

Engel	Martinez	Pelosi
Fattah	McDermott	Rivers
Filner	McKinney	Roybal-Allard
Gutierrez	Meek (FL)	Rush
Hastings (FL)	Meeks (NY)	Scott
Hilliard	Menendez	Serrano
Hinchey	Miller, George	Stark
Jackson (IL)	Mink	Thompson (MS)
Kennedy	Nadler	Tierney
Kilpatrick	Obey	Velazquez
Kucinich	Olver	Vento
Lee	Owens	Waters
Lewis (GA)	Pastor	Watt (NC)
Markey	Payne	Woolsey

NOT VOTING—9

Lantos	Salmon	Smith (MI)
McCarthy (NY)	Saxton	Thompson (CA)
Nussle	Schakowsky	Udall (CO)

□ 1207

Messrs. HILLIARD, GUTIERREZ, MARTINEZ, CROWLEY, RUSH, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Ms. PELOSI changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. DEUTSCH changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 94, I was stuck in the No. 4 elevator in the Cannon House Office Building. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 94 on April 20, 1999, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I was absent for rollcall vote No. 94. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on the Conference Report to H.R. 800—the Education Flexibility Act.

EARTHQUAKE HAZARDS REDUCTION AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1999

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 142 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 142

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1184) to authorize appropriations for carrying out the Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act of 1977 for fiscal years 2000 and 2001, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. Points of order against consideration of the bill for failure to comply with clause 4(a) of rule XIII are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Science. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Science now

printed in the bill. Each section of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of the rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. The chairman of the Committee of the Whole may: (1) postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment; and (2) reduce to five minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any postponed question that follows another electronic vote without intervening business, provided that the minimum time for electronic voting on the first in any series of questions shall be 15 minutes. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EWING). The gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Dayton, Ohio (Mr. HALL), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded will be for the purposes of debate only.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 142 is an open rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 1184, the Earthquake Hazards Reduction Authorization Act of 1999.

The purpose of the bill is to reauthorize the Federal government's earthquake research and hazard mitigation programs. The rule provides for the customary 1 hour general debate, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Science.

The rule waives clause 4(a) of rule XIII requiring a 3-day layover of the committee report against consideration of the bill because the report could not be filed in the House until 2 days ago.

The rule makes in order the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Science as an original bill for the purpose of amendment which will be open to amendment by section. The rule further encourages priority recognition of Members who preprinted their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and allows the Chair to postpone votes.

Mr. Speaker, in my State of California and in too many other regions of the United States, earthquakes are a

fact of life. They are something we accept and work through. Thankfully, most are not devastating occurrences. We clean up, rather than rebuild. However, we cannot overlook the fact that the average annual cost from earthquakes in the United States is about \$4.4 billion. Of course, the toll imposed by a major earthquake can be much greater.

In California, we have suffered two major quakes in the past decade. In 1999, the Loma Prieta earthquake in the San Francisco area cost \$6 billion, and then in 1994 in Los Angeles what was known as the Northridge earthquake, which I felt and was horrible, cost \$40 billion. Of course, major earthquakes cost a lot more than dollars and cents.

In both cases, both of those earthquakes in California in the last decade, the Loma Prieta and the Northridge quakes, people were killed and lives were very, very disrupted. An earthquake can wreak havoc on a community. During the 1987 earthquake in Whittier, an area that I used to represent, I saw firsthand how unreinforced buildings can fail.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to have the attention of my California colleagues who are in the back, and I know this is of great importance to them.

During that 1987 earthquake in Whittier, I saw how unreinforced buildings can fail. I saw how faults can act in a random manner and cause complete devastation to one block while leaving untouched another block that is right nearby.

□ 1215

Mr. Speaker, the Boy Scout motto is "Be Prepared." This legislation is crafted in that spirit. H.R. 1184 authorizes the National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program, the Advanced National Seismic Research and Monitoring System, and the Network for Earthquake Engineering Simulation. These programs will modernize the existing seismic network, which is both outdated and disjointed, and interconnect earthquake engineering research facilities.

We all know that we cannot stop earthquakes from happening. However, we can plan for them and improve our readiness. We can improve our detection and warning systems and build roads and buildings to better serve so that we can survive them. In short, we can be better prepared. This bipartisan legislation clearly moves us in that direction.

I would like to commend the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), chairman of the Committee on Science, the members of his committee for their efforts.

