will not weigh too heavily on your decision to grant our suspension request.

During staff discussions with HUD, it was mentioned that no precedent exists for such a suspension. In fact, President Roosevelt, Nixon and Bush have granted it on three occasions. Additionally, I trust you will agree that no precedent exists for what occurred in Oklahoma City and any reliance on past situations are not analogous or relevant.

The following are a sampling of real life examples of how the Act is constricting the rebuilding efforts. The increased costs are undeniable. The city of Oklahoma City has submitted a request for an additional $26 million in bombing relief. This subsequent request underscores the urgency in maximizing the relief funds already available to Oklahoma.

1. The use of a single ''prime contractor'' increases the cost of the project because the prime contractor will add overhead costs for subcontracting, administrative expenses to complete the Davis-Bacon compliances and profit.

2. Most Davis-Bacon wages in Oklahoma City exceed the wage that is usually paid in the open market.

3. Because Davis-Bacon sets specific wages for specific trades, the general laborer, employed by a small business, may perform several tasks during his daily shift. In a given day, the employee may use a backhoe, a shovel and frame walls in a building. Each trade classification has a different wage rate which must be documented with the number of hours worked in each classification. This means that in an eight hour day, the employee could use a shovel for 1.5 hours @$7.37 per hour, use a backhoe for 45 minutes @14.06 plus $3.49 in fringes/ per hour and frame a building for 5.45 hours @$11.90 per hour.

4. City staff have been told that if an employee is working at a higher wage classification, the employee must be paid at the highest wage rate regardless of the work being performed (See Asbestos removal).

5. Davis-Bacon does not take into account merit and longevity of employees and their corresponding wages. All employees are paid the same minimum wage regardless of experience. An employer could pay more than the

minimum wage to more senior employees, but that is unlikely given that the minimum wage is usually more than the most senior employee makes on projects not subject to Davis-Bacon wages.

6. According to the Department of Housing and Urban Development, repairs to bomb-damaged buildings completed before October 30, 1995, are not subject to Davis-Bacon wages. Any project after that date is subject to Davis-Bacon. If the work has been completed by the property owner and the contractor has been paid and his employees have been paid:

(a) What incentive does a contractor have to recalculate all of his employee hours at the Federal Wage rate?

(b) If a contractor does not want to re-figure his wages, what recourse does an owner have to get reimbursed? (The contractor has been paid, why spend the time to re-figure?)

(c) When the contractor does comply, he will add overhead and profit to his costs making the job even more costly.

7. The $2,000 threshold for Davis-Bacon projects is too low. If you have two items to replace such as a window and an overhead door, the total cost may only be over $2,000. Each contractor will spend an hour or less on the job to install the products. Most of the bid is for the product, not the labor. A small independent contractor or small business owner will spend three days filling out paperwork for an hour-long job (See 1 NW 12th Example).

EXAMPLES

311 N. Harvey—original bids:	
Ward Construction	$2,900
Southwestern Roofing	21,398
Total	24,298
Revised Davis-Bacon bids (11% increase)	27,000
520 N. Hudson—original bids:	
Brat Paint	5,434
Mike Harper	675
King Electric	3,045
Mid-American Roofing	32,134
Total	41,288
Revised Davis-Bacon bids (One Prime Contractor) (44% increase)	59,398
225 NW 6th—original bids:	
Overhead Door	1,600
Mid-American Roofing	37,578
Total	39,178
Revised Davis-Bacon Bids (One Prime Contractor) (25% increase)	48,920
408 NW 6th—original bids:	
Central Glass	7,209
Bob Growan (exterior paint)	2,305
Ed Orr (replace ceiling)	11,900
Total	21,459
Revised Davis-Bacon Bids (75% increase)	37,720

In this case at 408 NW 6th, the property owner obtained the low bids above from individual contractors. The owner had also completed some minor reimbursable repairs prior to this bidding. The owner was told that he would have to rebid the project with the required wage rates and that he could only sue one ''prime contractor'' on projects where Davis-Bacon wage rates are in effect. The results of bidding the same work with general contractors and Davis-Bacon wage rates, is provided. This is an increase of $16,261 or 75% for the same work.

Although this may be an extreme case, history with our program shows most increases due to wage rate requirements in the range of 8–50%, it is indicative of the possible cost increase that can result from a combination of wage rate requirements and the use of general contractors on small jobs. The property owner was not surprised that the price increased significantly, but was baffled that we required him to do this. His question was why? To be honest, I don't know, other than ''that is the federal requirement.''

1 NW 12th Street: Taylor's Downtown Glass gave a bid of $433.23 to replace a window in a downtown building. It will take less than 30 minutes to perform the task. Tull Overhead Door gave a bid of $3,597.00 to replace an overhead door. The contractor will spend less than an hour installing the product. Taylor's Downtown Glass spent three days filling out the paperwork and has to keep track of the entire week of payroll for a job that takes less than 30 minutes. Tull Overhead Door spent costly time attending a pre-work conference that was required even though he had done Davis-Bacon work before.

Asbestos Removal: The federal wage rate for Asbestos Workers is $18.00 per hour plus $5.13 in fringes. The problem is that local asbestos abatement companies only pay that rate to employees when working in full containment garments (''moon suits'' with respirators). Otherwise they pay them at a regular common laborer rate or a wage rate that corresponds to their other job.

However, according to Davis-Bacon Rules, the abatement workers must be paid as such when they are driving a truck, unloading lumber and building containment areas, load out areas, etc. This will increase the asbestos abatement cost significantly and our project designers are amazed that this rule must be followed.

CONCLUSION

The point of the examples provided in this letter is that there is a substantial cost factor involved in implementing this program with Davis-Bacon prevailing wages, and I feel the money would be better spent providing additional assistance to those who were damaged. In addition, the fact that we must pay these wage rates with the accompanying reporting paperwork for businesses and additional City staff costs, frequently adds to the frustration of those who we are trying to help. Business and property owners often state that this is just another example of the government doing everything slower and at an increased cost. Unfortunately, I must agree with them.

I realize that there may be a reluctance to suspend Davis-Bacon wage rates for these funds. Although, I do find it interesting that if Oklahoma City had obtained funding through the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), as is typical in a disaster area, federal Davis-Bacon wage rates would not apply. However, because Congress designated Community Development Block Grant Funds (CDBG) for this unique disaster, HUD requires all construction projects with a total project cost of $2,000 or more to pay Davis-Bacon wages. In general, if the intent of the FEMA policy is not to burden those affected by a disaster or emergency with Davis-Bacon requirements, then I feel that the same policy should apply to the unique situation in Oklahoma City.

Your attention to this matter is truly appreciated. I look forward to our continued cooperation in assisting those damaged and providing for the revitalization of the areas affected by the bombing.

Sincerely,

FRANK D. LUCAS.

□ 2245

THE CONTINUED ASSAULT ON OUR NATION'S WORKING FAMILIES AND SENIORS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, during the past year, the majority has consistently advocated proposals to weaken programs and protections for our Nation's working families and seniors. As recent action shows, the majority has not been listening to the consistent and concerned voices of the American people which have expressed opposition to these proposals.

The majority is once again proposing fundamental changes in Medicare and Medicaid, which I might say helps and empowers over 70 million Americans gain access to health insurance. Their plan is to change the Medicare and Medicaid from programs which assure health care for those who need it to programs which limit Federal spending to a defined amount. In other words, they are changing them from defined benefit programs to defined contribution programs.

Congress should be acting to expand health care coverage and rein in escalating health care costs, but instead, Republicans in this Congress are focused on tearing our Nation's health safety net, potentially adding millions more to the ranks of the uninsured.

At the same time, the Republican plan includes tax breaks from $124 billion to $175 billion over the 6 years, and leaves the option open for even additional tax breaks, such as the costly capital gains tax break.

The majority would not need to make such drastic cuts and changes in Medicare and Medicaid if they did not insist on providing tax breaks for the wealthy.

Their plan will jeopardize health care for 623,000 Minnesotans who are enrolled in Medicare and 443,000 Minnesotans that receive help from Medicaid, half of those are children. In other words, 220,000 children receive Medicaid in Minnesota. In fact, about 1 in 5 Minnesotans relies on Medicaid or Medicare; over a million people.

The Republican Medicare plan continues to essentially include the same policy proposals as last year's plan, drastically cutting payments to the providers, restructuring the current programs, and heavily relying upon untested medical savings accounts. The medical savings accounts proposal has been predicted to cost, at a loss to the Medicare trust fund, an estimated $15 billion because Medicare funds would be given to healthier, wealthier people who most often do not need medical care.

The claim of extending Medicare solvency is only a pretext for the out of context policy the GOP pursues. The Medicare Part A program needs changing, but the Republican plan goes too

far and in the wrong direction, changing Medicare from a reliable health care insurance for our seniors to a second-class health care system for Medicare recipients.

