Ortiz
Orton
Packard
Pallone
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Pickett
Pombo
Porter
Quillen
Quinn
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Richardson
Riggs
Rivers
Roberts
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sanders
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Schumer
Scott
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shaw
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Stokes
Studds
Tanner
Tate
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Velazquez
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Ward
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Williams
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—11

Bass
Dornan
Fields (LA)
Kennelly
Moakley
Schiff
Tejeda
Tucker
Volkmer
Wilson
Zeliff

□ 1631

Mr. MARKEY changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. LOWEY, and Messrs. STOCKMAN, PORTMAN, NORWOOD, UPTON, BURTON of Indiana, and COOLEY changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye''.

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise informally in order that the House may receive a message.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BONILLA) assumed the chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will receive a message.

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Edwin Thomas, one of his secretaries.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

□ 1635

OMNIBUS CIVILIAN SCIENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1995

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title III?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WALKER

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALKER: Page 90, line 16, strike ''$49,955,000'' and insert ''$121,265,000.''

Page 90, line 17, strike ''$43,234,000'' and insert ''$55,714,000.''

Page 90, line 20, strike ''$59,829,000'' and insert ''$112,186,000.''

Page 90, line 22, strike ''$45,535,000'' and insert ''$66,597,000.''

Page 90, line 23, strike ''$476,000'' and insert ''$1,701,000.''

Page 91, line 3, strike ''$1,994,000'' and insert ''$2,304,000.''

Page 91, line 5, strike ''$7,557,000'' and insert ''$6,295,000.''

Page 91, line 7, strike ''$12,370,000'' and insert ''$14,919,000.''

Page 91, after 7, insert the following new paragraph:

(9) Fuels Conversion, Natural Gas, and Electricity, $2,687,000.

Page 91, line 13, strike ''$55,074,000'' and insert ''$88,645,000.''

Page 91, line 14, strike ''$55,110,000'' and insert ''$109,518,000.''

Page 91, line 15, strike ''$112,123,000'' and insert ''$176,568,000.''

Page 91, line 17, strike ''$7,813,000'' and insert ''$31,600,000.''

Page 91, after line 17, insert the following:

(5) Policy and Management—Energy Conservation, $7,666,000.

(e) FISCAL YEAR 1997.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary for fiscal year 1997 for operating, capital equipment, and construction, the following amounts:

(1) Energy Supply Research and Development Activities, $2,600,000,000.

(2) General Science and Research Activities, $950,000,000.

(3) Fossil Energy Research and Development, $220,950,000.

(4) Energy Conservation Research and Development, $230,120,000.

Page 93, strike lines 3 and 4 and lines 21 and 22; and redesignate the subparagraphs accordingly.

Page 103, line 24, strike ''Unobligated'' and insert in lieu thereof ''Subject to further appropriations, unobligated''.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment essentially is an attempt to bring about where the authorization bill is in the energy area in line with where the Interior appropriations conference report has come in terms of numbers. So what we do in this particular amendment is align the 1996 authorization levels for fossil energy and energy conservation R&D with the levels contained in the 1996 Interior appropriations conference report. I think that solves the problems of a couple of Members who wanted to make certain that our authorization bill, if it passed, did not interfere with the arrangements that have already been made with regard to the fossil energy accounts in the present appropriations bill.

But beyond that, it needs to be understood that one of the reasons why we accepted somewhat higher levels than the original authorization bill called for in Interior appropriations was because there was a problem in terms of close-out costs and a number of other anomalies in the process that gave them a 1-year problem. So as a result, when the House committee came forward with its report, that is, the appropriations subcommittee, what they did was indicated that they would then look at a plan for downsizing these accounts over the years in the future.

I quote from page 80 of that report: ''Those would be in line or be consistent with the recommendations of the authorization committee of jurisdiction as adopted by the House.''

So it was our feeling that this whole arrangement is based upon the fact that, yes, for this year we are going to have to have numbers consistent with close-out costs and a number of other items.

But as we look out toward the next year, then we have to make certain that we get these accounts on a glide path toward a balanced budget by the year 2002.

So this amendment also contains 1997 spending figures which are consistent with the amounts of money that presently are in the authorization bill for 1996. In other words, what we have done is we have accepted the Interior appropriations numbers for this year, and then we have moved the bills' authorized amounts to next year, which means there would be a reduction next year over what is being spent this year, but it would still be considerably above what the budget recommendation called for. We think it does establish a glide path toward a balanced budget.

So I would say to my colleagues that if what you want to do is assure that in these authorized accounts we do get ourselves on the road toward a balanced budget and assure that we are going to get to a balanced budget by the year 2002, what you want to do is support this amendment. It does two things: Yes, for the moment it raises the authorized levels to the appropriated levels to conform our bill with what is coming along in the appropriations accounts, but for the future what it does is it assures we are on the glide path to a balanced budget beginning with the amounts that are put in the bill for next year.

I would urge you to accept this amendment, to assure that we do two things: make certain that we have sufficient authorization to cover the appropriations for this year; but, second, to assure that next year we are on the glide path toward a balanced budget.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am sympathetic to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and I know he offers the amendment in an effort to make this bill a more acceptable bill and more in conformity with actions already taken by the Committee on Appropriations.

But let me indicate, in all honesty, some of my reservations about this, and they are probably nitpicking. We proposed earlier a couple of amendments which were aimed at doing essentially the same thing in other categories where the authorization is below the appropriation. The chairman, in his eloquence, and he is very eloquent, defended to the death the logic of maintaining our authorization in this bill substantially below both the House- and the Senate-appropriated numbers.

I understand that consistency is the hobgoblin of small minds, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] certainly does not have a small mind and, therefore, does not have to be consistent, but I raise that point just so that we will understand that on occasion we can be inconsistent and the result is not always bad.

In this case, his willingness to raise the 1996 figures for this category of energy R&D to the level already appropriated is commendable. Now, the other part of his amendment is not quite so commendable, because it then goes on to authorize for fiscal year 1997.

There are one or two places in this bill where we have 2-year authorizations, but it is not the pattern, and certainly not in this particular case. This is another technical inconsistency. I can understand that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], in his desire to put his imprint as much as possible on the future, now wants to imprint his 1997 numbers, which he has not yet had a chance to do in the Committee on the Budget, onto this bill. I would prefer that he followed due procedure and waited until, as vice chairman of the Committee on the Budget, he can undoubtedly influence them to come up with these numbers, and then we could put it in another bill.

But, as I say, I am nitpicking here, because essentially I believe in 2-year authorizations, and I certainly believe that they should not be lower than the appropriations. So I take this opportunity to take advantage of it to point these things out and hope that the political dialog can be somewhat more rational as a result of it.

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

Mr. Chairman, I certainly commend our distinguished chairman of the full Committee on Science for this action.

What has happened here is that at our Committee on Science earlier this year as we did our work, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DAVIS] actually offered an amendment that said, and it passed the Committee on Science, that if the appropriators actually appropriated a dollar figure higher than the authorization that we were setting in place there, that we could increase these funds at that time, and this accommodates that desire.

As he knows, my friend from Pennsylvania, Mr. DOYLE, and I were prepared to offer an amendment, which is at the desk which I do not believe is necessary at this time, which would actually accommodate this, and the chairman saw this need to increase this funding up to that appropriated level in 1996.

I want to point out this keeps us within our budget caps, keeps us on the glide path to a balanced budget, something we can all agree must be done.

I commend the chairman for this action and support his initiative.

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

Mr. Chairman, first I want to commend the chairman of our Committee on Science, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], for his action in this amendment. But I would like to express some concerns about this amendment also.

First of all, I think it is wonderful in this amendment that we are going to match the authorization levels in this bill with those contained in the Interior appropriations conference report. It is what we talked about doing in committee. It is what we talked about during the Davis amendment, and I commend the chairman for raising those levels.

However, I do have some concern with the fact that we are going to authorize 1997 numbers today, and some of the concerns I have are with regard to the fossil energy program. It is my understanding that, under the chairman's amendment, that we would be taking fossil energy from $380 million down to $220 million next year, in 1997.

I would like to read from the House Interior appropriations conference report, which says:

> The committee recommendation reduces fossil energy research and development funding about 10 percent below fiscal year 1995 levels. The committee intends to continue reducing this account by 10 percent a year for each of the next 4 years.

So it seems to me that the language that I read in the House Interior appropriations conference report calls for a gradual phasing down of the fossil energy budget by an amount of 10 percent a year over the next 4 years.

As I understand the chairman's intention, it is his intention to get that entire cut in next year's budget in 1997, as opposed to doing it gradually, if I understand the chairman correctly, and I cannot in good conscience support that type of a cut in a 1-year period.

I do support the conference report, which gets us there 10 percent a year over a 4-year period.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DOYLE AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WALKER

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as a substitute for the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DOYLE as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. WALKER:

Page 90, line 16, strike ''$49,955,000'' and insert in lieu thereof ''$121,265,000''.

Page 90, line 17, strike ''$43,234,000'' and insert in lieu thereof ''$55,714,000''.

Page 90, line 20, strike ''$59,829,000'' and insert in lieu thereof ''$112,186,000''.

Page 90, line 22, strike ''$45,535,000'' and insert in lieu thereof ''$66,597,000''.

Page 90, line 23, strike ''$476,000'' and insert in lieu thereof ''$1,701,000''.

Page 91, line 3, strike ''$1,994,000'' and insert in lieu thereof ''$2,304,000''.

Page 91, line 5, strike ''$7,557,000'' and insert in lieu thereof ''$6,295,000''.

Page 91, line 7, strike ''$12,370,000'' and insert in lieu thereof ''$14,919,000''.

Page 91, after line 7, insert the following new paragraph:

(9) Fuels Conversion, Natural Gas, and Electricity, $2,687,000.

Page 91, line 13, strike ''$55,074,000'' and insert in lieu thereof $88,645,000''.

Page 91, line 14, strike ''$55,110,000'' and insert in lieu thereof $109,518,000''.

Page 91, line 15, strike ''$112,123,000'' and insert in lieu thereof $176,568,000''.

Page 91, line 17, strike ''$7,813,000'' and insert in lieu thereof $31,600,000''.

Page 91, after line 17, insert the following:

(5) Policy and Management—Energy Conservation, $7,666,000.

Page 93, lines 4 and 5, strike paragraph (29).

Page 93, lines 21 and 22, strike paragraph (41).

Redesignate paragraphs (30) through (42) on page 93 accordingly.