The payoff will be in lives saved, homes and businesses protected, and communities preserved. We cannot afford to do anything less for the people of California or the 39 other States that are inclined towards earthquakes.

Therefore, I urge my colleagues to support both this open rule and the underlying bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the chairman of the Committee on Rules, for yielding me the time.

This is an open rule. It will allow full and fair debate on H.R. 1184. As the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) has described, this rule provides for 1 hour of general debate to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Science.

The rule permits amendments under the 5-minute rule, which is the normal amendment process in the House. All Members on both sides of the aisle will have the opportunity to offer germane amendments.

According to the National Earthquake Information Center, about 12,000 to 14,000 earthquakes take place each year. That is 35 each day. Of these, we can expect about 18 major earthquakes in a year.

Earthquakes can cause enormous loss of life, injury, and destruction. They can occur almost anywhere at any time. They cannot be prevented. However, damage, destruction, and loss of life can be significantly reduced if we are prepared.

That is why this bill is important. This bill establishes a system to organize earthquake monitoring systems in the United States. It makes other improvements to help our Nation plan for earthquakes. It authorizes funds for the existing Federal programs that study and provide information about earthquakes.

The rule waives the requirement for a 3-day layover of the committee report. This is necessary because the report was not filed until Monday. The purpose of the requirement is to give adequate time to all Members before a bill comes to the House floor. Because of the bipartisan support and the uncontroversial nature of the bill, waiving the requirement is appropriate in this case. However, I hope that waiving this rule does not become routine.

This is an open rule. It was adopted unanimously by the Committee on Rules. I urge adoption of the rule.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I do not have any requests for time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that I mentioned the very distinguished chairman of the Committee on Science, and I am very pleased that this will be very ably handled on the minority side by my very good friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. BROWN), who has been intimately involved in these issues and has probably suffered through a number of earthquakes himself.

I look forward to seeing bipartisan movement on this very important measure, and I would like to congratulate the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) who has done a great deal of work on this.

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

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, as I said, I urge support for both the rule and the bill itself.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EWING). Pursuant to House Resolution 142 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1184.

The Chair designates the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD) as chairman of the Committee of the Whole, and requests the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) to assume the chair temporarily.

□ 1220

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1184) to authorize appropriations for carrying out the Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act of 1977 for fiscal years 2000 and 2001, and for other purposes, with Mr. SESSIONS (Chairman pro tempore) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Under the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER).

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I come before the House today to urge its support for H.R. 1184, the Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act of 1999.

Mr. Chairman, it is a common complaint that we cannot control the weather, neither can we control earthquakes, nor after years of effort can we even forecast them with any confidence. But we can prepare for them, and that is the main purpose of the National Earthquake Hazard Reduction Program, known as NEHRP.

According to the U.S. Geological Survey, 39 States are subject to serious earthquake risk, and 75 million people live in urban areas with moderate to high earthquake risk. The Federal

Emergency Management Agency estimates the annual loss resulting from earthquakes is \$4.4 billion. The Northridge earthquake of 1994 alone resulted in damages of \$40 billion.

Still, to date we have been fortunate that an earthquake with the destructive force of the Tangshan, China event of 1976 or the Kobe, Japan event of 1995 has not struck a large U.S. city. But if history is any guide, the U.S. will be hit by violent shocks sometime in the not too distant future. Indeed, major earthquakes have been recorded throughout our Nation's history: in southern Missouri in 1811 and 1812, southern California in 1857, Hawaii in 1868, South Carolina in 1886, Alaska in 1899, and northern California in 1906.

The same geologic processes that led to these cataclysmic events are still at work today. That we know. What we do not know is when and where these forces will be unleashed.

Earthquakes may be inevitable, but catastrophic losses of life and property need not be if we use science to help communities prepare. The provisions in H.R. 1184 do just that.

Four agencies participate in NEHRP: the Federal Emergency Management Agency, the U.S. Geological Survey, the National Science Foundation, and the National Institute of Standards and Technology.

For fiscal year 2000, H.R. 1184 authorizes \$99.6 million for the base activities in these agencies, including specific authorizations for the U.S. Geological Survey for the Global Seismic Network, the Real-Time Seismic Warning System pilot program, external research, and an advisory committee. For fiscal year 2001, the bill authorizes \$102.6 million for these base earthquake programs, an increase of 3 percent.