Under the Medicare plan, seniors will pay more and get less. The plan would allow doctors and hospitals to charge seniors above and beyond the established Medicare reimbursement rate. Balance-billing will bottom the norm as providers shift more cost to the seniors, the proposed cuts by the Republican Congress will show up as bills on the backs of the Medicare elderly who earn an average of $10,000 or less yearly.

Perhaps even more damaging than the Medicare cuts are cuts and program changes planned for Medicaid. Under the Republican plan seniors, people with disabilities, and low-income families who receive help from Medicaid, would be at risk of losing their coverage. In addition, States will be allowed to reduce their own share of funding for Medicaid, making the actual cuts more severe than they first appear.

Two-thirds of all nursing home residents receive help from the Medicaid system to pay their nursing home bills. The Republican plan will allow States to target the assets of seniors' children to help pay nursing home bills, which average $38,000 per year. Again, the plan is really nothing less than a form of cost-shifting.

The plan cuts Federal expenditures but does not limit consumer costs. In fact, these programs were put in place to permit families to take care of themselves when a health care crisis occur. Now, the changes being proposed would pull the plug on the 30-year commitment to Medicare and Medicaid.

Republicans have shown that they are indifferent to the elderly and willing to send the American working families and seniors the bill for tax breaks for the wealthy. But these are not responsible or fair priorities for our Nation's future. The American people expect shared sacrifice, not cuts for people programs and tax breaks for wealthier individuals, but there they go again, hoping that the bumper sticker slogan of a tax break will cover up the cuts of people programs.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Members of this body to strongly oppose these proposals again as were proposed last year.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EWING] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. EWING addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

TRIBUTE TO ST. MARTHA'S STUDENTS—INTERNATIONAL SCHOOL CYBERFAIR 1996

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHRYSLER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CHRYSLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the students of St. Martha's Elementary School of Okemos, MI. Mr. Speaker, the students of St. Martha's recently became one of the grand prize winners of the International School CyberFair, a global competition celebrating the ability of on-line communications to share and unite students throughout their communities, their nations, and indeed the world.

Placing second in their category, the third, fourth, and fifth grade students of St. Martha's created an Internet web site highlighting familiar treasures of the mid-Michigan area so that students throughout the world could explore their community.

In addition to creating their own web site, the students of St. Martha's incorporated links to numerous other Michigan attractions, such as Michigan State University, the University of Michigan, Lansing Community College, and the Michigan State Government Offices.

Mr. Speaker, in receiving this outstanding award, the students of St. Martha's are paving the way for advancement of technologies in our classroom. These students have not only demonstrated exceptional skill and determination in providing their communities with this tool of learning, but they have also become student ambassadors to the world.

As we have now passed the telecommunications bill and it has been signed into law this year, these students are on the cutting edge of the Information Age. As sure as we lived in the agricultural age in the 1800's, and moved on into the industrial age in the 1900's, we are now into the information age of the 21st century.

Between 1600 and 1960, human knowledge doubled. Between 1960 and 1980, human knowledge doubled again. And between 1980 and 1990, human knowledge doubled again. And between 1990 and 1995, it doubled again. And now about every 18 months to 2 years, human knowledge will double again.

The telecommunications bill will not only create 3.2 million new jobs, but it will also create a new America where 40 percent of the working people can work out of their homes.

That means that we will eliminate the traffic jams in the morning and in the evenings. We will stop polluting our air from the cars sitting in the traffic jams idling away. But more importantly, we will have mom or dad, or maybe mom and dad both, at home when these kids go to school and, just as importantly, when they come home from school, and we will start putting American families back together again.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the students and the faculty of St. Martha's in receiving this award. Additionally, I would like to recognize Cisco Systems and the MCI Corporation for sponsoring this global competition for their commitment to tomorrow's future leaders.

I would encourage my colleagues and citizens throughout the Nation to visit our mid-Michigan community via the web site created by the fine students at St. Martha's. The web site is located on the worldwide web at http://cyberfair.gsn.org/stmartha.

REPUBLICAN MEDICARE/MEDICAID PLANS ARE ''CLUELESS''

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Representative PALLONE for organizing this special order tonight and for his outstanding leadership in protecting Medicare.

Mr. Speaker, colleagues, the Gingrich majority just can't keep its hands off of Medicare. For a second year in a row, the new majority is trying to pay for special interest tax breaks by forcing drastic cuts in Medicare.

After shutting the Government down twice, after seeing their approval ratings plummet to record-breaking lows, after the near collapse of their legislative agenda you would think they would learn.

Well, my friends, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle remain clueless. They remain clueless to the fact that the American people want no part of a scheme to make Medicare ''Wither on the vine,'' as the Speaker suggested.

They remain clueless that seniors are not willing to pay more to receive less. The Republican budget cuts $167 billion from Medicare over 6 years, which will mean drastically higher health care costs and fewer health care benefits for our Nation's seniors.

They remain clueless about forcing americans into managed care programs without physician choice—the same programs which may force seniors to give up their trusted doctors. And the American people sure don't want to be gouged through excessive copayments, known as balanced billing, which is included in the Republican plan.

And Republicans remain clueless to the fact that the American people don't want their local hospitals closed because of a budget plan that cuts the Medicare Hospital Trust Fund by $51 billion over 6 years.

Well, I am here, armed with messages from three of my constituents, to help members of the new majority get a clue. Hopefully our colleagues on the other side of the aisle are sitting in their offices, watching C–Span. I urge you to turn up the volume in your office, listen closely, and take note.

First, a 65-year-old man wrote me to say (and I quote): ''I worked hard all of my life, raised ten kids, and fought in two wars to live my life in peace. Living on only 801 dollars a month, I need all the help I can get.''

This person deserves better. He fought two wars for our country, and he should not live his golden years in fear of getting sick. With his income, he can't pay more for health care. It is wrong that the new majority is asking people like him to do so.

The second message is from Ethel from San Rafael. She wrote to let me know that ''Medicare is only barely sufficient as it is. (She continued that) ''A cut would be a death knell to help as we know it.''

So, I ask you if Medicare is barely sufficient now, what will it be like if the new majority has its way and cuts $167 billion and weakens anti-fraud laws?

Finally, an elderly gentleman named Vernon, wants all of us to know that he can't afford to pay more for Medicare. He said, ''The old folks need money for food. Cutting Medicare will take away our food money.''

How much food will Vernon give up, Mr. Speaker, when the new majority cuts Medicare by $167 billion? Does this Congress really intend for people like Vernon to give up food in order to pay for a doctor's visit or to pay for prescription drugs?

I hope that our colleagues in the majority listen to the heartfelt pleas of these people. I hope that members of the new majority can open their eyes to the devastation that will occur if their Medicare plan is enacted.

So get a clue, my friends. Listen to the American people and stop raiding Medicare for your special interest tax break. Start working with Democrats.

I'm proud to say that I voted for the President's budget, which preserves the solvency of the Medicare system without damaging cuts to services. This Democratic alternative prevents outrageous increases in premiums and copayments, and maintains strong anti-fraud policies.

Let's work together to strengthen Medicare, and preserve it for future generations.

Again, I want to thank Congressman FRANK PALLONE for his leadership on this issue. You have done a terrific job of protecting Medicare from cuts, and it is always a pleasure to work with you.

□ 2300

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NEY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. ROHRABACHER addressed the house. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

FEDERAL SPENDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, let me start off by saying I have got great news for Ethel in San Rafael, California and Vern in California also. The Republican plan increases their Medicare from $190 billion to $304 billion. Good news.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to send them the information since they are not getting it from that side of the aisle. I will be happy to. Let me yield to the gentlewoman for 20 seconds. But let the Record show Democrats earlier would not yield to me for even 10 seconds. But I got some other stuff I want to talk about.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I would have yielded for 10 seconds, believe me.

I would like to point out that Medicare is not growing to cover the cost of inflation, nor the cost of the need for the services and the people who will be needing those services. One thing is increasing an amount, the other thing is to increase the amount to cover those who will be using the benefit.

Mr. KINGSTON. Reclaiming the time, I appreciate that point. Our budget increases Medicare from $5,000 to $7,000 per person in anticipation of new enrollees, so that includes new enrollees. Again, I will be happy to send that information to your constituents and work with you on a bipartisan basis.

Let me also, though, address the good old days of Democrat leadership because that is one of the things I really wanted to talk about since the theme on the Democrat side seems to be let us go back to Democrat leadership. What happened when President Clinton, the Democrats controlled the Senate, the House and the White House? The highest tax increase in the history of America, $265 billion. Highest spending, $300 billion increase in spending. A $16 billion stimulus package that President Clinton and the Democrats in the Senate and the Democrats in the House passed, which included, among other important things, is cataloguing fish.

