The Assistant Secretary of Defense concurred with the IG's findings. He promised corrective action in the areas of budgeting, management, acquisition and oversight. The administration disagreed, however, with the IG's recommendation that unauthorized services be stopped. This sole remaining area of disagreement is the subject of the Spence amendment.

The Spence WHCA amendment simply reaffirms the Agency's traditional role by limiting its use of DOD appropriations to providing telecommunications support to the President, the Vice President, and others specified by the President. Adoption of the amendment will refocus WHCA's mission and prohibit the improper funding of nontelecommunications activities through Defense dollars. Those activities will be returned to the White House for executive funding, management, and control.

While Chairman SPENCE, Subcommittee Chairman ZELIFF, and I had hoped to pursue this correction informally, we have been stymied by the administration's refusal to address the problem. The White House has even prohibited its witnesses from appearing at the oversight hearing which Mr. ZELIFF will chair on Thursday. Because the administration has rejected the inspector general's recommendation and refused to discuss informal correction, we have no choice but to proceed with the amendment.

I appreciate the gentleman's sponsorship of this small, but important reform, commend him on his work, and urge the amendment's adoption.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments en bloc, as modified, offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE].

The amendments en bloc, as modified, were agreed to.

Mr. SPENCE. 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. CHABOT) having assumed the chair, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, 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. 3230) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1997 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 1997, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 3230.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET TO FILE REPORT ON AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 1997

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Budget may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1997, and that it be in order on Wednesday, May 15, 1996, to consider that concurrent resolution under the following terms:

One, the Speaker may declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the concurrent resolution;

Two, the first reading of the concurrent resolution shall be dispensed with;

Three, all points of order against consideration of the concurrent resolution shall be waived;

Four, general debate shall be confined to the congressional budget and shall not exceed 3 hours, including 1 hour on the subject of economic goals and policies, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget;

Five, after general debate, the Committee shall rise without motion;

And six, no further consideration of the concurrent resolution shall be in order except pursuant to a subsequent order of the House.

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

There was no objection.

NOTIFICATION OF INTENT TO OFFER HOUSE RESOLUTION 303 RAISING A QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 4(C) of rule XI, I announce my intention to call up House Resolution 303 as a question of privilege. The resolution was reported on December 13, 1995.

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 Massachusetts [Mr. MEEHAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

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

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

THE AVIATION SAFETY PROTECTION ACT OF 1996

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

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I regret the crash of ValuJet flight 592 was the catalyst for renewed attention on airline safety. However, I hope that a productive dialog on the future safety of the aviation industry will result from this tragedy.

For me, a similar tragedy brought home the need for greater air safety measures. July 4th weekend, 1994, a USAir flight that originated in my hometown, of Columbia, SC, crashed just outside of Charlotte, NC. Several of my constituents were among the victims. That single event heightened my awareness of aviation safety concerns and prompted me to begin a search for solutions.

That search led me to the first step of what I believe is the long journey to restoring public confidence in air travel—the enactment of the Aviation Safety Protection Act of 1996 (H.R. 3187). I introduced this legislation on March 28 to provide whistle-blower protection for airline employees who supply information to the Federal Government relating to air safety.

The intent of this legislation is to encourage airline employees to become actively involved in the safety of airline passengers and to feel free to come forward if they believe that safety is being jeopardized due to negligence or oversight. The same job protections afforded to most of the work force should be extended to the airline industry, especially since lives are at stake.

Under the legislation, an employee who believes he or she has been fired or otherwise retaliated against for reporting air safety violations may file a complaint with the U.S. Secretary of Labor. If the employee's claim is found to be valid he or she would be entitled to reinstatement and compensatory damages.

On the other hand, if the Secretary of Labor determines that the complaint has been filed frivolously, the offending employee will be required to pay up to $5,000 of the employer's legal fees.

This is an issue of safety and fairness. The Aviation Safety Protection Act of 1996 will provide security for airline employees who may be afraid to report safety violations for fear of losing their jobs and the income they need to support their families.

In addition, the Federal Aviation Administration has recently recognized the need to require the same safety standards for commuter airlines as for major carriers. Commuter planes carry an estimated 60 million passengers annually. With the tremendous growth of

commuter flights in recent years, we must do everything we can to ensure the safety of those passengers.

Due to the growing competitiveness among airlines, the number of aircraft of all sizes that have entered the market is growing exponentially. At the same time, the limited FAA budget is already strapped. The Aviation Safety Protection Act would enable airline employees to aid the FAA in ensuring air travel remains safe without fear of reprisal.

The checkered safety record of ValuJet Airlines is just now coming to light. One can only wonder if this tragedy could have been prevented if an employee had come forward earlier to report safety concerns.

In light of this American tragedy, I urge Congress to expedite approval of the Aviation Safety Protection Act, so that we can begin to rebuild the public's confidence in our aviation industry.