Page 91, at the end of section 303, insert the following new section:

(e) FISCAL YEAR 1997.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary for fiscal year 1997, for the purposes for which amounts are authorized under subsections (c) and (d), amounts which are 10 percent less than the amounts authorized under such subsections.

Mr. DOYLE (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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

□ 1645

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, basically what my substitute amendment does is basically what the chairman does in his amendment; we raise the fossil energy and energy conservation levels up to the level in the Interior appropriations conference report. The only difference is for the year 1997, since we are doing a 2-year authorization, that we in 1997 authorize 10 percent less basically in accordance to the language of the House conference report which calls for a 10 percent reduction over the next 4 years. We just do that in 1997. It is basically the same as what the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] does, with the exception being we are authorizing a 10 percent reduction in 1997 versus a reduction from $380 million to $220 million.

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

Mr. Chairman, it just seems to me we have got two alternatives in front of us: One alternative by the chairman, who basically is setting forth a proposal that we balance the budget. Again we are faced with another alternative coming from the other side of the aisle in which balancing the budget has no priority whatsoever.

While I have some questions about the chairman's original proposal, certainly this substitute basically takes away from the chairman's long-term goals, and I think they are supposed to be the long-term goals of this Congress, which is we will balance the budget within a reasonable period of time.

I remember during the early days of this session when the Republicans were challenged, people said, ''We do not need a balanced budget amendment. Just do it. Just go ahead and do it.''

Well, that is what we are trying to do. Over and over again, what we found is every time we try to do this, because the people said, ''You do not need the balanced budget amendment, you can do it because you are the majority,'' when we try it, we get nothing but opposition from the other side of the aisle.

This is yet another example of how, when we are trying to balance the budget, not only can we not get a balanced budget amendment, but we cannot get a game plan to lead us to a balanced budget amendment.

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

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

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is talking to one of the Democrats that voted for a balanced budget amendment. Raising this up to the authorization levels in the Appropriations Subcommittee on Interior is consistent with the House budget resolution asking for a 10 percent reduction.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. That is what the chairman is doing.

Mr. DOYLE. I agree with the chairman. The chairman and my amendment are similar in that respect. We both agree with that. Where my amendment differs is I am using the report language in the Interior appropriations conference report. I read it verbatim.

It is my impression that the members of that conference and the chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Interior are also committed to balancing the budget. I think I am just reading the language, not from any Democrats; I am reading the House conference report, which is Republican language and is consistent with what your Interior appropriations chairman has said, which is we will reduce these accounts 10 percent a year over the next 4 years.

We are committed to reducing these accounts. It is just that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] proposes to do it in 1 year. We propose to do it over a 4-year period, both consistent with balancing the budget. I appreciate the gentleman's comments, but I wish the gentleman would not characterize it as us not wanting to balance the budget.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, it seems every time we come forward with some proposal like this, there is some kind of objection. I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Chairman WALKER, just like the other members of the committee on the majority side, have made their commitment to try to do what we can to balance the budget. I personally would go a lot further than what the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] has, but he wants to be responsible and try to make sure everybody can vote for this, and he is letting DANA ROHRABACHER be the radical here. But the fact is I would even be more strenuous in cutting down the budget than the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER]. He is being frugal, but not irresponsible. Now what we find is even a frugal approach is being rejected by the other side of the aisle.

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

Mr. Chairman, we have an interesting series of arguments going on. On the one hand, we have the ranking Democrat on the committee arguing that these are somehow my figures, that I created these figures.

None of the figures we are dealing with here were created by this chairman. They were figures created by our committee. Our committee voted for the $220 million. They voted for the $220 not for next year, but for this year. That is the authorization level. That is what our committee decided to do, by a majority vote in our committee. We made that determination. These are not Chairman WALKER's figures; they are the figures developed as a part of our consensus process.

Now, the fact is that as we move forward, that the Committee on Appropriations said there are a number of contracts and all kinds of problems in keeping with that figure for this year. We have decided to agree with that, that in essence that for this year we will accept that figure. So we are giving them the authorization numbers that they need in order to comply with contractual arrangements and a number of other anomalies within the process.

Now, what they wrote in their report was if there is no authorization figure, that their intent is to go at 10 percent a year. That is what the Committee on Appropriations decided to do. The authorizing committees, it may surprise some people to find out, have some authority in all of this, too, and in fact that was recognized in the report. What they said was they would agree to a plan for getting to a balanced budget that was passed by the House as an authorization plan. What we are trying to do here is to do exactly what the report asks us to do.

I realize there are people that would decide that they do not want to go that far, that they do not want to actually get us toward a balanced budget. Ten percent a year does not get one anywhere close to a balanced budget. The fact is that this year's number is within the context of the balanced budget.

But I do not think there is anybody who analyzes this and suggests that doing 10 percent a year over the next several years gets to a balanced budget.

So what we are trying to do here is make certain that we are taking an approach that recognizes what needs to be done this year, but, beginning next year, moves us on to that glidepath for a balanced budget.

My colleague from Pennsylvania has decided he does not want to do that. He wants to go to the overall figure. He wants to do 10 percent a year. He is about $270 million out of whack with me. He wants to spend $270 million more than I do and call that a balanced budget approach? Fine, It is not. It does not get anywhere close to a balanced budget. It is, in fact the antithesis of a balanced budget, and it is the kind of thing that we cannot permit to have happen on a regular basis if we are going to meet the conditions that we have set forth.

So I would ask the House to reject the Doyle substitute. The Doyle substitute is, in fact, going the opposite direction from what we have to do. It takes these high figures from this year and uses them as a base off which to continue spending at levels that are much too high to get to a balanced budget.

I do not think that is the route that the House is going to take. It seems to me we want to get down to doing two things: We want to make certain that, as in the original Walker amendment, that we make certain our authorizations come to the appropriate numbers. But, second, we want to make certain that beginning next year, we get on the glidepath to the balanced budget that supposedly everybody is for. But it is always amazing to me, members say, ''I voted for a budget amendment, I am for it.'' Fine. What did they vote to do to discipline yourself to actually get to one? That is what we are enacting in the House today.

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

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Chairman, just to clarify then, now in 1996 the gentleman's amendment ups the amount to the full appropriated amount?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, absolutely.

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, in 1997 is it not possible we could reauthorize again next fall?

We are talking somewhat semantics, to reauthorize into the future. I understand the gentleman wants the stakes to be set in the ground. The fact is the appropriators are also going to have a voice in what we spend in 1997 as well.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, they continue to have that voice. They did say in their report they would respect the authorization levels set by the House. I think that presents us with an opportunity and, in my view, an obligation to then give our best wisdom about how we move in that direction. With this amendment, what we are trying to do is meet that obligation and utilize that opportunity.

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

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

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, this is the point I am trying to make.

It is my understanding that what the chairman wanted to do today is in effect lock us into a number, today, for

next year's authorization. If I would vote for the gentleman's amendment, what I am in effect voting for is not only to raise these levels up to the Interior, but I am also locking myself into saying I will vote for $220 million for fossil energy next year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. WALKER was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, what I would like to see us do as the Committee on Science, No. 1, no member of the Committee on Science voted to authorize for 1997. We talked about 1996. That is what the vote was in the Committee on Science.

We said if additional moneys were found per the Davis amendment and per the gentleman's speeches here, too, we would authorize at higher levels. We found additional money. The appropriators gave us additional money, and we are upping it. Now we are going to say for 1997. No member of the Committee on Science voted only 1997 authorizations, as the gentleman tried to state. We are going to state today we are going to set 1997 authorization levels, and we are all going to be honor bound by that. I would expect the gentleman would intend to hold us to that.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, the House Committee on Science did vote for the $220 million per year for 1996, and we have simply extended that over to 1997, having gotten the new moneys.

I would say as chairman, that I have fulfilled the obligation that the committee gave me. If additional moneys were found, we were supposed to move ahead with it. I have done that, but we are now going to go to what the committee decided it wanted to do with the $220 million.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am rising in support of the substitute amendment we are considering here and take issue with some of the statements which the chairman of the committee has made.

This has been a controversial area within the committee, because despite the chairman's protestations that these numbers have been arrived at by full and fair discussion in the committee, and so forth, the committee began the year with a memo from the chairman to the subcommittee chairmen telling them how much they could authorize within their subcommittees and asserting this was their 602(b) authorization number.

I think we all know that there is no such thing as a 602(b) authorization level for authorizing legislation. The process does not exist. The 602(b) process applies to appropriation bills only, and in fact the budget resolution applies to appropriation bills only, not the authorization bills, and the chairman knows this full well. But I sometimes suspect he thinks by talking real fast that people will think that he is saying something that is real important when it really has no basis in fact or law, and I regret this.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Doyle amendment to raise authorization levels for the fossil energy and conservation research and development activities of the Department of Energy. At a time when the United States is extremely dependent on foreign oil, the Congress should not move to slash research and development efforts in fossil energy and conservation.

I drove to work today in a car; I dare say most of us did. Figuratively speaking, half of the gas in my gas tank came from foreign countries. Do I want my grandkids to depend on foreign resources and to have the geopolitical problems that go along with them? Investment in R&D now will pay off later in increased energy conservation and less developed energy security problems. In 20 years, American auto manufacturers might be selling cars that are powered by renewable fuels or perhaps fossil resources will be increasingly produced domestically with enhanced recovery technologies. We cannot know now what the future will bring. However, we can be sure that with less R&D in these areas, the future will not bring as much innovation and discovery and that the American public will be poorer for it.

If we cut R&D, we will balance the budget but leave an investment deficit for our children. It simply doesn't make sense to stymy long-term investment in knowledge and discovery that can solve future fossil energy and energy security problems.

I urge my colleagues to vote for the Doyle amendment.

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

Mr. BROWN of California. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman knows that the chairman has never contended in any way, shape or form that what he did in allocating 602(b)'s had any authority in law or the rules of the House. The chairman made the decision that that was the way he was going to run the committee.

The gentleman from California, when he ran the committee, ran it in a different way. He never gave his subcommittee chairman any caps. That was his choice. My choice was to try to exercise some degree of responsibility. I know the gentleman does not agree with that, but the gentleman has never stated anything that was not factual in that regard.