They did not propose a balanced budget when the Democrats controlled the House, the Senate and the White House. The Republicans on the other hand, have passed a balanced budget out of this House for the first time in 26 years. The balanced budget amendment did not get out of the House under Democrat leadership; did pass under Republican leadership.

On welfare reform, the President of the United States in 1992 promised to end welfare reform as we know it, had a Democrat House, a Democrat Senate, and did not introduce a welfare bill. We have passed two out of this body and in the Senate, one passing on a bipartisan vote of 87–12. It was vetoed not once but twice by the President.

On health care, the President of the United States, when he had the two Chambers, tried to pass a nationalized health care plan and increased the bureaucracy by 59 different agencies. It did not move under the Republican House and the Republican Senate. We have health care reform that is making health care more affordable and more accessible. It is now in conference. It looks good.

New bureaucracy, endless growth of the Government under President Clinton , including AmeriCorps, which is a volunteer program that pays volunteers $26,000 per volunteer. Let me repeat that: $26,000 per volunteer. We are trying to downsize the bureaucracy.

Student loans, very little happened under student loans under President Clinton. A lot of defaults, of course, but implemented the first stage of government takeover of the student loan program. We, on the other hand, have a budget that has increased student loans from $24 billion to $36 billion. Be happy to share that with any Democrat who does not have that information.

When the Democrats controlled the Senate and the House and the White House, there were no major reforms of Congress. Under the Republican Congress, we passed Congressional Accountability Act, a gift ban. We have cut the staff by one-third. We have required a two-thirds vote for an increase in taxes. We are considering campaign reform as we speak.

For the senior citizens that the Democrats used to love to say that they are great champions of, under President Clinton and the Democrat House and the Democrat Senate, there was an increase on Social Security taxes, taxes were increased on Social Security. Under the Republican House, we have decreased those taxes. Now, that of course was vetoed by the President.

We have also passed an earnings limitation so that seniors who want to can stay in the workplace longer. Even little things, I am not going to say this is little at all, but I mean, things that are less visible, we have done many, many changes on. I will be happy to share that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] is recognized for one-half the time remaining before midnight as the designee of the minority leader.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to begin this special order tonight by pointing out that this evening, when we had the Democratic motion to instruct on the budget, that a major point that was being made in that motion to instruct is that the budget resolution that was adopted here in the House that is put forward by the Republican leadership basically denies basic protection on health care for seniors.

Essentially what we have in this budget resolution are major attacks on the Medicare Program, and also on the Medicaid Program. As a result, in the motion to instruct that was put forward by the Democrats this evening,

we were trying to seek to retain current protections under the law against excessive Medicare charges by doctors and hospitals to preserve Federal nursing home standards and also to make sure that we do not have a recurrence of the spousal impoverishment and liens on homes that occurred before protections were put into place for the Medicaid Program, again to protect seniors.

Part of this motion to instruct was for us as Democrats to make the point that this Republican budget, which we will be considering again probably in conference within the next couple of weeks, essentially takes us down the same path that we were on last year with regard to fiscal priorities, especially with regard to our Nation's seniors. May is Older Americans Month, and I want to emphasize that this Republican budget truly reflects the hurt, if you will, that the Republican leadership seeks to implement on seniors, particularly on the Medicare and Medicaid Programs.

The Republican Medicare plan will result in seniors paying more out of their own pockets for substandard care while cutting over $160 billion to pay for tax breaks for the wealthy. More important than these steep cuts are the extreme structural change that the Republican leadership is trying to impose on seniors. Their plan eliminates the choice of doctors and hospitals that seniors now enjoy by basically forcing them into managed care.

This Republican plan will allow doctors to charge seniors extra money beyond the expenses that Medicare will cover. This means that seniors will have to pay doctors a lot more money out of their own pocket. To compound all of this, the cuts that the Republicans are imposing will force many hospitals to close. The funding that hospitals, home health care service, skilled nursing facilities receive will be sharply reduced. The bottom line is that with that reduced resource, many seniors will suffer.

I have to say once again that I believe very strongly that Medicare should not even be discussed in the context of the budget resolution. If we are looking to improve Medicare, we should increase preventive services and cut the waste, fraud and abuse in the Medicare Program. These are the types of things that will ensure Medicare's future while providing quality health care for our Nation's seniors. Instead, the Republican leadership is essentially going down a path of destroying Medicare and also Medicaid.

I wanted to just point out again, and I know I have a number of speakers here tonight who want to join in this special order, and I would like to yield some time to them. But essentially we went through the same process in 1995 last year with the Republican leadership in their budget trying to essentially change both the Medicare and the Medicaid Programs in very negative ways.

As Democrats, we pointed out that last year, essentially what we tried to do was to prevent the Republicans from doubling Medicare part B premiums, eliminating doctor choice, cutting Medicare premium assistance for low-income seniors, repealing Federal nursing home quality standards, putting homes and family farms of elderly couples at risk for nursing home care. And also the Republicans were trying to force adult children to be financially liable for their parents' nursing home bills.

Mr. Speaker, we were very successful as Democrats in essentially putting to rest these changes that the Republicans were trying to make last year in the Medicare program. We have the same phenomenon again this year. The budget that was already adopted here, the Republican leadership that was adopted already on the floor and which will come up again in a few weeks in conference before it finally is adopted by both the House and the Senate Republican leadership, still plans to eliminate doctor and hospital choice by forcing seniors into Medicare managed care plans. It also allows doctors to charge extra out-of-pocket costs to seniors who remain in medicare fee-for-service, severely cuts Medicare and Medicaid hospital funding, forcing many hospitals to close their doors on seniors, eliminates coverage guarantees for over 4 million elderly Americans who need nursing home care, and also further erodes Medicare's solvency by creating wealthy healthy plans, leaving many seniors with higher costs and less care.

We have the same thing again, which is Medicare cuts to pay for tax care to pay for tax breaks for wealthy Americans, and a continued decline in the quality of service and the ability of our senior citizens to obtain quality Medicare programs and forcing them to pay more out of their own pockets.

So the record, the Republican leadership record is the same. It is just the same old plan that we dealt with last year that we are going to have rehashed again here in the House in 1996.

With that, I would like to introduce and yield some time now to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Thank you, Mr. PALLONE, for your work in opposing these extreme Gingrich Medicare and Medicaid plans.

What is amazing, and I want to take one small part out of what you said. The Gingrich plan and what they are trying to do in this body today is not much different from when they shut the government down last year. Medicare cuts, student loan cuts, cuts in the environment, all to pay for tax breaks for the richest people in society.

One particular issue that you touched on is what they want to do to nursing home protections. Last year we thought we had won that battle. We thought that they would not try that again. Again, this year in their budget and in our committee, in the Committee on Commerce, and the Health Subcommittee when they are talking about these issues, the Gingrich plan again says let us repeal all the protections for nursing homes that this Congress, with President Reagan, passed 10 years ago.

I though in this society there was a consensus around making sure that there were protections against oversedation, protections against restraints or senior citizens in nursing homes.

□ 2315

I thought there was a consensus in the society that they in fact would be protected if those laws would be in place to make nursing homes safer because clearly those laws passed by the Democratic Congress with the Republican President in the mid-1980's made sense and would stay in place.

Yet the Gingrich extremists, this Congress, has tried to pull that consensus apart when a great majority, probably 90 percent of the public, believes, yes, we should have those protections in nursing homes. Yet this Gingrich extremist group says, ''Let's not; let's repeal it, turn it over to the States.'' That was the problem we had in the beginning where State governments simply were not providing for safe nursing homes with the kinds of regulation that is necessary to protect those senior citizens in nursing homes.

And not only are they making cuts in Medicare and Medicaid to pay for tax breaks for the richest people in society, at the same time they are stripping away those protections for the safety of our parents and our grandparents in nursing homes.

Mr. Speaker, it just simply does not make sense, and they are trying to explode a consensus, these Gingrich extremists are trying to explode this consensus that we have built in this country on this issue, on clean air laws, on safe drinking water laws, on pure food laws, on worker safety laws. They are trying to explode this consensus that society in this great country has built, and I simply do not understand it.

Mr. PALLONE. Well, I think, if the gentleman will yield back, the problem is that they are trying to squeeze all of this money out of the budget through the Medicare and the Medicaid programs, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] makes the point that essentially what is happening here is they are turning over, if you will, the Medicaid program in a block grant to the States and letting the States essentially do what they want, whether that means no nursing home standards or whatever, in order to try to save money, to squeeze money out of Medicaid again primarily to pay for these tax breaks for the wealthy. That is what motivates this. It is all budget driven.

And I want to thank the gentleman for his statements, and I would like to yield now to the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON].