□ 2115

ELIMINATING THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE IS NOT THE WAY TO GO

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CHABOT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, the bill that has been under consideration on the floor of the House for the past few hours has been dealing with the defense of our Nation, and no one in this Chamber would think of unilaterally disarming our country militarily. So why is it, then, that the Republican leadership now proposes to eliminate in the budget debates coming up during the next 2 days the Department of Commerce and so unilaterally disarm us economically? Because this Department of Commerce under, first, Secretary Ron Brown and now his successor, this Department of Commerce has been turned into an efficient juggernaut advancing U.S. interests here and abroad economically.

Mr. Speaker, if I were a business leader in this country, a small- or mid-size business leader particularly, but also a CEO of a large corporation, I would be very, very concerned about this move to take the one agency in the Federal Government that has become very effective at promoting U.S. commerce and jobs and exports and dismantling it and eliminating some of its functions and shipping some of the functions off to other agencies and departments where there is not a smooth fit.

For instance, what would be eliminated or phased out? The advanced technology program. Well, certainly we do not need technology in our economy, do we? The manufacturing extension partnerships is like the old agricultural extension program for rural areas. This is manufacturing extension, and it can be for rural areas but urban areas as well, particularly benefiting small-and mid-size businesses.

They would eliminate the U.S. Travel and Tourism Administration. Tourism is becoming one of the fastest growing industries in our country. The National Telecommunications and Information Administration. They would take the Economic Development Administration, which has been crucial in my State of West Virginia as well as every State in this country, they would take it and move it to the Small Business Administration, believing it would take only 25 employees to administer its many millions of dollars worth of grants.

The irony to this of course is the SBA, the Small Business Administration, and the EDA are not a compatible fit. The Small Business Administration deals with small business, and individual small businesses. The EDA, the Economic Development Administration, deals with the infrastructure that is necessary to help businesses grow. But it is not the same function at all.

Mr. Speaker, as I say, the business community should be greatly concerned. It should be greatly concerned at the idea that the International Trade Administration could be greatly phased down. For instance, it is estimated that half the State offices would have to be eliminated. It would reduce the support for the U.S. business community. It would terminate domestic services in one-half the States. It would lessen the ability to protect U.S. industries against unfair practices, such as dumping.

There are many, many areas of the Department of Commerce which would be, of course, either phased out or phased down or eliminated under this proposal.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to look at the achievements that the United States Department of Commerce, this department that is now sought to be eliminated over the next couple of days in the Republican leadership budget, I think it is very important to look at some of the accomplishments. Ron Brown was a heck of a leader for the United States and for the Department of Commerce. He created the first-ever national export strategy which brought $80 billion worth of business deals, that is right, deals, contracts signed, jobs created, on the bottom line. That is what the Department of Commerce has been doing these last 3 years.

He championed the role of civilian technology by entering into $1.5 billion of public-private partnerships, roughly a 50–50 split, 220 of these, to advance technology, increase the number of manufacturing extension centers in this country from 7 to 60. They benefit small- and mid-size businesses. U.S. merchandise exports went up 26 percent in 3 years, from 1993 to 1995.

He hosted the first-ever White House conference on travel and tourism. This is what you want a Department of Commerce to be doing. This is what you want a Government agency to be doing, to be working in public-private partnerships, to be bringing home the bacon, to be creating jobs, working with the private sector. That is what our Department of Commerce has been doing.

So, what is the solution? What is the answer? Well, the bean counters on the other side now say eliminate the Department of Commerce, eliminate the Economic Development Administration, which, with its $2.5 million of assistance to the Swearingen project in Martinsburg, WV, helped leverage $130 million of investment so that the first jet manufacturing center in this country in many, many years is under construction right now and will create 800 jobs, good-paying jobs, when it is created.

That is what the Department of Commerce can do and is doing across this country. Their answer? Eliminate it, phase it out, break it up, ship it off. We do not like coordinated approaches. We do not like efficiency. We do not like somebody going out and actually bringing home the business. That is what this is about.

Mr. Speaker, I understand the motivations; there are no bad motivations. It may be a philosophical difference. Maybe they do not like success. Maybe it is just that they think that Government should not be involved in this type of activity. Eliminating the Department of Commerce is not the way to go.

TRIBUTE TO FORMER CIA DIRECTOR WILLIAM COLBY

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

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to remind my colleagues and remind the American people of a great American, a spy who has come in from the cold, William Colby. Mr. Colby was memorialized today in a service that I had the honor of attending at the National Cathedral and sitting there among so many hundreds of family members, friends, world leaders, former colleagues of his and probably many average American citizens who had read about him in the newspaper, believed in what he had done, recognized him for the greatness that he embodied and simply came in and attended the memorial service.

As I sat there, I was reminded of the time that I have spent, that I have known Mr. Colby, first as a junior officer for several years during my tenure at the CIA. I had the honor of serving under him during the years that he served as DCI or Director of Central Intelligence. At the time I knew him probably simply by reputation as the boss, the man that headed the agency. I knew him by reputation for the long years of service that he had put in serving his country at the CIA and,