I simply stated from the beginning that this committee was going to operate in a sensible manner that lived within the budget restraints that this House had voted on itself. I know the gentleman does not agree with that, but the gentleman did not agree with the budget in the first place.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I am very pleased that the chairman has made this clarification, and he has stated that there is nothing in law or in the Budget Act that allows him to proscribe a number like he did.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I am allowed to do it as chairman of the committee. It is not a matter of allowing. The gentleman is suggesting that there is nothing in the rules or in law. I am agreeing with the gentleman. As chairman of the committee, in consultation with the subcommittee chairmen, I am certainly allowed to do that. It is certainly something that we can do as a committee to be responsible. The gentleman does not like it, but it does not mean we are not allowed to do it.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I think this is a useful dialog, and I enter into it in good spirits because I have the greatest respects for the chairman, and the gentleman will recall that I have frequently praised him for the discipline and the leadership which he is giving his side of the committee, and I think he is setting new standards.

It is not the style I am accustomed to. I preferred a much more collegial way of operating. I was unaware, frankly, of the extensive deliberations that the gentleman claims he was had with the subcommittee chairmen in which he reached these numbers.

Now, that is the way the appropriators work. I assume the gentleman is saying he is following a similar process in the authorizing committee. I do not condemn the gentleman for that. I think that this is an interesting innovation, and I hope it works. But the gentleman is not very consistent.

The gentleman has just proposed an amendment which extends the authorization for an additional year, and, to the best of my knowledge, the gentleman has not brought this before the committee, either the minority or the majority, staff. The gentleman has unilaterally picked this number because in the gentleman's opinion, it coincides with the budgetary glidepath necessary to balance the budget.

□ 1700

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, again, if the gentleman would yield, I did not arbitrarily pick a number. I took exactly the numbers that the committee has approved for 1996. I took the numbers that the committee reported for 1996 and put them in 1997, and so it is no arbitrary number.

Mr. BROWN of California. That was not my contention, that the gentleman has not picked the number that we approved for 1996. My contention is the committee never approved it for 1997.

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

Mr. BROWN of California. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I think that this is the point I am trying to make and I would make to every Member of this body. We, as a Science Committee, have not met to discuss authorization levels for 1997. We are going to abdicate that today by taking the 1996 numbers and say, ''Let's use them for the 1997 numbers.'' Now, we may well

end up there when we sit as a committee and decide authorization levels, but we ought not to do it today. I would like to do it in committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BROWN of California was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I continue to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman that we have an open-rule process. The gentleman was going to bring his own version of reality to the floor. As chairman of the committee, I am not precluded from bringing my own amendment to the floor, and that is exactly what I have done. I have brought an amendment to the floor. The House can accept it or reject it.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment I brought happens to be consistent with what the committee already agreed to do in 1996, but under the open-rule process I would tell the gentleman this is something that I am perfectly allowed to do.

Mr. BROWN of California. The gentleman, if he will allow me to reclaim my time, I have never contended that he was not allowed to do that. He can project an amendment clear through to 2000 if he wishes. I am objecting to the fact that he is purporting to represent that this has been discussed in the committee and that he does nothing that has not been cleared by a democratic process in the committee.

Mr. WALKER. If the gentleman would yield, I never said anything of the kind. I said that this was approved by the committee as 1996 numbers. I never contended that I brought this matter before the committee. I brought it to the floor as my own amendment.

Mr. BROWN of California. Let us agree that we have a slight misunderstanding then.

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

Mr. BROWN of California. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I would just ask the gentleman that, if we approve his amendment today, would he consider all members of the Committee on Science, those that vote for his amendment this evening, would sort of be honor-bound to stick to those authorization levels when we meet as a committee and discuss 1997 authorizations?

I am asking a question, if the gentleman would like to respond.

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

Mr. BROWN of California. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, Members obviously do whatever they want to do. As my colleagues know, some days they vote one way, some days they vote another way. Members can make their decisions at a particular time. I would think that, if the people vote in a particular way today, and they have changed their minds tomorrow, that the voters might have a problem with that, but the fact is the Members can do whatever they want.

Mr. DOYLE. So we will not have to meet as a committee then. We will just authorize 1997 tonight and the Committee on Science does not have to have any more authorization meetings.

Mr. Chairman, I just do not think that is a good way to do business.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DOYLE] as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Members will record their presence by electronic device.

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 2 of rule XXIII the Chair will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the pending question following this quorum call. Members will record their presence by electronic device.

The call was taken by electronic device.

The following Members responded to their name:

[Roll No. 705]

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allard
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Conyers
Cooley
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Filner
Flake
Flanagan
Foglietta
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Funderburk
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Green
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
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 (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Lincoln
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Longley
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Metcalf
Meyers
Mfume
Mica
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Riggs
Rivers
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roth
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Salmon
Sanders
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Stokes
Studds
Stump
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thornton
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Williams
Wilson
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zimmer

□ 1724

The CHAIRMAN. Four hundred Members have answered to their name, a quorum is present, and the Committee will resume its business.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DOYLE] for a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 2(c) of rule XXIII, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the underlying amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 173, noes 245, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 706]

AYES—173

Abercrombie
Bachus
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Berman
Bevill
Bishop
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Cardin
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Durbin
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Fox
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gillmor
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Holden
Hoyer
Jackson-Lee
Jefferson
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kleczka
Klink
LaFalce
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lincoln
Lipinski
Lofgren
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mink
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Murtha
Neal
Ney
Oberstar
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Pomeroy
Poshard
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Richardson
Rivers
Roemer
Rose
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schroeder
Scott
Serrano
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Spratt
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Tanner
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Velazquez
Visclosky
Volkmer
Wamp
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Williams
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NOES—245

Ackerman
Allard
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clinger
Collins (GA)
Combest
Conyers
Cooley
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dreier
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Funderburk
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Manzullo
Martinez
Martini
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Minge
Molinari
Moorhead
Morella
Myers
Myrick
Nadler
Nethercutt
Neumann
Norwood
Nussle
Obey
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Reed
Riggs
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Schumer
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stark
Stearns
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Traficant
Upton
Vento
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—14

Bass
Chapman
Clay
Condit
Dornan
Duncan
Fields (LA)
Hunter
Kennelly
Moakley
Owens
Tejeda
Tucker
Zeliff

□ 1733

So 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 Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KLUG

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I cannot hear the Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct. The committee will be in order.

Mr. BROWN of California. Second, Mr. Chairman, I was on my feet seeking recognition to call for a roll call vote, as was the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DOYLE] on the last vote and we were not recognized, primarily because of the disorder in the House, I believe.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair looked at both sides of the aisle for Members seeking recognition and did not see any Member seeking recognition, so I moved to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG].

Mr. BROWN of California. The Chair did not see me seeking recognition?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair did not.

Mr. BROWN of California. Nor the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DOYLE].

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair did not see the gentleman from California nor the gentleman from Pennsylvania seeking recognition.

Mr. BROWN of California. For the RECORD I would like to state that I was seeking recognition, as was the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DOYLE].

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Klug:

Page 104, after line 5, insert the following new section:

SEC. 313. PRIVATIZATION OF DOE LABORATORIES.

(a) SALE OF LABORATORIES.—Within 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Energy shall publish in the Commerce Business Daily a request for proposals to sell all Department of Energy laboratories other than Los Alamos National Laboratory, Sandia National Laboratories, and Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory. The Secretary shall coordinate the process of review of such proposals, and shall oversee the transfer of such operations to the private sector.

(b) REPORT ON DISPOSITION.—If no offer to purchase property under this section is received within an 18-month period after a request for proposals is published in the Commerce Business Daily, the Secretary shall submit a report to the Congress containing recommendations on the appropriate disposition of the property and functions of such laboratories.

(c) PRIVATIZATION OF LAWRENCE LIVERMORE NATIONAL LABORATORY.—(1) Within 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Energy shall begin the process of transferring national security and defense-related research from Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory to Los Alamos National Laboratory.

(2) Within 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Energy shall publish in the Commerce Business Daily a request for proposals to sell Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory. The Secretary shall coordinate the process of review of such proposals, and shall oversee the transfer of such operations to the private sector.

(3) If no offer to purchase property under paragraph (2) is received within an 18-month

period after a request for proposals is published in the Commerce Business Daily, the Secretary shall submit a report to the Congress containing recommendations on the appropriate disposition of the property and remaining functions of Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory.

(d) CONTRACTING AUTHORITY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary is authorized, to the extent provided in advance in appropriations Acts, to enter into contracts for research functions performed by the laboratories described in this section prior to their privatization. Contract authority for such research for any fiscal year shall not exceed levels appropriated for those research functions for fiscal year 1995.

Page 3, after the item in the table of contents relating to section 312, inserting the following:

Sec. 313. Privatization of DOE laboratories.

Mr. KLUG (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 Wisconsin?

There was not objection.

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Chairman, the Department of Energy maintains 10 major laboratories and 18 minor laboratories with a joint annual budget of approximately $6 million and a payroll of more than 50,000 employees. Earlier this year we received a critical report done and headed by Bob Galvin, the former Chairman of Motorola and the so-called Galvin Report which took a close look at the future of Department of Energy labs across the country.

Mr. Chairman, earlier this afternoon we had an opportunity in this Chamber in an amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON] to cut the DOE laboratory budget by 15 percent, and then in an amendment by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] we had an opportunity to cut the DOE budget by 30 percent. We unfortunately failed in both of those efforts.

We have talked for some time in this Chamber, over the last several months in particular, led by the freshmen with the idea of dismantling the Department of Energy. Mr. Chairman, about 30 percent of the Department of Energy staff runs and operates something called the Power Marketing Administration, which is a collection of 130 dams across the country. Nearly another 40 percent of the Department of Energy staff works in running and operating and managing those 10 Department of Energy labs with a budget of $6 billion.

This amendment, based on testimony we heard in the Committee on Commerce earlier this summer, recommends that we dramatically move above and beyond the Galvin Commission recommendation and essentially says, within 30 days after the date of the enactment of this act, the Secretary of Energy shall publish in the Commerce Business Daily requests for proposals to sell all Department of Energy laboratories except Los Almos, Sandia and Lawrence Livermore National Laboratories.

The reason we need to do this, Mr. Chairman, quite frankly is, as we discussed earlier today in the deliberations to cut the Department of Energy lab budget, was the fact that many of these labs no longer have a mission. For example, the mission of Lawrence Livermore 40 years ago was to do 90 percent of its research on nuclear power research. Today we find ourselves with that same laboratory doing less than 40 percent of its research on nuclear defense research connected to the national defense of this country.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I note that there are a number of my colleagues here who will say you cannot move to privatization even though that is what the Galvin Commission recommended very strongly. But let me suggest that across the world, other countries have attempted to do that, and frankly, with a great deal of success.