Mrs. CLAYTON. Thank you for yielding, and I also want to thank you for

your leadership in keeping us focused on what the implications of these cuts are, and I would just like to make my brief remarks on emphasis of rural communities.

I come from North Carolina, and my district, North Carolina, including my district, is rural and represents a rural America which indeed suffers already from other economic indicators. We are communities that have less of infrastructure. We are communities of lower wages. We are communities having less of conveniences already.

Now, when you combine that with having these indiscriminate cuts of reducing in the amount that senior citizens can get and hospitals can get, that is going to further impact those poorest, must vulnerable of our society, and that means rural hospitals, which are already operating at the margin because they have more than 80 percent of all of their pay coming from either Medicare or Medicaid. So they are already over-dependent on Medicare and Medicaid.

That would mean more closing of hospitals in rural areas, yet this Congress's particular majority say they believe in rural America. They say that, but people will see indeed what they do.

What they want is a cheaper health service, not a better health service, and I think we should make the point that Democrats would like to see that senior citizens have better health care. We would like to see a better health care plan, not necessarily a cheaper health care plan. Cheaper is not always less costly, because in the long run, when the society has less health care, that would mean there will be less providers. Already we are suffering from a disproportion of health providers in hospitals in rural areas.

So cheaper does not mean better. It means always that you get less for the quality of services for the money that you offer.

So we do not want to deny senior citizens quality health care under the disguise of having a cheaper plan. What we want is a better health plan that does not cost as much.

And you are correct. What we should focus on is reducing—reducing the preventive—I mean increasing preventative programs that will give us better quality of health. Then those of us in rural areas can make a better life for ourselves.

So I just want to add to the discussion that those of us who live in rural America will be hurt far greater than those of us who live in the rest of America. Already we are disproportionately suffering from the lack of services, and now to put this greater cut on our rural hospitals, that means that one-fourth of the hospitals in rural America will be finding themselves threatened with closure, and I think that is grossly unfair.

Rural Americans also suffer with high percentage of people who are lower income, and 63 percent of those who are senior citizens in rural areas happen to live in poverty. So you know what the cuts in Medicare and Medicaid will do to that population, and I yield back the time and thank the gentleman for his leadership.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentlewoman makes a very good point, and I think a lot of people do not realize that whether it is rural areas, or suburban areas, or urban areas, my district is mostly suburban, but the majority of the hospitals are more than 50 percent Medicare-Medicaid dependent in my area, and so when you talk about cuts in Medicare and Medicaid, even in a suburban district like that I represent, you are talking about most of the income that these hospitals have. They will not be able to continue to operate with the level of cuts that the Republicans have proposed.

And they are trying to say that they are doing this in order to save Medicare. In reality what they are really doing is using Medicare as the focal point of their budget in order to achieve, you know, tax breaks, and to deal with their budget, they are cutting, making these massive cuts in Medicare and Medicaid, and the result is that the hospitals in many areas will close, not only in rural areas, but even in some suburban areas.

Mrs. CLAYTON. I think the American people will judge them by what they do. They say they are for America, but what they really are for is for the richest of America, and they do not mind who suffers in the process, whether senior citizens or whatever.

Mr. PALLONE. Exactly. Thank you.

I like to yield now to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR], our minority whip.

Mr. BONIOR. I thank my friend for taking this time and for laying out for us, I think rather clearly, this evening how the Republican agenda with respect to Medicare—and it really has not changed. You are absolutely right. Although we were able to beat back some of these Draconian measures in terms of cuts and increased charges for our seniors in order to pay for the huge tax breaks that they want to provide for the wealthiest in this country, we will beat that back, get the President to veto that particular provision. They have come back again this year, and they want to do it all over again. It is like deja vu all over again.

And the gentlewoman from North Carolina is absolutely correct in terms of what this is going to do, what their plan is going to do to hospitals, and it is not just rural hospitals, but she is absolutely correct. It is going to really hurt rural hospitals. We are talking roughly about $5 million out of hospitals, and that means many hospitals will be closing in this country, and the services that they provide for those who remain open will be diminished in terms of what they provide today.

But in metropolitan areas in southeastern Michigan where I come from, the Republican proposal last year would have cost those hospitals $2.2 billion over the 7 years of their budget plan. Now, what does that mean? That means 5,000 people with good-paying jobs would have to be laid off in those hospitals. That means poor service for the people who are in those hospitals.

And on top of all of that we learn that the Republican proposal to cut Medicare in order to give tax breaks to the wealthiest in our country today, the extremist Gingrich idea here would also do something that is beyond me. That is, it would allow people to be billed by their doctors above what Medicare allows, and this extra billing is disastrous for our seniors. Sixty percent of our seniors today in this country have incomes of $10,000 a year or less. That includes their Social Security and any annuity or retirement they may have; 60 percent, $10,000 or less. They cannot afford to go to a doctor, have Medicare pick up x amount, and then have the doctor send them a bill, and these bills start piling up on their bureau drawers, and they look at them every day, and they have this terrible feeling they are not meeting their obligations, and these bills are there staring them in the face, hundreds of dollars, thousands of dollars.

This billing practice that they want to institute is not in the best interests of our elderly people in this country. They cannot afford it. Is not fair. And you know this is all part of their plan to put together a pot of money in order to provide tax breaks for the wealthiest individuals in our society today.

So I thank my friend from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] for laying these facts out for us today, laying out the fact that what they really want to do is break this system, and they want to do it by moving people into managed care so those people who are left in fee for services are going to have humongous rates charged to them, and they want to do it by providing medical savings accounts which go to the healthy and the wealthy in this country, and not anyone else, and basically take away from the basic structure of Medicare.

They really want to kill Medicare. We know that. I think the general public understands that. They are not interested in reforming it. They want to change it and change it permanently, and you really basically get rid of it.

And Medicare has been a very good system. It has worked for seniors in this country for many, many years. Before we had Medicare in 1965, literally hundreds of thousands of seniors were indigent in this country. A large percentage of them were indigent because they could not afford health care, they have to rely on their families. This has helped bring literally tens of millions of seniors out of poverty and helped them live with dignity in their later years.

We are here to protect that program. We, as you point out correctly, understand that there needs to be some streamlining, we need to make some

savings, we need to get rid of the waste, the fraud and the abuse in the system. And we are committed to do that. But we are not committed to destroy a program that has provided for our seniors in this country.

And I thank my colleague for his determination, for his leadership on this issue and for raising this issue tonight for the American people to focus in on because in fact we are in another battle, and it is a battle to save Medicare for our elderly in this country.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Michigan and just point out again, you know, I know that our colleagues on the other side always say, well, people will have choice, they do not have to go into managed care. But the reality is the way the system is set up by the Republican leadership, people are forced into managed care. You have a rate differential, which means basically that doctors will get reimbursed more or less depending on which system seniors opt for, and then you have this balanced billing. So essentially what happens is seniors find that since they have to spend a lot more money out of pocket to pay the doctor, if they stay in the traditional system where they can choose their own doctor, they are literally forced into the managed care system because under that system they do not have to pay the extra money out of pocket to their doctor.

So when the Republicans say, oh, you have a choice, the reality is you do not have a choice. You are forced into managed care. Otherwise you have to stay in a system where the cost and how much you have to pay out of pocket just gets to be more and more. And so in reality you do not have a choice. You lose your choice of doctor and also maybe your choice of hospital in a lot of cases, and I think that is important to point out.

I yield now to the gentlewoman from Connecticut, who has done so much on this Medicare issue and made the point so well on it.

Ms. DELAURO. It is a pleasure to join my colleagues here tonight, and I just like to pick up a comment that our colleague from Michigan pointed out, and that is, if you need to put the Medicare debate in a context, we live in a great country, we really do, and in 1965 we passed a Medicare system. As a matter of fact as an aside, it was the current Republican candidate for President, BOB DOLE, who said that he was proud of his vote back then and he voted against Medicare because he did not believe that it was a system that worked. And we ought to keep that in mind. This was not a comment that he did not believe it would work in 1965. In 1996, when he was running for President of the United States, he does not believe that this is a system that works. We ought to keep that squarely in mind.

But the fact is that it was passed, and it was a stroke of genius in terms of health care for seniors in this country.

□ 2330

Before Medicare, less than 50 percent of seniors in this Nation had health care coverage in any way. Today, 99 percent of seniors are covered. They have health care. They do not have to worry that they are going to be wiped out because of an illness that they did not create but they were unfortunate enough to get.

I think we need to talk about this debate on Medicare and Medicaid in the context of what this system has meant to people in this country. As my colleagues have pointed out, last year in the Republican budget they intended to make a $270 billion cut in Medicaid to pay for tax breaks, $245 billion in tax breaks for the wealthiest in this country.