In addition, H.R. 1184 includes multiyear authorizations for two new projects, each of which grew out of congressional direction in the last NEHRP bill. The Advanced National Seismic Research and Monitoring System will update the Nation's existing seismic monitoring network, which is based on 30-year-old technology.

The bill authorizes \$170.8 million over 5 years for the U.S. Geological Survey for equipment, and a further \$14.8 million over 2 years for the incremental costs of system operation.

The Network for Earthquake Engineering Simulation will link more than 30 earthquake engineering research facilities and upgrade and expand major earthquake testing facilities. H.R. 1184 provides the National Science Foundation with a 5-year authorization totaling \$81.8 million for this program.

Finally, the bill authorizes a Scientific Earthquake Studies Advisory Committee at the U.S. Geological Survey, requires greater interagency coordination in formulating the Program's budget, requests a report on how the Program meets the needs of at-risk populations, and repeals obsolete provisions of the statute.

With earthquakes, it is not a question of if, but when the next one will

strike. Through its emphasis on monitoring, research, and mitigation, H.R. 1184 will help the Nation prepare for the inevitable and save lives and property.

I would like to thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Basic Research, for drafting such a fine bill; the gentleman from California (Mr. BROWN), the minority ranking member of the Committee on Science, for his continued support of the program; and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) for her valued input in the consideration of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 1184 represents the sensible, long-term investment that will pay for itself many times over and save lives and reduce property costs. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Chairman, I insert the following for the RECORD:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE,
Washington, DC, April 20, 1999.

Hon. DON YOUNG,
Chairman, Committee on Resources,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter of April 16, regarding H.R. 1184, the Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act of 1999.

I understand that your waiver of Resources Committee jurisdiction should not be construed to affect any future referrals of bills dealing with the same subject matter. I also will support the Resources Committee request to be represented on any conference on H.R. 1184 or related bill.

H.R. 1184 is scheduled for Floor consideration on April 21 and I will include this letter as part of the floor proceedings.

I, as well as my staff, look forward to working with you if H.R. 1184 should go to conference and also, collaborating with you on any legislation on which we may share jurisdiction in the future.

Sincerely,

F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR.,
Chairman.

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

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1184, the reauthorization of the National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program, NEHRP. It has been over 20 years since the Congress first authorized the Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act; and, during the intervening two decades, the program has made tremendous strides in combating these natural disasters.

We now have maps that inform engineers, architects, and builders of seismic hazards, model building codes, and greater understanding of the science of earthquake hazards and the response of buildings to seismic movement.

In practical terms, federally funded research in geosciences, social sciences, and engineering has saved countless lives, in addition to saving personal property and critical infrastructures. I am certain that with continued support we can make even greater strides in the innovative areas that FEMA, the U.S. Geological Sur-

vey, the National Seismic Foundation, and NIST are currently exploring.

Advances such as early warning of seismic events, more structurally sound buildings, regional analysis of seismic risk, mobile research centers, and widespread use of the Internet and our other telecommunication capabilities are going to make marked reductions in the impacts of not just earthquakes, but almost all natural and man-made disasters.

But the story does not end there. While our increased understanding of earthquake kinematics and the mitigation procedures proves that we have made progress, there are still challenges we must face and assessments that must be made periodically to make sure that we are doing everything that we can to ensure the safety and security of the American people.

There are still earthquake-prone communities that have not adopted appropriate building codes. Monitoring in earthquake-prone areas is still done with less than state-of-the-art equipment, and disparities in earthquake losses due to age and socioeconomic status and physical limitations still exist.

For these reasons and more, the earthquake programs must continue to evolve to address these new challenges.

□ 1230

I feel that the bill before us today will help us meet these new needs.

In addition to authorizing increased funding for these base NEHRP programs, the bill authorizes the Network for Earthquake Engineering Simulation, an effort by the National Science Foundation to modernize earthquake engineering research facilities; the Advanced Seismic Research and Monitoring System, which will enable the Geological Survey to upgrade and expand our seismic monitoring networks to reflect the needs across the Nation, and a study on elements of NEHRP that address the needs of at-risk populations.