In Britain, for example, the British Maritime Laboratory devoted to research and design on ship design and maritime structures was successfully privatized nearly 10 years ago. The National Engineering Laboratory in Great Britain, with a staff of 400 people dealing with the engineering of large structures such as oil rigs, was sold to a number of private investment firms just last year. The national physical lab, which does the primary meteorology research for the British government, was sold to a consortium of bidders including Laboure University. The Transport Research Laboratory was put up for sale as of August 31 of this year, and that deal will close at the end of 1995, and the AAE Technology Research Laboratory, which does most of the nuclear research for the British government, is going to be put up for sale in April of next year, although it is not clear whether it will be sold to a private firm or corporatized.

□ 1745

I know this will send shudders to a number of my colleagues who represent these laboratories and represent the employees. But with a mission I think largely now unfocused at the end of the cold war, with dedicating three very specific laboratories across the country to doing national security work, and with moving to privatize the other seven laboratories, I think we have managed to preserve that infrastructure but get those employees off the public payroll and allow them to do what they are beginning to do anyway, which is to move away from the kind of classic nuclear research, defense industry program that these laboratories have been engaged in for years and instead shift to a number of industrial technology research programs which those labs have embraced as a new way to define their mission into the future, now that the defense programs have all been evaporated underneath them.

In that case they can do research on energy, they can do research on environmental technology, on advanced technology for manufacturing. I think those are all appropriate missions, but I would suggest to my colleagues those are missions better served in the private sector rather than in seven government laboratories largely constructed and funded and developed over the years to do arms research for the United States military.

Mr. Chairman, I realize this is a bold move, but it is a move I think frankly that many of my colleagues in the Committee on Commerce endorsed. It is based on a hearing we had in the Committee on Commerce earlier this year.

I would like to close, if I might, with a quote from a colleague of mine on the CATO Institute who pointed out to say: ''The principal organizational recommendation of this task force, the Galvin Commission, is that the laboratories be as close to corporatized as is imaginable. We are convinced that simply fine-tuning a policy or a mission, a project or certain administrative functions, will produce minimal benefits at best.''

If colleagues are serious about cutting back on the $6 billion we now devote to the Department of Energy facilities, if we are serious about moving away from a cold war mission, and if we are serious about preserving those laboratories but doing it without taxpayer subsidies which can no longer be justified, I would urge my colleagues to support this amendment to move toward the sale and the privatization of 7 of the 10 DOE labs.

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

I have a question for the maker of the amendment. If he would, I would like to know the comparative budgets. You have excluded Los Alamos, Sandia, and Lawrence Livermore. What is their budget compared to the total budgets of those which you would sell?

Mr. KLUG. If the gentleman will yield, I am looking at staffers to try to determine that. I cannot tell you. But the reason we focused on those three primary labs is because they are still dedicated and devoted to national security purposes. That is the core principal for the original organization of the DOE labs. As the Galvin Commission pointed out, those other seven labs have poorly defined missions at this point, and that is why we zeroed in on those for the privatization efforts.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Reclaiming my time, I hope before the end of this debate we can get those numbers. I think that the serious money in the Department of Energy, if you look at the Department of Energy budget, it is not any more dedicated to energy independence and conservation of resources in this country. It is dedicated only to nuclear weapons production against a lot of enemies that no longer exist. These three labs get the lion's share of the money.

Things that would make America truly competitive in the next century, like solar energy research, research conservation, we are gutting and doing away with. During the Reagan years,

we sold all of our solar energy division here in Washington, DC. We privatized it. You know who bought it? Seimens, the Germans. Now what? They are the world's leader in solar energy technology. The United States is far, far behind.

So we are going to unilaterally disarm, that is, give up any research that makes America more competitive in the international energy markets, international energy wars, but we are going to keep on building hydrogen bombs that we do not need when we have already got 10,000 of them. So the gentleman here, it looks good on the surface, but I wish the gentleman would do away with the obsolete nuclear weapons laboratories, ones that are building hydrogen bombs, and save the real money as opposed to picking on the things that have a real product, research for the civilian sector, research that makes this country more competitive in the international marketplace. It is an ill-intentioned amendment from that direction since it does not go after the big bucks.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in reluctant opposition to this amendment. I am the chairman of the subcommittee that would have dealt with this bill had this bill been submitted in the proper way. The fact is that I am very sympathetic with the goal that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG] has in mind here. Had we had a chance to look at it and to examine the issues and examine the figures and the facts, I might be standing today in partnership with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG] in support of this amendment. But we do not know. In fact, there were hearings on various bills that were aimed at privatizing laboratories or reforming the laboratory system and the bill of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG] was not included because it was not submitted to us. Thus for all we know, there could be some unintended consequences that we have not looked at.

So whereas I am always open-minded to try to find ways of privatizing government services and seeing how we can do this, I would have to be in opposition to this particular amendment at this time. I would hope that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG], if this loses in a vote on the floor, would not give up but instead resubmit this and submit to the committee and I would be very happy to bring this up at the earliest possible time.

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

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KLUG. I want to thank my colleague from California for his willingness to work on this. I think it is the intention of both members of the Committee on Science and also the Committee on Commerce to get to that point in serious discussions next year.

To answer briefly my colleague from Oregon, if I might, of the $6 billion programmed for the national energy laboratories, roughly $2.5 billion still goes to nuclear weapons research. The balance is spread among a wide array of programs. But again I think what we need to do is to figure out as we talked about on privatizing other areas, that what we should do is figure out a way to move these forward, allow the Secretary to develop individual strategies perhaps to corporatize some and privatize others and to see quite frankly what interest is out there in the private sector because I am convinced these are a national treasure that we can preserve, be run and operated by the private sector and at the same time preserve the technology for important science and technology programs.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Reclaiming my time, I would just say that I agree with that goal. I agree totally with that goal and that may well be achievable. I would like to try to proceed and to study that issue and let people on both sides of the aisle have their say and examine it as it should be examined. In terms of the amount of money spent on energy research, let me just say, to correct my friend, this bill is about $6.5 billion of non-defense energy and environmental research. That is what this is about. So I do not think that that is low-balling this issue. I believe that $6.5 billion spent by the Federal Government on energy and environmental research is a good sum of money. Our job is to make sure it is spent properly. Some people may want to spend more money, but we should at the very least prioritize and make sure that the very most effective and promising sources of energy and environmental technology are funded. That is what this is all about, when we are trying to balance the budget, to find that particular project, rather than funding all the projects or cutting all the projects by 10 or 20 percent, find those projects that are most promising and fund those and come up with creative ideas like we just have.

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

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

Mr. BAKER of California. Let me just speak in behalf of our national treasures that we are cutting. The Livermore and Sandia labs and the other labs in New Mexico as well as California are cutting. This year the laboratory in my district, Livermore Lab, is cutting $46.4 million. That is a lot of jobs, a lot of scientists, a lot of science.

Are we afraid of the future? Are we afraid of looking forward and saying, is there an alternative to burning coal and burning oil? Do we need nuclear fusion? Without the national ignition facility which has just been proposed by the Energy Department, Livermore was selected as the site because of their laser capability. Without it, we are going to have to go back to nuclear testing. France is fighting that battle now and losing. We are not going to do that.

The national ignition facility allows us to keep our stockpile fresh. It also allow us to keep out stockpile fresh. It also allows us to study nuclear power. We are not afraid of the future. We are going to manage our $6 billion and we are going to downsize the laboratories because the need for nuclear defensive laboratories is waning. But we want to be prepared for China, we want to be prepared for the next empire and the laboratories are doing that for us.

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

Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment and I would like to say just a couple of things about why. I do not have a national lab in my district, but I have a very great interest in the national labs because, like other Americans, I believe that science and research really holds the key to our economic future as a country.

I think it is important to outline what the Galvin report did say and did not say. The Galvin report never said to put our national labs up for sale. In fact, when Mr. Galvin testified before the Committee on Science, that question was posed to him. He said that that was not a good idea, that it was impossible to imagine who would have the money to bid on these labs.

What the Galvin report suggested was a different type of management structure for the labs. Actually it is an issue that I think, as the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER] has said, deserves additional analysis and study. I for one believe it is something that we ought to explore, but never once did Mr. Galvin suggest that the national labs go outside of the ownership of the Federal Government. I think the concept of selling the national jewels is one that ought to be rejected.

Finally, I would like to note that the complex arrangement of some of these labs, for example, the linear accelerator at Stanford University is not readily susceptible to a bid as is suggested in the amendment. I would say in closing that the only people who have lobbied me to eliminate our investment in the labs are foreign companies. Our economic competitors have lobbied me to cut the labs. No one else in America has.

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

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHRYSLER].

Mr. CHRYSLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Klug amendment to privatize the Department of Energy laboratories. Congressman KLUG's amendment would privatize the DOE laboratories, encouraging private sector innovation and competitiveness, much like we did in the dismantling of the Department of Commerce act, H.R. 1756.

By privatizing the laboratory functions of the DOE, we will encourage these newly privatized entities to produce and sell their services more widely. By removing the nonessential research and development functions and the means of production from the Federal Government labs, we will now produce on the basis of demand, and in turn spin off other industries, creating jobs and providing increased revenues for the Nation.

Speaking from firsthand experience, the private sector entities have always proved to be more efficient and accountable, and if they are not, they would go out of business. Federal programs, on the other hand, such as the DOE labs, are simply not held to the degree of accountability that private sector labs are. Instead of going out of business, as would be the case in the private sector, Congress merely passes the cost on to the taxpayers.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I think that the spirit of this amendment is supported by many people on both sides of the aisle. That spirit is that we really need to look at these national labs because some of their missions have changed. We are in a post-cold-war era. That does not mean that we are in a really safe world. I am not sure this is the best way to approach that problem, but I wanted to take just a moment to focus on one of the things that our labs are doing which I think is very important for our future.

Mr. Chairman, first I want to commend my committee chairman, Mr. WALKER, for this sensible approach to consolidating U.S. civilian science research and development programs into an omnibus bill. I believe that this approach elevates civilian science R&D and its contribution to our national security.

It is a sound precedent for prioritizing national science programs.

As we consider H.R. 2405 and our priorities in science policy, I urge my colleagues to reflect of the importance of these science programs.

I am particularly interested in alternative energy research programs. Just as it is irresponsible to saddle our children with the national debt we have created, it is irresponsible for this Nation not to develop clean, safe alternative energy sources for future generations.