What happened around the Nation, the hue and cry of seniors, of their families, of people who believed that this was the wrong thing to do, stopped them from doing the kinds of things that my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey, has pointed out in his chart. What they wanted to do was to double the premiums, to increase the copayments, increase the deductibles, do away with choice, make it more difficult for hospitals, make it more difficult for rural areas.

Quite frankly, we thought we had beat back the barbarians. But instead, what we see is in the 1997 budget the very same set of premises, the very same policy being brought forward again. This is a new budget, but it is the same set of policies with regard to Medicare and Medicaid and the same sweeping and dangerous cuts.

To quote the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. GINGRICH, he said ''We can't do it all at once.'' The goal for Mr. GINGRICH, he would like to see Medicare wither on the vine, but ''we can't do it all at once. We need to do it in pieces.'' So we tried in 1995 and we got pushed back, so we are going to try again in 1996, and God help us in 1997, because it will come back again.

The Republicans got a little trickier this time in this budget. They learned a lesson: Don't let anything sit around for too long so that the American public has some time to notice what is going on and to learn about it, because if they learn about it and they know about it, they are very smart and they will rise up and they will say that we are not going to do this. Sixty percent of the public said to the President of the United States that they wanted him to veto that budget because it contained these kinds of Medicare cuts.

This new budget, and I put ''new'' in quotes, moved through this House in a week, moved through this House in 1 week because they knew that if they let it stay around long enough, we would see the exact same set of premises, the exact same policy with regard to Medicare and Medicaid that they tried to impose on the American public in the last budget, last year. It is $168 billion in Medicaid and Medicare cuts this time around. It is done in 6 years versus 7 years. It would have sliced 19 percent last year from Medicare. This year it is 17 percent, a 2 percent difference. The American public should not be fooled. It is the exact some policy.

Let us contrast the cut with the amount of the tax break for the wealthy. It is $168 billion in a tax cut in Medicare and it is $176 to $180 billion in a tax break that will benefit the wealthiest in this country. It is the same exact equation that was set up in the last budget. The public should not be fooled.

If we move to Medicaid, or as my colleagues has pointed out, in these areas we have the same things that exist. The restrictions that are now on doctors and hospitals not to overcharge people beyond what Medicare will take care of will be removed: increased bills, out-of-pocket costs for seniors; nursing home standards not enforced. And we know what that means in the quality of life and the quality of care for those we love who go into nursing homes. We know also what they want to do to spouses and children in being able to attack their assets.

The long and the short of it is that we are going to make this fight day in and day out in the next several weeks, in the next several months, because the public should not be fooled by the same set of policies that would foist upon American seniors a second-rate health care system. It is wrong, it is unfair, it is not what this Nation is about. It is not what our values are. It is not what our priorities are. We are going to make the same fight and the same cases that we did over the last several months. This is not going to rest until we turn this policy around and do what is right and do what is best for America's seniors and the American people.

THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE 104TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NEY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX] is recognized for the balance of the time remaining before midnight as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to address my colleagues and speak to the House regarding some important issues. I think it is important at this time, as we approach the end of the week here in the second session of the 104th Congress, to really look at the fine record of achievement in a bipartisan House that we have to this date brought about.

We only have to look at the fact that we have passed $250 billion in reductions of taxes for families here in the United States. We only have to look at the fact that we have reduced Federal spending in duplicative programs, not in worthwhile programs, obviously. We have passed the first balanced budget since 1969, very important to this economy and to this country.

We only have to look to Alan Greenspan, who is the individual who told this Congress and this Nation that if we reduce our interest costs we will help each American be able to buy a car, pay for those interest payments. If we have a balanced budget we will be able to better handle the mortgage and the cost of education.

We have gotten tough on crime, limited criminals' endless death row appeals in cases where there are baseless appeals, where there has been no wrongdoing at the time of trial. We have passed victim restitution, we have passed truth-in-sentencing grants, strengthened the antiterrorism statutes, strengthened sexual crimes against children statutes.

We have also passed private health care reform. Our legislation will provide portability, accessibility, availability.

Look to the student loan program, where we have increased student loan volume by 50 percent, from $24 billion in 1996 to $36 billion by 1997. We have had real congressional reform. We have passed the Congressional Accountability Act, signed into law by the President, which provides that every law we now pass in the Congress, as we have in prior Congresses, there have been laws passed, but this is the first time in this Congress that when the laws are passed by also will apply to Congress. Whether it be the fair labor standards or civil rights law, they also apply to our employees as well.

We have passed lobbying reform and gift ban, cut committee staff by one-third, and required a two-thirds vote for any tax increase in this House for this Congress.

We have also passed an increase in the amount senior citizens can earn without losing Social Security benefits. That was brought by a Republican majority proposal. Currently, Mr. Speaker, seniors are frozen at $11,038, those under 70 are frozen at that amount without deductions being made from Social Security. But under the legislation we have passed here, that will rise to $30,000.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot of distortions tonight from the other side of the aisle trying to talk about what we are doing here in Congress. The facts are far different from the distortions we have heard. The fact is, when it comes to Medicare reform, our proposal was bipartisan and the best we could actually come up with, a very positive program, considering the fact that it was the President who said that if we do nothing with Medicare it will go out of business in 7 years. It will go bankrupt.

You might say to yourself, how did it get to this point? Why would it go bankrupt? But we got to this point because, frankly, there has been fraud and abuse and waste up to $30 billion a year. Frankly, that can be stopped, but it will take legislation which has been introduced in this House. For the first time those who commit fraud under the Medicare or Medicaid system, health care fraud is a crime, and if you commit that kind of offense you will no longer be a provider and you can go to jail for 10 years.

That is the kind of forward thinking legislation that has been introduced in this House, and frankly should be adopted and signed into law by the President. If we take out the fraud, abuse and waste that is in Medicare, we will be able to preserve Medicare and preserve for each senior the right to have their choice of doctor and choice of hospital. Very important.

In addition, the proposed legislation is going to increase the current payment about $5,000 per senior, up to $7,100 by the year 2002. We also offer for the first time, choice besides fee-for-service, giving you a choice of doctors and hospitals, and also medical savings accounts and, as well, managed care. That is, what the seniors want in their particular case, to have eyeglasses and pharmaceuticals included at no extra charge.

But the proposal went further. We think it is a very, very wise proposal. In addition to limiting fraud, waste, and abuse, the proposal from the House calls for making sure that the medical education component, which is now under Medicare, will be a separate line item in the budget, so we make sure that our interns and residents have that quality education without cutting away from our senior citizens' health care benefits what they need.

We also call for reductions in the cost of paperwork. Right now we spend about 12 percent of Medicare dollars in paperwork. That should mostly go to health care for our seniors. Under our proposal, that is what will happen.

We also make sure that this whole program is based on the fact that whatever savings we have in Medicare, whatever savings are achieved, whether it is $30 billion a year in fraud, waste, and abuse, it has to go back for health care and not for some other item in the U.S. Budget.

We can see, Mr. Speaker, that working together we can have Medicare reform that is going to be helpful to our seniors, and make sure we have a system that is for this year's seniors and the next generation's seniors and something that is going to be good for this country.

We, as well, have been working on tax reform, and tax reform that is fair to all Americans, not from the distortions that you have heard from the other side of the aisle about how it is only for the rich. The tax reform we are talking about is for the middle class, a $500-per-child tax credit. We are talking about an adoption tax credit of $5,000. We are talking about tax credits for small businesses to start up, to provide jobs for our citizens.

These are real proposals that will make a real difference. We are talking about a $2,000 new IRA for each individual, $4,000 for each married couple. These are proposals that were adopted by the Kennedy administration and made a difference. They could happen again here in this Congress.

It is also important to note that our welfare reform proposals will make real difference. Of course, there are people in the safety net who must get welfare. That is undeniable. But there are people who are able-bodied, and under our proposal what will happen is able-bodied individuals, through job counseling, job training, and job placement will have the opportunity to obtain employment, to have the pride of work, to make a difference in their lives, and instead of the welfare as we have it now being a hammock, it will be springboard, Mr. Speaker, to a new class of individuals getting involved in the world of work, more people paying taxes, more people who are employed and stabilizing those taxes. That is the kind of true welfare reform that will make a difference.

Under that proposal as well, it calls for us, Mr. Speaker, to have new enforcement procedures for child support. We have a situation in this country where probably the most unpaid bills we have are child support. We can make a difference by adopting plans like they have in the State of Maine.

There they require, Mr. Speaker, that every person who is not paying their child support would lose their license if it was not paid. Ninety-five percent paid their amounts owned on child support, once they knew they could lose their driver's license. It is recommended under our welfare reform proposals that States adopt plans like Maine's or an alternative which will, again, get us the enforcement that we want.

We can achieve this, and it is certainly meaningful, and it is something that can make a big difference.

We also called for improvements in our child nutrition programs and our WIC programs, women, infants, and children programs, by increasing the amount of money that is going to be spent on the school lunch programs, and in fact making sure that the States administer them.

Mr. Speaker, currently under our school lunch programs we spend 50 percent of the funds just to administer them. Under the proposals that the Governors have talked to Congress about, they said they will only spend 5 percent on administration, but with the extra 10 percent we will still provide in this program, they would be able to feed more children more meals, but by Federal standards. If they did not adhere to those standards, then we as a Congress would take it back.

So working in partnership with local governments, which are closest to the people, we can provide the kinds of services that people want without bankrupting the Nation, without making people pay until July 1 every year through taxes and regulations all that money to Uncle Sam. We want to make sure there is more money in their pocket to spend as they want to, to spend as their families need.

I think it is very important that we continue trying to find the bipartisan effort, instead of the rhetoric we have heard previously tonight about how this party, the Republican Party, does not care about seniors. Nothing could be further from the truth.

The two major proposals that have come before this Congress in this session have been raising the income eligibility for seniors' earnings, and No. 2, the other proposal was to roll back in 1993 the unfair tax on Social Security. The Republican majority brought both those forward and they were both adopted in this House.

Now it is incumbent upon us to continue fighting for seniors to make sure Medicare provides the health care benefits they need, but removing the waste from the system, and that is the key feature here. We will make sure that we eliminate the waste, the fraud and abuse that has gone on for so many years and must end.

Part and parcel of our making sure that health care is improved for our seniors is that we provide FDA reform as well, to make sure that for all citizens we speed up the approval of life-saving, life-extending drugs and medical devices in this country.

□ 2345

This can and will be done under legislation that has been introduced in the Committee on Commerce under the leadership of JIM GREENWOOD as the task force chairman, the Commerce Committee chairman TOM BLILEY, the subcommittee chairman MIKE BILIRAKIS, and the three sponsors of the bill, Congressman KLUG, Congressman BARTON and Congressman BURR of North Carolina who has the pharmaceutical bill.

Together the bills dealing with pharmaceuticals, medical devices, and food will in fact move this country forward in such a way that the discoveries we have in the United States will be kept here. If we do not speed up the FDA reform process, then the discoveries for medical benefit and the jobs will go overseas. We cannot afford that as a Nation both from an employment point of view or from a health care point of view.

So I am pleased to see that the leadership is moving forward with FDA. What we are going to do is work with the Commissioner of FDA and the White House to make sure this legislation is bipartisan, is passed, and we do make a difference in the lives of the people we are representing.

Mr. Speaker, as I know from the hearing I had in my own district in Montgomery County, PA, in the county seat, we had victims who have diseases, patients who are waiting for a cure, a vaccine. They tell us that if we can speed up the approval of these drugs, they will live longer, others will have a chance to live longer and frankly their families are waiting for this kind of relief.

We need to fast track this legislation. I am very appreciative that the individuals who brought forward the vehicle in the Committee on Commerce folded my legislation which was introduced last year into the majority bills and I am hopeful that together with other Congressmen and the Senate we will be able to get this passed in this session and make a real difference in people's lives.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HOUGHTON (at the request of Mr. ARMEY), for today, on account of attending a funeral.

Mr. QUINN (at the request of Mr. ARMEY), after 12 noon today, on account of attending a funeral.

Mr. GUTKNECHT (at the request of Mr. ARMEY), after 12:30 p.m. today, on account of attending his daughter's graduation.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FILNER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, for 5 minutes today.
Mr. VENTO, for 5 minutes, today.
Mrs. CLAYTON, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. FILNER, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. PELOSI, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. DOGGETT, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JONES) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. EWING, for 5 minutes today.
Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes on June 5.
Mr. DELAY, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. CHRYSLER, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. ROHRABACHER, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. KINGSTON, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FILNER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. LANTOS in three instances.
Mrs. MALONEY.
Mr. TORRICELLI.
Ms. WOOLSEY.
Mr. JACOBS.
Mr. BONIOR.
Mr. TRAFICANT.
Ms. KAPTUR.
Mrs. LINCOLN.
Mr. KANJORSKI in two instances.
Mr. RUSH.
Mr. KLECZKA.
Mr. FAZIO of California.
Mr. CONDIT.
Mr. SANDERS in six instances.
Mr. LIPINSKI.
Mr. MASCARA.
Mrs. SCHROEDER.
Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JONES) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FIELDS of Texas.
Mr. OXLEY.
Mr. RIGGS.
Mr. QUINN.
Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
Mr. HORN in two instances.
Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
Mr. LIVINGSTON.
Mr. SHAW.
Mrs. ROUKEMA in two instances.
Mr. GEKAS.
Mrs. VUCANOVICH.
Mr. CRANE.
Mrs. MORELLA.
Mr. ZIMMER.
Mr. CHRYSLER.
Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HOSTETTLER.
Mr. BROWN of Ohio.
Mr. HALL of Texas.
Mr. MCINNIS.
Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
Mrs. SMITH of Washington.
Mr. FOLEY.
Mr. VENTO.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 47 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, May 31, 1996, at 9 a.m.

OATH OF OFFICE OF MEMBERS, RESIDENT COMMISSIONER, AND DELEGATES

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members, Resident Commissioner, and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in 5 U.S.C. 3331:

> ''I, A B, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely; without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God.''

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Members of the 104th Congress,

pursuant to the provisions of 2 U.S.C. 2b:

Honorable EARL BLUMENAUER, Third Congressional District of Oregon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3224. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Fluid Milk Promotion Order; Final Rule [DA–96–07] received May 30, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3225. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Secretary's report pursuant to section 1208(c) of Public Law 104–106; to the Committee on National Security.

3226. A letter from the Director, Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Language Affairs, Department of Education, transmitting notice inviting applications for new awards for fiscal year [FY] 1996—Foreign Language Assistance Grants (State educational agencies), pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1232(d)(1); to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

3227. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting final priorities—Research and Demonstration Project; Rehabilitation Research and Training Center; and a Rehabilitation Engineering Research Center, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1232(d)(1); to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

3228. A letter from the Director, Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Language Affairs, Department of Education, transmitting notice inviting applications for new awards for fiscal year [FY] 1996—Foreign Language Assistance Grants (Local educational agencies), pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1232(d)(1); to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

3229. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel for Regulations and Legislation, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's report on the notice of final funding priorities for Research and Demonstration Project, Rehabilitation Research and Training Centers, and Rehabilitation Engineering Research Center—received May 30, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(B); to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

3230. A letter from the Director of Communications and Legislative Affairs, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, transmitting the Commission's annual report for fiscal year 1994, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 2000e–4(e); to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

3231. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled the ''Runaway and Homeless Youth Amendments of 1996''; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

3232. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards' Head Restraints (RIN: 2127–AF70) received May 30, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

3233. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Prosulfuron; Extension of Pesticide Tolerance (FRL–5371–8) received May 28, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

3234. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Prosulfuron; Pesticide Tolerance (FRL–5357–5) received May 28, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

3235. A letter from the Managing Director, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Parts 2 and 15 of the Commission's Rules to Deregulate the Equipment Authorization Requirements for Digital Devices (ET Docket No. 95–19) received May 30, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

3236. A letter from the Program Management Officer, National Marine Fisheries Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Taking and Importing of Marine Mammals; Dolphin Safe Tuna Labeling; Regulation Consolidation [Docket No. 960516135–6135–01; I.D. 051096A] (RIN: 0648–AF08) received May 29, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

3237. A letter from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting the Department's 33d quarterly report to Congress on the status of Exxon and stripper well oil overcharge funds as of December 31, 1995; to the Committee on Commerce.

3238. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the texts of ILO Convention No. 176 and Recommendation No. 183 concerning Safety and Health in Mines and the Protocol of 1995 to Convention No. 81 concerning labor inspection, the instruments were adopted by the International Labor Conference at its 82d Session, at Geneva, June 22, 1995, pursuant to Article 19 of the Constitution of the International Labor Organization; to the Committee on International Relations.

3239. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's report on employment of U.S. citizens by certain international organizations, pursuant to Public Law 102–138, section 181 (105 Stat. 682); to the Committee on International Relations.