Harnessing fusion power is the most challenging and ambitious scientific endeavor ever undertaken by man. Not only is fusion one of very few long-term energy options for the future but it is at the cutting edge of scientific research and technology. This country must not lose sight of the importance of scientific research, especially research that has such a tremendous payoff.

Steady progress continues in demonstrating the scientific and technological feasibility of magnetic fusion power as a viable long-term energy supply system. I realize that all programs must be tailored to more closely meet today's budgetary constraints, and this bill does not responsibly.

However with additional funding cuts we would forfeit our ability to develop a technology that holds great promise for our Nation's economic and environmental future.

I thank my colleagues on the Science Committee for their attention to alternative energy research and urge support for the civilian science programs in H.R. 2405.

□ 1800

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. FURSE

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. FURSE:
Page 94, strike line 6.

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment to strike a very punitive provision in this bill. That provision would eliminate last year's funding for a vital program in Oregon. This program has just begun. It is relying on a grant from the Department of Energy.

Mr. Chairman, I want to take just a few minutes to describe this program so that the Members will know exactly what it is that is being terminated. The Biomedical Information Communication Center is the backbone of Oregon health sciences rural network. This network provides information, education, and diagnostic services to health care providers and citizens throughout the State of Oregon. Through its innovative, 21st century information system, student practitioners can be educated and trained on the spot in their hometown communities. This allows isolated towns to retain health personnel in their area. Rural doctors are able to obtain information on the latest research in medical techniques via the network.

For example, if there were an injured logger in a rural, remote area, his x-rays can be transmitted electronically so that doctors hundreds of miles away can treat the patient. At a time when we are celebrating the many potential benefits of the information superhighway and are exploring ways to upgrade health and medical services to rural populations, this communications center will put innovative ideas into practice.

Mr. Chairman, a 1-year grant was approved by the Department of Energy to pay for the cost of completing the infrastructure of the network and to provide the staff and services. The Biomedical Information Communications Center opened September 15, relying on the grant, and personnel and programs are in place for the entire next year, based on a commitment of last year's appropriation. If, at this eleventh hour, the Congress were to pull the rug from under this important project, the jobs of more than 100 people would be in jeopardy and, even more important, thousands of people throughout the State would be denied the most up-to-date health care information far from its cities.

It makes no economic nor common sense whatsoever to terminate the Biomedical Information Communications Center in this bill. It is fundamentally unfair for Congress to renege on commitments it has already made.

I urge my colleagues to support rural health care, sound health science, and vote ''yes'' for this amendment so that we can fix the punitive provision in the bill.

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

Mr. Chairman, the language is in the bill for a very specific reason. One of the most disturbing processes that characterized Congresses of the past was the fact that we had a lot of earmarked science, money that showed up out of nowhere in conference committees that just suddenly appeared as spending that we ought to be doing because somebody thought it was a good thing. There was never peer review, never showed up on the House floor or Senate floor for debate. It just emerged out of a conference committee out of nowhere and so on, a specific earmark for a specific university or for a specific program.

So what we have decided to do is try to eliminate some of those programs and say to them, ''Compete with the rest of us.'' If this program is as good as the gentlewoman tells us it is, it ought to be very competitive. It ought to be able to go in and offer its credentials with everybody else, be peer reviewed by people who have knowledge about the programs and survive and be funded. They did not want to do that. They did an end run, got somebody to offer an earmark, got somebody to practice a little pork-barreling for them and throw it in the bill.

What we are going to do is we are going to stop that practice. Where we have projects that are on the dole because of some earmark along the way, we are going to divest them. We are not making a judgment about those programs. We are saying about those programs they ought to come in and compete in the regular process, and we would be perfectly happy to have Oregon or Nebraska or wherever get their money through the good old traditional way of actually competing fairly.

But this outrage that the American people's tax money gets spent simply because somebody sits in a committee somewhere and sneaks it in in the dark of night has got to stop. This is a ridiculous way to do science.

We are spending vast amounts of science money in this country going for earmarked pork-barrel projects. We cannot afford it. The science of this country is too important to have it being run that way, and so when this amendment is offered to knock out

that provision, what this amendment is is that this is a propork, proearmark amendment. This simply says, ''Keep it. We got it, it is all ours,'' and so on, ''and now we ought to keep it. It does not matter how we got it. If we got it unfairly, if we stuck it in in the dark of night, keep it, it is fine.'' I think the American people are telling us they want the Government run more effectively and they want to make certain the moneys we spend have been properly evaluated.

These projects, good as they might be, were not properly evaluated, and we thought they ought to be cut out. So we included in our bill a cut of some of these programs that showed up as earmarks in the past.

I would say to my colleagues, I think we ought to oppose this amendment. It is a terrible way to spend the taxpayers' money when what happens is powerful people in the Congress are able to earmark things without being properly reviewed, and it seems to me that this is a good chance to strike an antiearmarking blow once and for all.

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman's sentiment about getting rid of pork-barrel projects. It rings hollow with me when I think back to the debate we had on this floor about hydrogen research, which, as I recall, had a 50-percent increase, the bulk of which went to a plant close to or in the gentleman's district.

Mr. WALKER. The gentleman is making an accusation, which I think is against the rules of the House. The gentleman is absolutely wrong in both his facts and what we believe was done. I have supported hydrogen research for a long time. The gentleman is making an outrageous claim here. I brought it to the floor. I did not sneak it in in the dead of night somewhere. I brought up to the floor as part of a bill because it is the right thing to do.

I have no plant in my district. I have no plant close to my district. The fact is the money in that program went to Texas. If the gentleman thinks I am from Texas, maybe he ought to go check his Members' handbook and find out the real facts.

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. I did not say you sneaked it in in the middle of the night. I said it had a 50-percent increase.

Mr. WALKER. It is entirely legitimate. There are increases in this bill as well. We increase a number of places for science. Does the gentleman not want to increase priority science? Does the gentleman not believe doing hydrogen research is, in fact, the right kind of thing to do for our energy future? Maybe the gentleman is against doing good science. The gentleman can be a total antiscience person on this floor. He can do that. That is fine.

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. If the gentleman will yield further, I stand by my statement that my understanding is there is considerable hydrogen research done in the State of Pennsylvania. Maybe I am wrong. But I think that that is something——

Mr. WALKER. I would hope that Pennsylvania and a number of other States are doing hydrogen research. The gentleman is absolutely correct in his assumption here.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. WALKER was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. WALKER. The gentleman is making an accusation here as though I brought a pork-barrel item to the floor myself. I did nothing of the kind. The gentleman will find nothing in my district that got any of that money, and the gentleman will find that the bulk of the hydrogen money goes to States far outside.

I just think it is outrageous for the gentleman to raise the level, because I tell you what happened on this program, if the gentleman is up to defending this program, it was sneaked into a conference report. There was no debate on it on the House floor, no debate on the Senate floor. I think the gentleman came out here and tried to cut the hydrogen money, in fact. The gentleman came out here and got his shot at cutting the hydrogen money. In fact, he could not do it, because the House recognized the gentleman simply did not want to do something that was not in the best long-term interests of the country. Having good hydrogen research is the way to do it.

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. If the gentleman will yield further, again, I may vote with the gentleman on this. I think we should have some consistency. Yes, I felt hydrogen production, I correct myself, should have taken a cut just like other things. I think we should have some consistency. That should take a cut just as you go after these projects. That is what I am asking for, simply asking for consistency.

Mr. WALKER. The fact is, there is no port in any of these bills. There was no designation of Pennsylvania or any other place for the hydrogen money. It was put out on a competitive basis. Anybody who wanted to compete for it was happy to compete for it. The gentleman walks away. He does not want to hear the truth. This is what I am asking for in this kind of situation.

I think what we ought to have is a competitive process where everybody has a chance to come in and compete, and this kind of program is just an outrage, and I would hope that we would vote against this program that got the money strictly through a really pork-barrel, earmarked approach.

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

I think the gentleman from Wisconsin who just spoke and insinuated something about the chairman of the Committee on Science owes the chairman of the Committee of Science an apology. The insinuation was that this is some way correlates, the support of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], of hydrogen research, in some way correlates to the, you know, what we have in front of us today, which is basically pork-barreling that has not gone, and earmarking, that has not gone through the process, and it is very clear to those of us who are on the Committee on Science that any money allocated for hydrogen research was something that went through the committee process. Everyone had a chance to debate it. Everyone had a chance to examine it, to disagree or agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] about hydrogen research.

That is totally unlike what we are talking about today in this bill, where we are basically talking about something that was put in, not through the committee process, but instead has just materialized in front of us. I think that it is basically my colleague from Wisconsin, who, through this insinuation at the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] and owes him an apology. I would have to say that I have witnessed that what the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] did on the hydrogen research bill has nothing to do and is totally dissimilar and was absolutely consistent with the rules.

I would suggest that if some one is going to make those kinds of insinuations, that maybe they should study the the process and understand it a little more before they attack a senior Member, as such.

□ 1815

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak on behalf of the Furse amendment. I would hope for a moment we could get beyond the matter of accusations and look at a few facts.

The first is that the Oregon Health Sciences Center has cooperated with the Committee on Science at every turn. They have submitted detailed responses to committee questions with respect to earmarks. The president of the university has been available to the bipartisan leadership of the Committee on Science. The fact is that the university has cooperated in every respect with the Committee on Science.

Now, these funds have been obligated. Contracts have been let. Expenses are being met on a monthly basis with the expectation of the Department of Energy providing promised grant moneys. It now becomes simply a matter of fairness to ensure that the obligations under this contract are met.

The gentlewoman from Oregon [Ms. FURSE] has been absolutely correct in talking about the extraordinary potential of telemedicine. As our friend, the chairman of the health committee, notes, telemedicine is the medicine of the future. So this program that is being pioneered at the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center dollar for dollar is going to produce a return across this country. To consider that, after the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center has cooperated in an aboveboard fashion with the committee at every step along the way, the obligation has essentially been incurred by the Federal Government; the potential of the telemedicine is extraordinary. To then come and rupture the good work that has been done strikes me as a tragedy, not just for the country, but for the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I would hope my colleagues on a bipartisan basis would support the excellent amendment of the gentlewoman from Oregon [Ms. FURSE]. It has implications for bringing this country together, urban and rural areas across the Nation, across our State, and I hope my colleagues will support the amendment.

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

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

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, first of all, this might be a very fine program, and it probably is a very fine program, but what does this have to do with the Department of Energy?