3240. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting the semiannual report on activities of the inspector general for the period October 1, 1995, through March 31, 1996, and the semiannual management report for the same period, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

3241. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a list of all reports issued or released in April 1996, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 719(h); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

3242. A letter from the Executive Director, Committee for Purchase From People Who Are Blind or Severely Disabled, transmitting the Committee's final rule—Additions to the Procurement List (61 F.R. 6977, 14088, and 15225) received May 30, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

3243. A letter from the Chairman, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, transmitting the semiannual report on activities of the inspector general for the period October 1, 1995, through March 31, 1996, and the semiannual management report for the same period, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

3244. A letter from the Chairman of the Board, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the semiannual report on activities of the inspector general for the period October 1, 1995, through March 31, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

3245. A letter from the Independent Counsel, Office of Independent Counsel, transmitting the 1995 annual report in compliance with the Inspector General Act Amendments of 1988, pursuant to Public Law 100–504, section 104(a) (102 Stat. 2525); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

3246. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule—Allowances and Differentials; Separate Maintenance Allowance for Duty at Johnston Island (RIN: 3206–AH17) received May 28, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

3247. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule—Prevailing Rate System; Abolishment of Merced, CA, Nonappropriated Fund Wage Area (RIN: 3206–AH30) received May 28, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

3248. A letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the semiannual report on activities of the inspector general for the period October 1, 1995, through March 31, 1996, and the semiannual management report for the same period, also the inspector general's first 5-year strategic plan, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

3249. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Land and Minerals Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Royalty Relief for Producing Leases and Certain Existing Leases in Deep Water (Mineral Management Service) (RIN: 1010–AC13) received May 30, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

3250. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Oregon Caves National Monument, Admission to Caves (National Park Service) (RIN: 1024–AC26) received May 30, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

3251. A letter from the Chairman, Mississippi River Corridor Study Commission, transmitting the Commission's reports entitled ''Mississippi River Corridor Study Volume 1: Feasibility Report'' and ''Mississippi River Corridor Study Volume 2: Inventory of Resources and Significance'', pursuant to Public Law 101–398, section 9(b) (104 Stat. 859); to the Committee on Resources.

3252. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule—Foreign Prohibitions on Longshore Work by United States Nationals (Bureau of Economic and Business Affairs) (22 CFR Part 89) received May 28, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3253. A letter from the President and Executive Director, National Mining Hall of Fame and Museum, transmitting the Museum's 1995 audited financial statement and a copy of form 990 which was filed with the Internal Revenue Service, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 4111; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3254. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting the Department's report entitled ''Effects of the Immigration Reform and Control Act: Characteristics and Labor Market Behavior of the Legalized Population Five Years Following Legalization,'' pursuant to section 404(c) of the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 [IRCA]; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3255. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment to Class E Airspace; Pittsfield, MA (Docket No. 96–ANE–12) (RIN: 2120–AA66) (1996–0027) received May 30, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3256. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment to Class E Airspace; Ely, NV (Docket No. 96–AWP–5) (RIN: 2120–AA66) (1966–0028) received May 30, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3257. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Emergency Notice of Enforcement Policy (RIN: 2120–ZZ01) received May 30, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3258. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Special Use Airspace, Technical Amendment (Docket No. 73–8) (RIN: 2120–AA66) (1966–0029) received May 30, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3259. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Removal of Class D Airspace; K.I. Sawyer (AFB), MI (Docket No. 95–AGL–4) (RIN: 2120–AA66) (1996–0024) received May 30, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3260. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Modification of the Offutt AFB, Class C Airspace Area; NE (Docket No. 95–AWA–7) (RIN: 2120–AA66) (1996–0023) received May 30, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3261. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Robinson Helicopter Company Model R22 Helicopters (Docket No. 95–SW–27–AD) (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 30, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3262. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Robinson Helicopter Company Model R44 Helicopters (Docket No. (95–SW–32–AD) (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 30, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3263. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Israel Aircraft Industries (IAI), Ltd., Model 1125 Westwind Astra Series Airplanes (Docket No. 95–NM–94–AD) (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 30, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3264. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Beech Aircraft Corporation Model C90A Airplanes (Docket No. 95–CE–82–AD) (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 30, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3265. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC–9 Series Airplanes (Docket No. 95–NM–145–AD) (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 30, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3266. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC–9–80 Series Airplanes and Model MD–88 Airplanes (Docket No. 95–NM–98–AD) (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 30, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3267. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Saab Model SAAB 2000 Series Airplanes (Docket No. 96–NM–102–AD) (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 30, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3268. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Periodic Updates to the Pipeline Safety Regulations (Research and Special Programs Administration) received May 30, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3269. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Transportation for Individuals With Disabilities (Misc. Amendments) Correction to Final Rule published May 21, 1996 (RIN: 2105–AC13) (1996–0001) received May 30, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3270. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revision of State Participation Program (RIN: 2130–AB08) received May 30, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3271. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone Regulations: Delaware Bay, Delaware River, Salem River, NJ [CGD 05–96–030] received May 30, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3272. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Special Local Regulations; Miami Super Boat Race; Miami Beach, FL [CGD 07–96–018] (RIN: 2115–AE46) received May 30, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3272. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone: Empire State Regatta, Albany, NY [CGD 01–96–023] (RIN: 2115–AA97) received May 30, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3274. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Periodic Inspection and Testing of Cylinders [Docket No. HM–220A, Amendment Numbers 171–143, 173–251] (RIN: 2137–AC59) received May 30, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A) to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3275. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revision of Miscellaneous Hazardous Materials Regulations; Regulatory Review [Docket HM–222B; Amendment Numbers 171–145, 172–149, 173–253, 176–40, 177–87, 178–116, and 180–9] (RIN: 2137–AC76) received May 30, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3276. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards; Air Brake Systems [Docket No. 96–050, Notice 1] (RIN: 2127–AG31) received May 30, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(A)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3277. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Electric Engineering Requirements for Merchant Vessels (U.S. Coast Guard) [CGD 94–108] (RIN: 2115–AF24) received May 30, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3278. A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting informational copies of 3 lease prospectuses for the Department of Defense in northern Virginia, pursuant to 40 U.S.C. 606(a); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3279. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulations Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule—National Cemeteries (RIN: 2900–AI06) received May 29, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

3280. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulations Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule—Delegations of Authority: Tort Claims and Debt Collection (RIN: 2900–ai13) received May 30, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

3281. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulations Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule—Gender Policy for VA Publications and Other Communication (RIN: 2900–aI09) received May 30, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

3282. A letter from the Regulatory Policy Officer, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, transmitting the Bureau's final rule—Basic Permit Requirements Under the Federal Alcohol Administration Act, Nonindustrial Use of Spirits and Wine, Bulk Sales and Bottling of Distilled Spirits (95R–023P) (RIN: 1512–AB 43) received May 29, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3283. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Employment and Training, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule—Unemployment Insurance Program Letter No. 22–96 received May 29, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3284. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Weighted Average Interest Rate Update (Notice 96–32) received May 28, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3285. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Examination of returns and claims for refund, credit, or abatement; determination of correct tax liability (Revenue Procedure 96–33) received May 28, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3286. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Weighted Average Interest Rate Update (Notice 96–24) received May 30, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3287. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Reporting of Nonpayroll Withheld Tax Liabilities (RIN: 1545–AT86) received May 30, 1996, pursuant to 5

U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3288. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Payment by Employer of Expenses for Meals and Entertainment, Club Dues, and Spousal Travel (RIN: 1545–AS74) received May 30, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3289. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Closing Agreements (Revenue Procedure 96–29) received May 30, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3290. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Refund Requests under Section 4972(c)(6) (Announcement 96–26) received May 30, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3291. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of the Department's intent to provide $8 million in fiscal year 1996 funds for the purpose of supporting the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe's [OSCE] efforts to supervise and monitor Bosnian elections, as called for in the Dayton Accords, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2394–1(a) and Public Law 104–107, section 515 (110 Stat. 726); jointly, to the Committee on International Relations and Appropriations.

3292. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Agency for International Development, transmitting the Agency's report covering allocations under the economic support fund and international organizations and programs accounts, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2413(a) and Public Law 104–107, section 515 (110 Stat. 726); jointly, to the Committee on International Relations and Appropriations.

3293. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled the ''Plant Protection Act''; jointly, to the Committee on Agriculture, Ways and Means, and the Judiciary.