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, as the gentleman knows, the Department of Energy has been one of the pioneers in the research field. That is what this is all about. The Oregon Health Sciences Center is on the cutting edge of future medical technology.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, is this not supposed to be energy research, and not medical research?

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman knows, the Department of Energy is involved in a variety of important research. Much of this interfaces between communications and health and a number of related agencies.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. This is one of the reasons why these types of requests should go through the committee and subcommittee and be presented there rather than just being basically voiced on the floor.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I want to repeat again that the university has cooperated with the Committee on Science at every step. They have returned detailed responses. The university president has been available to the committee at every step along the way. The University of Oregon Health Sciences Center has cooperated.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I am sorry the gentleman's information is incorrect, unless my staff is incorrect. I am informed there has been no communication from the university this year, and that this was not presented to our subcommittee, nowhere along the line.

If this is such an important project and this is so justifiable, why was not an amendment presented to us at the subcommittee so we could go through the procedures and it could be talked out, so people up and down through the system would have their chance to have a say and to vote on this? Why do we have to have it just appear all of a sudden on the floor at the last minute?

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

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

Mr. BROWN of California. With regard to the point that the distinguished subcommittee chairman raises, the gentleman is correct in stating on the basis of the information from his staff that there has been no interaction this year. On the other hand, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. WYDEN] is absolutely correct; there were extensive discussions during the last Congress when I was chairman of the committee.

The gentleman may recall that we threatened to subpoena the earmarked institutions and bring them into Washington. The University of Oregon voluntarily came in and sent their president of the institution, and there were discussions. I will speak a little bit later about my attitude about earmarks, but the gentleman is correct that the cooperation was extended, the programs were fully explained, and they are among the best in the world.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, that is last year. They had a different Congress than.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. Were it so that this bill has been scrubbed so clean. It seems out of a number of earmarks, that it would have been chosen for some reason. Now, was this particular earmark chosen to be eliminated because it lacks merit? I think not.

What we are talking about here goes to some of the essential themes before this Congress. It is about health care in America. It is about providing more efficient health care. It is about saving lives for fewer dollars. That is what this project would do.

I represent a district that is the 45th largest district in the U.S. Congress. Many people in my district live a couple hours away from the nearest hospital. We have a lot of rural clinics. Those rural clinics will be tied in by this system, which is developing a model for rural medicine across America, so that when Blue River, OR, has a nurse-practitioner and there is a serious accident and they take the x ray, they can get real-time consultation with experts up in Portland and decide whether or not we have to dispatch a helicopter, a very expensive helicopter, on a mercy flight, or whether that person can be stabilized and transported an hour by ambulance to the nearest hospital.

Those are the sorts of decisions that will be made in an informed manner with this system. It is a system not just for the State of Oregon. Oregon is going to be the model, and it is going to set the template for the rest of the Nation, a way to provide rural health care in this country and meet our fiscal constraints.

So it is not that this program lacks merit. I would wonder what are the merits of the Florida State University earmark, the Southern earmark, the University of Vermont earmark, the earmark for A&M College Systems in Baton Rouge, LA. I think there is an important person representing that area, lives down that way. The University of Florida solar program. These are all earmarks that are still in the bill. This is not a clean bill that suddenly has achieved great virtue, although the chairman would have us believe that.

A couple of things have been chosen, for whatever reason, to be eliminated. I guess the question is, should this remain in on its merits? It saves money. Ultimately, it will save tens of millions, hundreds of millions of dollars across the country, for rural Oregonians and rural Americans. It will save lives.

The most outrageous thing about this amendment is this was funded previously. The program was begun on September 15. Funds have already been committed, people have been hired. The software is being written, the technology is contracted for. And now we are going to cut it off in midstream, because we are saying that the Senator from Oregon, MARK HATFIELD, somehow no one knew what the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations was doing, that he snuck this in in the dark of the night. As Members heard from the former chairman of the committee, Portland State, the Oregon Health Sciences Center came forward with information last year.

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

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

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, was this item in the Senate bill? If MARK HATFIELD was so supportive of it, was it in the Senate bill? It was not in the House bill. It just sort of appeared. That really is the question. We are trying to make sure things do not just appear anymore.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would remind Members not to refer to Members of the Senate.

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

Mr. Chairman, at the beginning of this debate, I indicated that it really did not make too much difference what

we did with this bill, but that we could expect some interesting dialog as a result of it, and this dialog with regard to earmarking or so-called pork is a part of that.

Now, I have been involved generally in close cooperation with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] on this issue for a number of years. We have almost always seen eye to eye in conducting a vigorous campaign to restrict the growth of earmarks which during the eighties reached the level of almost $1 billion on appropriation bills for research and development. Not earmarks for highways and dams and things like that, but for research and development, whose essence is that it should be peer reviewed and the best should be selected.

We felt that it was a crusade that was worth conducting. We compiled annual lists of the States and, as far as we could tell, the Members of this august body who were the most successful in their practice of earmarking.

Now, amongst the list of centers, the State of Oregon ranked very high. The reasons were very simple. It had two outstanding Senators, one of whom was the ranking minority member during this period of the Committee on Appropriations, and he had no hesitancy about getting what Oregon ought to have. He was not the only one. The Senator from Louisiana, from South Carolina, other Senators, from Alaska, I do not want to pick out any particular Senators, but they, because they were members of the Committee on Appropriations, participated in the conference, got very expert at this business of trading off pork with their counterparts on the House side. It became a fine art, which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] and I tried to stop.

Now, let me say, as I have already indicated, that the question was not necessarily the merit of the particular project. I tried wherever possible to invite these earmarked institutions to come in and defend their earmarks and, if it seemed meritorious, to assist them with getting a proper authorization.

We did that with the University of Oregon, and they were extremely cooperative. We did it with many other institutions. We did it with a fine institution up in Michigan, for example, which a former House subcommittee appropriations chairman wanted to earmark. We thought it was sufficiently meritorious to authorize it.

Our effort is to cooperate in making the systems of this Congress work effectively and to achieve the public goal. Now, it is my opinion, and I will state it very strongly, that the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center is one of the finest institutions in this country. I do not think there is any question about that. It will be a model for many other States. But it did go about securing its funding in the manner which has been described, which I was opposed to, and I sought to correct. But it was of very little avail, except that, as I indicated, there was full cooperation from the university in helping us to understand on the committee the work that these programs do, and I am glad to assert they were extremely cooperative.

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

Mr. BROWN of California. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman from California yielding, because I suspect this debate is closing.

Mr. Chairman, the Furse amendment is not a referendum on earmarks. A lot of us on a bipartisan basis have reservations, as the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] has said, about the earmarking concept. What we are concerned about is when a university does cooperate with the bipartisan leadership of the Committee on Science, does things in an above the board way, and incurs these obligations, it is a great mistake to then in effect tear up all of that good work which has the potential to serve the country. This is not a referendum on earmarks. This is a question of fairness for a particular university that has cooperated with the Congress in a bipartisan way.

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

Mr. BROWN of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, let me for the record state that I have deep admiration for the former chairman of the Committee on Science and in the past several years I have worked with the former chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN], on this issue as well as on the issue about other what I consider to be some kind of violations of the Committee on Appropriations process. The gentleman has my full respect for this and other issues that we have worked side-by-side on

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BROWN of California was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, this is a new Congress, and what the gentleman was describing earlier seems to indicate that this particular item was handled last year, and perhaps had there not been this change over between the Republicans and Democrats, that this might not have come up as an issue because things would have been handled, the university's request would have been handled in a different way earlier on because we would have been aware of it. As it was, the university did not communicate with us, but was in communication with the chairman and with the former leaders of the committee.

So I see where there is a breakdown of communication here, perhaps as the former chairman has indicated, with no bad thoughts or any strategy in mind, but just because of naivete did not remake the request. We needed the request earlier on before the subcommittee so people could have basically voted on it. By not following that procedure, that is why we have come to this conflict today.

Mr. Chairman, I do verify and respect the former chairman for all he has done in this area and appreciate the work that he has done.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BROWN of California was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's remarks and, Mr. Chairman, to complete my statement, I want to make this point. The campaign against earmarking needs to be continued and it should be on a bipartisan basis, and I would appreciate a chance to cooperate in that.

Second, the point before us is that the particular language in the bill here attempts to revoke two earmarks from last year's appropriations bill. I have said from the beginning that this bill that we are considering is not going anywhere and I will tell Members that if we strike out the money for the University of Oregon Health Sciences University, the former ranking minority member, who is now the chairman of that Committee on Appropriations, is going to take great umbrage and we will not get any consideration of getting this bill out of the Senate, which I think is probably just as well.

I am curious as to what masterful stroke of political acumen made the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER] decide to strike out the favored project over the last 15 years of the senior Senator from Oregon who chairs the Committee on Appropriations. Could the gentleman answer that?

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would yield for a response, these two projects were the only two projects that came out of this conference committee that were in neither the House bill nor the Senate bill, and that is why they were selected.

Mr. BROWN of California. Well, Mr. Chairman, the concluding point I will make is that I have looked at the bill, there are about three pages of other earmarks, as was pointed out earlier. My objection to the provisions here, and my reason for supporting the amendment of the gentlewoman from Oregon [Ms. FURSE] is that out of about 20, the gentleman has selected two, for one reason or another, and I was trying to elicit what those reasons were.

I would say, for lack of equal application of the gentleman's zeal, that we ought not to go ahead with these two.

There is a third paragraph here which is so defective that the Committee on Rules struck it out. The gentleman should have asked them to strike out these two earmarked positions as well and he would have a much better bill.

I have mixed emotions in saying this, because the bill is very bad. I hope it gets worse and that will guarantee it will not get anywhere, but I think this has been a most enlightening debate and it has been a pleasure to participate in it with the gentleman.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I include four pages for the RECORD regarding earmarks in the House and Senate energy and water 1995 appropriations bill.