3294. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled the ''Animal Health Protection Act''; jointly, to the Committee on Agriculture, Ways and Means, and the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on National Security. H.R. 2754. A bill to approve and implement the OECD Shipbuilding Trade Agreement; with an amendment (Rept. 104–524, Pt. 2). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GOSS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 445. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3540) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes (Rept. 104–601). Referred to the House Calendar.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule X the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 3107. Referred to the Committee on Ways and Means extended for a period ending not later than June 7, 1996.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. OXLEY (for himself and Mr. MANTON):

H.R. 3553. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to authorize appropriations for the Federal Trade Commission; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee (for himself, Mr. TANNER, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. DUCAN, and Mr. WAMP):

H.R. 3554. A bill to authorize immediate haying and grazing during 1996 on certain lands enrolled in the conservation reserve program in the State of Tennessee; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GREENWOOD:

H.R. 3555. A bill to provide for payment under the Medicare Program for transportation costs of portable ultrasound equipment for diagnostic tests in the same manner as payment is made for transportation costs of portable x ray equipment; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HANSEN:

H.R. 3556. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to require notice of cancellation rights with respect to private mortgage insurance which is required by a creditor as a condition for entering into a residential mortgage transaction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. HILLIARD:

H.R. 3557. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey the Marion National Fish Hatchery to the State of Alabama; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mrs. MEEK of Florida (for herself, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DIXON, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Ms. WATERS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. RUSH, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. WYNN, Mr. CONYERS, Miss COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. CLAY, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. OWENS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. TOWNS, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. CLYBURN, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. PASTOR, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. TORRES, Mr. FRAZER, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 3558. A bill to provide for greater accuracy in the 2000 decennial census of population, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Agriculture, Commerce, Economic and Educational Opportunities, and Banking and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. NETHERCUTT (for himself and Mr. HASTINGS of Washington):

H.R. 3559. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a deduction for a portion of the fiscal year 1996 transitional payment under the Agricultural Market Transition Act which is deposited into a reserve against future farm losses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 3560. A bill to designate the Federal building located at 290 Broadway in New York, NY, as the ''Ronald H. Brown Federal Building''; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 3561. A bill to provide greater authority for the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to share health-care resources of the Department of Veterans Affairs, to provide enhanced administrative flexibility in carrying out health-care resources sharing agreements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 40: Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 469: Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma.

H.R. 580: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.

H.R. 773: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 789: Mr. COBURN.

H.R. 974: Mr. FARR and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 987: Mr. DORNAN.

H.R. 997: Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

H.R. 1090: Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mr. BEVILL.

H.R. 1386: Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. LONGLEY, and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 1406: Mr. GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 1425: Mrs. CHENOWETH.

H.R. 1462: Mr. BEVILL, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. GORDON, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. WARD, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. DOOLEY, and Mr. JACKSON.

H.R. 1876: Mr. ROHRABACHER.

H.R. 1946: Mr. LUCAS, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. BROWNBACK, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H.R. 1972: Mr. MONTGOMERY and Mr. NUSSLE.

H.R. 2026: Mr. MURTHA, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. COBLE, Mr. WAMP, Mr. BONO, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. UPTON, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. POMBO, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. HANCOCK, and Mr. SOUDER.

H.R. 2144: Mr. MCINNIS.

H.R. 2247: Mr. LATOURETTE and Mr. SOLOMON.

H.R. 2320: Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. CRAPO, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. MCHUGH.

H.R. 2400: Mr. GORDON and Mr. NETHERCUTT.

H.R. 2508: Mr. ROHRABACHER.

H.R. 2548: Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO.

H.R. 2566: Mr. MCHALE.

H.R. 2579: Mr. HORN, Mr. BALDACCI, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. POMEROY, and Mr. SANDERS.

H.R. 2587: Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2598: Mr. BEREUTER.

H.R. 2607: Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO.

H.R. 2751: Mr. BORSKI.

H.R. 2757: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. TORKILDSEN, and Mr. GILMAN.

H.R. 2807: Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. LARGENT, and Mr. BEREUTER.

H.R. 2834: Mr. FROST.

H.R. 2844: Mr. STUPAK, Mr. DELLUMS, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. LAFALCE, and Mr. BORSKI.

H.R. 2900: Mr. WAMP, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. HOYER, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. LUTHER, Mr. KLUG, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. WALSH, Mr. TANNER, Mr. POMEROY, and Mr. MCCRERY.

H.R. 2911: Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina.

H.R. 2925: Mr. LONGLEY and Mr. DEAL of Georgia.

H.R. 2927: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 2943: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.

H.R. 2951: Mr. SANDERS, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. OLVER.

H.R. 2958: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.

H.R. 2976: Mr. KLINK, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. BROWN of California, and Mr. NUSSLE.

H.R. 2995: Mr. GILMAN and Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 3079: Mr. NORWOOD.

H.R. 3118: Mr. SCARBOROUGH and Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 3119: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. LONGLEY, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mrs. THURMAN.

H.R. 3138: Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida.

H.R. 3142: Mr. GILLMOR, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mrs. MYRICK.

H.R. 3147: Mr. CONDIT.

H.R. 3167: Mr. CAMP.

H.R. 3187: Mr. SHAYS, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FLAKE, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. BISHOP, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Mr. STOKES, Mr. CLAY, Ms. WATERS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. FAZIO of California, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mrs. CLAYTON, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. GREEN of Texas, and Mr. COLEMAN.

H.R. 3195: Mr. COBLE, Mr. KINGSTON, and Mr. DEAL of Georgia.

H.R. 3203: Mr. HORN, Mr. TORRES, Mr. FILNER, Mr. METCALF, and Mrs. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 3204: Mr. HORN, Mr. TORRES, Mr. FILNER, Mr. METCALF, and Mrs. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 3205: Mr. HORN, Mr. TORRES, Mr. FILNER, Mr. METCALF, and Mrs. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 3247: Mr. SANDERS, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Ms. FURSE.

H.R. 3252: Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. BONIOR.

H.R. 3293: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD and Mrs. MORELLA.

H.R. 3310: Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska and Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 3311: Mr. KLINK.

H.R. 3331: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. BENTSEN, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO.

H.R. 3332: Ms. DELAURO and Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 3357: Mr. YATES, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. FROST, Mr. WYNN, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. FILNER, and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 3358: Mr. YATES, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. FROST, Mr. WYNN, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. FILNER, and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 3359: Mr. YATES, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. FROST, Mr. WYNN, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. FILNER, and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 3360: Mr. YATES, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. FROST, Mr. WYNN, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. FILNER, and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 3361: Mr. YATES, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. FROST, Mr. WYNN, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. FILNER, and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 3362: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, and Mr. HOLDEN.

H.R. 3379: Ms. FURSE.

H.R. 3391: Mr. ROEMER, Mr. WHITFIELD, and Mr. PORTER.

H.R. 3396: Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. METCALF, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. HEINEMAN, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. JONES, Mr. WAMP, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mrs. SEASTRAND, Mr. HOKE, Mr. KIM, and Mrs. CUBIN.

H.R. 3421: Mr. CLEMENT.

H.R. 3431: Mr. COBURN.

H.R. 3443: Mr. MANTON, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. NADLER, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. YATES, Mr. FLAKE, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. PALLONE, and Mrs. CLAYTON.

H.R. 3447: Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. LINDER, Mr. HANCOCK, and Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 3449: Mr. TEJEDA.

H.R. 3451: Mr. CANADY, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 3468: Mr. HORN, and Mr. VENTO.

H.R. 3496: Mr. JACOBS.

H.R. 3508: Mr. FOLEY, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO.

H.R. 3511: Mr. BOUCHER, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. HILLIARD, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 3525: Mr. HEINEMAN.

H.R. 3527: Mr. BROWN of California.

H. Con. Res. 10: Mr. EDWARDS.

H. Con. Res. 47: Mr. ROSE, Mrs. CLAYTON, and Mr. JONES.

H. Con. Res. 100: Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. BARR, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. BONO, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Ms. DUNN of Washington, Mr. FIELDS of Texas, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. LINDER, Mr. MICA, Mr. NEY, Mr. STUMP, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, and Mr. WELLER.

H. Con. Res. 181: Mr. COMBEST.

H. Res. 429: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Mr. TRAFICANT.

H. Res. 439: Mr. FOLEY.

H. Res. 441: Mr. NEY, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MANTON, and Mr. TORKILDSEN.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 3540

OFFERED BY: MR. BURTON OF INDIANA

AMENDMENT NO. 1: Page 7, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $144,000,000)''.

H.R. 3540

OFFERED BY: MR. BURTON OF INDIANA

AMENDMENT NO. 2: Page 7, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $152,296,000)''.

H.R. 3540

OFFERED BY: MR. BURTON OF INDIANA

AMENDMENT NO. 3: Page 7, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $8,296,000)''.

H.R. 3540

OFFERED BY: MR. BURTON OF INDIANA

AMENDMENT NO. 4: Page 13, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $46,554,000)''.

H.R. 3540

OFFERED BY: MR. BURTON OF INDIANA

AMENDMENT NO. 5: Page 97, after line 5, insert the following new section:

LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE FOR INDIA

SEC. 573. Not more than $48,674,000 of the funds appropriated in this Act under the heading ''Development Assistance'' may be made available to the Government of India, or to nongovernmental organizations and private voluntary organizations operating within India.

H.R. 3540

OFFERED BY: MR. LIGHTFOOT

AMENDMENT NO. 6: Page 2, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $64,000,000)''.

Page 7, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $60,000,000)''.

Page 13, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $4,000,000)''.

H.R. 3540

OFFERED BY: MR. VISCLOSKY

AMENDMENT NO. 7: Page 85, line 16, insert after ''Funds'' the following: ''(other than funds appropriated in this Act under the heading 'Economic Support Fund')''.