EARMARKS IN HOUSE AND SENATE ENERGY AND WATER 1995 APPROPRIATIONS BILL

Location/section	Description	House	Senate
Corp. of Engineers, pp. H18 and S12	* * * has provided $300,000 for the Corps of Engineers to proceed with detailed design and plans and specifications, including detailed cost estimates, for certain elements of the master plan of the multipurpose Indiana University South Bend, St. Joseph River, Indiana, project * * *. The Committee expects the Corps to continue to conduct this work in close cooperation with Indiana University South Bend.	$300,000.00	$300,000.00
Pp. H19 and S22	* * * has included $300,000 for continuation of the Construction Technology Transfer Project between the Corps of Engineers research institutions and Indiana State University.	300,000.00	0
Corps of Engineers, p. S22	* * * Committee has included an additional $2,000,000 for R&D activities related to zebra mussel control		[1] 2,000,000.00
Corp. of Engineers, Aquatic Plant Control Program, p. H28.	* * * directs that $1,000,000 of these additional funds be used to increase the research effort at the Corps of Engineers waterways Experiment Station * * * for cooperative research to be conducted primarily by the University of Miami, Florida.	1,000,000.00	1,000,000.00
Corp. of Engineers, Oil Spill Research p. S58.	In accordance with section 7001(c)(10) of the act [Oil Pollution Act of 1990], the Committee has added $275,000 * * * to establish cooperative agreements with research institutions located in the northern gulf coast region to conduct essential research in oilspill remediation and restoration.		275,000.00
Dept. of Energy/Electric Energy Systems and Storage, p. H71.	* * * has included $600,000 to support the ongoing and productive research at the Florida Solar Energy Center	600,000.00	600,000.00
DOE/Biological & Environmental Research, pp. H72 and S85.	* * * provides $1,000,000 to make one grant to continue research and develop technology for commercial exploitation in the disposal of infectious hospital waste through electron beam sterilization at a public, urban teaching hospital affiliated with a comprehensive medical school and research center with an active electron beam program and documentable experience in operating a functional machine.	1,000,000.00	1,000,000.00
DOE/Biological & Environmental Research, p. S86.	* * * Committee recommends an appropriation of $5,000,000 to assist the University of Nebraska Medical Center in the development of its transplant center * * *.		5,000,000.00
	Positron emission tomograph (PET) * * * Committee directs the Department to undertake a cooperative project to develop and test this concept in a medical setting * * * and has provided funding for this purpose.		Unspecified
	* * * Committee has included $5,000,000 for the second phase of the Biomedical Information Center (BIC) at the Oregon Health Sciences University		5,000,000.00
DOE/Supporting Research and Technical Analysis, pp. H75 and S90.	* * * to continue the Midwest Superconductivity Consortium. The Consortium is directed to continue using a competitive review process to identify and fund university research * * *.	3,200,000.00	3,700,000.00
DOE/Supporting Research and Technical Analysis, p. H76.	* * * is supportive of the work done at Florida State University's Super Computations Research Institute * * * recommendation includes $5,900,000 to continue the Super Computations Research Institute.	5,900,000.00	
DOE/Supporting Research and Technical Analysis, pp. H76 and S91.	* * * Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory, the Ana G. Mendez Educational Foundation and Jackson State University have enjoyed a productive relationship intended to enhance computer science and scientific research at all three institutions * * * directs the Department to continue the program, and provides $4,000,000 to maintain and support this relationship.	4,000,000.00	4,000,000.00
DOE/Supporting Research and Technical Analysis, p. S90.	* * * Committee recommendation provides $500,000 to continue the partnership begun in 1992 with Lawrence Livermore and Sandia National Laboratories, Southern University, and other institutions of higher education to support the Louisiana systemic initiative * * * to increase representation of minorities and women in science, math technology, engineering and related disciplines.		500,000.00
DOE/Supporting Research and Technical Analysis, p. S91.	* * * urges the Department to fund nonprofit optics consortia to coordinate research and development activity between the private sector, university researchers, and the Government * * *.		Unspecified
DOE/Supporting Research and Technical Analysis, p. S91.	* * * an additional $5,000,000 under university and science education programs to establish the Center for Minorities in Science, Engineering, and Technology at existing facilities at Southern University and A&M College System in Baton Rouge, LA.		5,000,000.00
DOE/Environmental Restoration and Waste Management, p. H77.	From within available funds, the Committee recommendation is to continue the support of the existing University Research Program in Robotics at the level of fiscal year 1994 of $4,000,000.	4,000,000.00	
Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management, p. S134.	* * * the Department is presently considering a proposal to establish the International Center for Groundwater Remediation Design. The Center is an outgrowth of the partnership between Lawrence Livermore Lab and the University of Vermont * * *. The Committee encourages the Department to support this university/national laboratory consortia * * *.		Unspecified
Cong. Record, 6/30/94, p. S8033	* * * within funds available for hydrogen research, $250,000 shall be made available to an institution [University of Oklahoma] where expertise in electrochemical (fuel cells), thermochemical and photochemical reactions for hydrogen production may be synergistically studied and the application to gas storage and alternate vehicle technology may be integrated.		250,000.00
Grand totals		20,300,000.00	26,625,000.00

[1] Although included on this list, Senate report provides no cue as to where research will be conducted. The $2,000,000 for this earmark is not included in Senate grand total amount.

Note: Page references with H=House report; S=Senate report.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Oregon [Ms. FURSE].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KLECZKA

Mr. KLECZKA. 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. KLECZKA: Page 90, lines 17 through 19, strike '', including'' and all that follows through ''Energy Research''.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Chairman, a short time ago the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], chairman of the committee, indicated that the time has come that we have to stop earmarking, and in an effort to continue the ware against earmarking, this amendment does exactly that.

I direct the attention of the Members to page 90 of the authorization bill before us where we do authorize funds for various programs in the fossil fuel energy program. If the Members look down to the coal technology, up pops off the page one big fat earmark, and if I might read the portion that deals with the authorization for oil technology, it indicates an amount of $43,234,000 for operating; however, it adds including maintaining programs of the National Institute of Petroleum and Energy Research.

Mr. Chairman, the reason I raise this point is because the House spoke a few months ago on the appropriations bill whereby a vote of 251 to 160 this earmark was deleted. My information is that the committee will accept this amendment and I will yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, the committee will accept this amendment.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] and ask if he also concurs?

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, since it has met my ironclad test of what constitutes a good amendment, mainly satisfying the Republicans, I am happy to accept it.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] for accepting this ironclad amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLECZKA].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WARD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word in order to engage the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] in a colloquy.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman taking the time to talk with me about my concerns over report language in this bill that serves to prioritize research and development programs for the Department of Energy, in particular requiring $1 million to be spent on research in the area of sonoluminescence.

Mr. Chairman, I offered an amendment to the energy and water appropriations bill to strike that funding. The amendment was passed by a vote of 276 to 141. I believe there is widespread support for allowing the Department of Energy, and other departments, for that matter, and their scientists and administrators, to make the decisions on what research and development projects to fund, and that Congress should not attempt to micromanage these issues.

Mr. Chairman, I know the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] shares my respect for the importance of research and development programs but especially in the area of basic energy sciences. That is why I seek his assurance that the report language would not be binding, in that the Department of Energy would not be required to spend $1 million on sonoluminescence research.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would yield, the gentleman is correct that the Committee on Science believes the research into sonoluminescence is worthy of support. We hope the Department of Energy will agree. Scientists at Lawrence Livermore believe the effect of sound waves in water holds promise for a number of

applications, however, the report language would not be binding and the Department of Energy would be free to spend its research dollars as it sees fit.

Mr. WARD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman very much for his assistance.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title III?

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to engage my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], the Chair of the Committee on Science, in a colloquy regarding H.R. 2405.

Specifically, I rise to inquire about section 303(b)(2) of H.R. 2405, the Omnibus Science Authorization Act of 1995, which authorizes funds for the Department of Energy nuclear physics program. I would also like to applaud the gentleman for his leadership role in funding this program.

It is my understanding that $316,873,000 is authorized to be appropriated for nuclear physics for fiscal year 1996, of which $239,773,000 is designated for operating in capital equipment. Of these dollars, I understand that it is the intention of the Committee on Science to support the university-based accelerators under the nuclear physics account within the funds available. Furthermore, I understand that it is the intention of the committee to support the William H. Bates Linear Accelerator Center, named after former Congressman Bill Bates, and located in Middleton, MA, again within available funds; is this correct?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would yield, the gentleman is corrected that university-based accelerators are crucial to the further scientific exploration of the nuclear physics field in the United States. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TORKILDSEN] for bringing up this important point for clarification.

Mr. TORKILDSEN. Mr. Chairman, again I applaud the chairman for his leadership role and thank him for his clarification.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further 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 1995''.

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, $472,338,000 for fiscal year 1996. 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.—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, $79,034,000 for fiscal year 1996. Such duties include the development, acquisition, and implementation of major public warning and forecast systems. 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—

(1) 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

(2) it is to be used only for spare parts, not as an installation at a particular site.

(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), $16,952,000 for fiscal year 1996 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 AUTHORIZATION.—Of the sums authorized in subsection (b), there are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary $52,097,000 for fiscal year 1996, to remain available until expended, for—

(1) the acquisition and deployment of the Advanced Weather Interactive Processing System and NOAA Port and associated activities; and

(2) associated program management and operations and maintenance.

(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, $20,628,000 for fiscal year 1996. 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.—(1) There is 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, $8,757,000 for fiscal year 1996. Such duties include internannual and seasonal climate research and long-term climate and air quality research.

(2) The Administrator shall ensure that at least the same percentage of the climate and air quality research funds that were provided to institutions of higher education for fiscal year 1995 is provided to institutions of higher education from funds authorized by this subsection.

(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, $39,894,000 for fiscal year 1996. Such duties include research for developing improved prediction capabilities for atmospheric processes, as well as solar-terrestrial research and services.

(c) GLOBE AUTHORIZATION.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to enable the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to carry out the Global Learning and Observations to Benefit the Environment program, $7,000,000 for fiscal year 1996.

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, $319,448,000 for fiscal year 1996, 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 $184,425,000 for fiscal year 1996, to remain available until expended, for the procurement of Polar Orbiting Environmental

Satellites, K, L, M, N, and N[1], and the procurement of the launching and supporting ground systems of such satellites.

(c) GEOSTATIONARY OPERATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL SATELLITES.—Of the sums authorized in subsection (a), there are authorized to be appropriated to the Administrator $46,300,000 for fiscal year 1996, to remain available until expended—

(1) to procure up to three additional Geostationary Operational Environmental NEXT Satellites (GOES I–M clones) and instruments; and

(2) for contracts, and amendments or modifications of contracts, with the developer of previous GOES-NEXT satellites for the acquisition of the additional satellites and instruments described in paragraph (1).

(d) 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, $35,665,000 for fiscal year 1996. Such duties include climate data services, geophysical data services, and environmental assessment and information services.

(e) 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 1996, $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.

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, $29,149,000.

(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, $19,927,000 for fiscal year 1996.

(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, $11,279,000 for fiscal year 1996.

(2) CIRCULATORY SURVEY 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 Circulatory Survey Program, $695,000 for fiscal year 1996.

(3) 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, $4,231,000 for fiscal year 1996.

(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, $1,171,000 for fiscal year 1996.

(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, $8,401,000 for fiscal year 1996.

(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, $585,000 for fiscal year 1996.

(4) COASTAL OCEAN 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 Coastal Ocean Program, $9,158,000 for fiscal year 1996.

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, $13,763,000 for fiscal year 1996.

(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 1996.''.

(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 1996''.

(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''.

SEC. 423. USE OF OCEAN RESEARCH RESOURCES OF OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds the following:

(1) Observing, monitoring, and predicting the ocean environment has been a high priority for the defense community to support ocean operations.

(2) Many advances in ocean research have been made by the defense community which could be shared with civilian researchers.

(3) The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's missions to describe and predict the ocean environment, manage the Nation's ocean and coastal resources, and promote stewardship of the world's oceans would benefit from increased cooperation with defense agencies.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration should expand its efforts to develop interagency agreements to further the use of defense-related technologies, data, and other resources to support its oceanic missions.

(c) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Commerce 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 on the feasibility of expanding the use of defense-related technologies, data, and other resources to support and enhance the oceanic missions of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

(2) CONTENTS.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall include—

(A) a detailed listing of defense-related resources currently available to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration missions which utilize those resources;

(B) detailed findings and recommendations, including funding requirements, on the potential for expanding the use of available defense-related resources;

(C) a detailed listing and funding history of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration resources, including data and technology, which could be supplemented by defense-related resources;

(D) a listing of currently unavailable defense-related resources, including data and technology, which if made available would enhance the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration mission performance;

(E) recommendations on the regulatory and legislative structures needed to maximize the use of defense-related resources;

(F) an assessment of the respective roles in the use of defense-related resources of the Army Corps of Engineers, data centers, operational centers, and research facilities of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration; and

(G) recommendations on how to provide access to relevant defense-related data for non-Federal scientific users.

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, $20,632,000 for fiscal year 1996.

(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, $30,000,000 for fiscal year 1996.

(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 1996.

(d) MARINE SERVICES.—

(1) CONTRACTING AUTHORITY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary is authorized to enter into contracts for data or days-at-sea to fulfill the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration missions of marine research, climate research, fisheries research, and mapping and charting services.

(2) UNOLS VESSEL AGREEMENTS.—In fulfilling the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration mission requirements described in paragraph (1), the Secretary shall use excess capacity of University-National Oceanographic Laboratory System vessels where appropriate, and may enter into memoranda of agreement with operators of those vessels to carry out those mission requirements.

(3) 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, including activities described in paragraphs (1) and (2), $60,689,000 for fiscal year 1996.

(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, $9,548,000 for fiscal year 1996.

(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, $7,374,000 for fiscal year 1996.

Subtitle D—Streamlining of Operations

SEC. 441. PROGRAM TERMINATIONS.

(a) TERMINATIONS.—No funds may 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) The Southeast United States Caribbean Fisheries Oceanographic Coordinated Investigations Program.

(8) National Institute for Environmental Renewal.

(9) The Lake Champlain Study.

(10) The Maine Marine Research Center.

(11) The South Carolina Cooperative Geodetic Survey Account.

(12) Pacific Island Technical Assistance.

(13) Sea Grant/Oyster Disease Account.

(14) National Coastal Research and Development Institute Account.

(15) VENTS program.

(16) National Weather Service non-Federal, non-wildfire Fire Weather Service.

(17) National Weather Service Regional Climate Centers.

(18) National Weather Service Samoa Weather Forecast Office Repair and Upgrade Account.

(19) Dissemination of Weather Charts (Marine Facsimile Service).

(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, 1995.

(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) SUBSEQUENT FISCAL YEARS.—No sums are authorized to be appropriated for any fiscal year after fiscal year 1996 for the activities for which sums are authorized by this title unless such sums are specifically authorized to be appropriated by Act of Congress with respect to such fiscal year.

(b) FISCAL YEAR 1996.—No more than $1,692,470,000 is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary for fiscal year 1996, by this Act or any other Act, to enable the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to carry out all activities associated with Operations, Research, and Facilities.

(c) 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. REDUCTION IN THE COMMISSIONED OFFICER CORPS.

(a) MAXIMUM NUMBER.—The total number of commissioned officers on the active list of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration shall not exceed—

(1) 369 for fiscal year 1996;

(2) 100 for fiscal year 1997; and

(3) 50 for fiscal year 1998.

No such commissioned officers are authorized for any fiscal year after fiscal year 1998.

(b) SEPARATION PAY.—The Secretary may separate commissioned officers from the active list of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and may do so without providing separation pay.

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. REIMBURSEMENT OF EXPENSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 3302 (b) and (c) of title 31, United States Code, and subject to subsection (b) of this section, all amounts received by the United States in settlement of, or judgment for, damage claims arising from the October 9, 1992, allision of the vessel ZACHERY into the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration research vessel DISCOVERER—

(1) shall be retained as an offsetting collection in the Marine Services account of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration;

(2) shall be deposited in that account upon receipt by the United States Government; and

(3) shall be available only for obligation for National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration vessel repairs.

(b) LIMITATION.—Not more than $518,757.09 of the amounts referred to in subsection (a) may be deposited into the Marine Services account pursuant to subsection (a).

SEC. 454. ELIGIBILITY FOR AWARDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall exclude from consideration for awards of financial assistance made by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration after fiscal year 1995 any person who received funds, other than those described in subsection (b), appropriated for a fiscal year after fiscal year 1995, 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.

SEC. 455. PROHIBITION OF LOBBYING ACTIVITIES.

None of the funds authorized by this title 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. 456. REPORT ON LABORATORIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall conduct a review of the laboratories operated by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and submit a report to the Committee on Science of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—The report required by subsection (a) shall—

(1) address potential efficiencies and savings which could be achieved through closing or consolidating laboratory facilities;

(2) review each laboratory's—

(A) mission and activities and their correlation to the mission priorities of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration;

(B) physical assets, equipment, condition, and personnel resources; and

(C) organization and program management; and

(3) address other issues the Inspector General considers relevant.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there amendments to title IV?

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. LAHOOD] having assumed the chair, Mr. KINGSTON, 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. 2405) to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1996 and 1997 for civilian science activities of the Federal Government, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

□ 1845

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2405 the bill just considered.

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

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION BIENNIAL REPORT ON HAZARDOUS MATERIALS TRANSPORTATION, CALENDAR YEARS 1992–1993—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with Public Law 103–272, as amended (49 U.S.C. 5121(e)), I transmit herewith the Biennial Report on Hazardous Materials Transportation for Calendar Years 1992–1993 of the Department of Transportation.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 11, 1995.*

ELECTION OF MEMBER TO COMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC AND EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 236) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

HOUSE RESOLUTION 236

Resolved, That the following named Member be, and is hereby, elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

To the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities: the following Member: CHAKA FATTAH of Pennsylvania.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The Speaker pro tempore. 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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HORN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. HORN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

TRIBUTE TO JIM KENNELLY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GEJDENSON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today first as a senior member of the Connecticut delegation to give our condolences to a colleague, the gentlewoman from Connecticut, BARBARA KENNELLY, who lost her husband this weekend.

Jim Kennelly was my speaker when I was first elected to the State House in 1975. Speaker Kennelly was one of the individuals that every Member, Republican and Democrat, respected for his incredible knowledge of the rules of the House. In every legislative opportunity, Speaker Kennelly really showed his brilliance. As a legislator, he was second to no one. He held such a commanding presence on legislative matters in the State House.

Mr. Speaker, I think that of all those 151 Members that served those two sessions that I served in the Connecticut General Assembly with Speaker Kennelly, it was clear he was felt to be the most brilliant Member of the body, the most dedicated public servant working late into the night.

We are going to miss Jim, and we obviously feel for our colleague and friend, BARBARA KENNELLY. I have known the Kennelly's now for in the range of 20, 25 years. The intensity of political life is such that it bonds you in a way that almost no other experience except for war may do to individuals. And for Democrats and Republicans alike, as we have tremendous battles over substantive issues, our feelings for our families and for our friendship is that much more intense. I will miss Jim Kennelly, and I pain for my colleague and friend, BARBARA KENNELLY.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEJDENSON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Connecticut.

Both Sam and I served in the Connecticut State Legislature when Jim was Speaker of the House of Representatives. While Sam served directly under him, I felt his influence in the upper chamber. Jim Kennelly was probably as brilliant a legislative mind as any State has enjoyed. But not only was he a fine legislator, he was an extremely able politician in the best sense of that word.

He really did listen to the concerns of people from different parts of the State with different difficulties, different problems, and, kind of in the tradition of Tip O'Neill, he led in the best sense of that word. The gift that the gave to Connecticut during his years of political involvement, though naturally we did not all agree, was a gift that every single citizen enjoyed with or without their direct knowledge.

As we join on the floor here tonight to remember Jim Kennelly, I would like to comment on my heartfelt sympathy for BARBARA, his extremely able wife and our colleague, for she has served Jim and her family, this Congress and her constituency and our Nation with extraordinary ability. They were a close couple, a strong family, the best kind of model both of public servants and capable leaders that America is capable of producing.

I join you in paying tribute to Jim Kennelly, an outstanding political leader and a special person in the hearts of every Member of the Connecticut constituency.

Mr. GEJDENSON. I would like to thank the gentleman from Utah, Mr. HANSEN, who has agreed to wait a couple extra minutes so that we can complete our respect and concern for BARBARA.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO].

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues, SAM GEJDENSON and NANCY JOHNSON, and I wish we did not have to take the floor this evening for this sad occasion. Connecticut truly today did lose one of its finest public servants in Jim Kennelly. My colleague, our colleague, BARBARA KENNELLY, lost so much more today, and we extend to BARBARA and to her family and to her children our heartfelt sympathy. Our thoughts and our prayers are with the Kennelly family.

We pay tribute to a man who was truly a powerhouse, an unbelievable legislator in his own right, and as well a political spouse. There were none better in that role. It was 1959 that Jim and BARBARA were married, and they became a political power couple in the State of Connecticut. Jim was a rising star. BARBARA was heir to one of Connecticut's most famous political dynasties.

Together they shared the dream and, as our NANCY JOHNSON just said, they were a wonderful couple. They were a political couple. They were a caring couple. They cared about what happened to people in the State of Connecticut and all over this country.