Today's bill will not solve all of these challenges that remain, but it will move us in the right direction.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, let me say that while natural disasters are inevitable, the extent of the damage is not. We must attack the problem from all sides with renewed efforts to implement seismically safe building standards, to increase our pool of data on natural disasters, to respond rapidly to disasters when they strike, and, in general, to understand the risks associated with earthquakes in whatever form they may manifest themselves.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER); the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH), our subcommittee chair, for their work; and certainly our leader, the gentleman from California (Mr. BROWN).

I also note that this bill is the product of a bipartisan effort, and I urge passage of this bill, Mr. Chairman.

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

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and also thank him for his leadership on this legislation; of course, along with the gentleman from California (Mr. BROWN) and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON).

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 1184 is legislation to reauthorize what is called the National Earthquake Hazard Reduction Program, NEHRP. It is a bill I am pleased to sponsor on behalf of the Committee on Science.

The National Earthquake Hazard Reduction Program, this NEHRP, has long enjoyed strong bipartisan support in the Committee on Science. The primary purpose of NEHRP is simple: To save lives and to reduce property damage. But while the goal may be stated simply, getting a grip on this problem of earthquakes poses a greater dilemma.

Since its inception in 1977, NEHRP has done a credible job of contributing to our store of knowledge about the causes and effects of earthquakes, and it has reduced our vulnerability to them through engineering research and new building designs. The program's monitoring component also holds the promise of providing real-time warning to citizens and a wealth of data to researchers.

Indeed, improving earthquake warning by just a few seconds can mean the difference between life and death. It can mean those few seconds where we might send a signal to shut off the gas going through gas mains and many other areas which can significantly reduce the damage of earthquakes.

The National Earthquake Hazard Reduction Program also has an international and humanitarian aspect. Because of the almost tens of thousands of earthquakes around the world, all of these countries look to our research and information to help reduce their damage to property and save lives. Many countries around the world continually monitor and use the information that will develop through the authorization in this bill.

The advanced national seismic research and monitoring system, authorized in this bill, is important. Not only will it improve warning times, but the data it collects will provide researchers with information that will lead to safer buildings and designs and a greater understanding of how earthquakes propagate.

The periodic nature of earthquakes can often lead to complacency. Probably that is human nature. But that kind of complacency can carry great risk. Let me just hold up this map a minute, Mr. Chairman, to give my colleagues an idea. If we can see sort out the dark images of little spots across this globe, tens of thousands of earthquakes happen every year. In fact, in

the United States last year there were over 1,000 earthquakes. Some modest, some very severe.

Certainly the earthquake that struck Kobe, Japan in early 1995 caused nearly 6,000 deaths and over \$100 billion in damages. And of course, more recently, the tragedy in Armenia, Colombia, in which well over 1,000 people lost their lives I think are stern reminders of the destructive power of earthquakes. The Loma Prieta earthquake caused \$6 billion in damage, Northridge earthquake caused \$40 billion in damages, and provide, I think, a glimpse of what could happen here if we are not adequately prepared.

As the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), noted in his statement, 39 States in this country are exposed to a significant earthquake risk, and about 75 million people live in urban areas with a moderate to high earthquake risk. Thankfully, in my home State of Michigan, earthquakes are very rare, but even Michigan is vulnerable to earthquakes.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I would again certainly like to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), the chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. BROWN), and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON), the ranking member of our Subcommittee on Basic Research of the Committee on Science, for their assistance in preparing this important bill and for their efforts in bringing it to the floor, and I would urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this bill.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, first let me indicate my very strong support for H.R. 1184, which will reauthorize the National Earthquake Hazard Reduction Program, NEHRP.

Since its inception in 1977, and particularly in the last decade, NEHRP has been successful in assessing how earthquakes affect us and what we can do to prepare for the next one. Too bad they cannot prevent earthquakes from happening in the first place.

NEHRP has been reaching out to State and local officials, improving building codes, and assessing the level of seismic risk in different areas across the country. This is a very important program, especially in my Congressional District, which has the San Andreas Fault running through it.

During the Committee on Science markup of this bill, I was pleased that my amendment to H.R. 1184 was unanimously accepted and is in the bill today. My amendment directs FEMA to report on the element that addresses the needs of at-risk populations. Specifically, this includes the elderly, the non-English speaking, persons with dis-

abilities, single parent households and the poor.

There are risk factors that cannot be determined by seismological or engineering research and analysis. These risks deal with the social culture and the economic factors that are presented nationwide when there is a disaster. I am aware that the National Science Foundation, which is a part of NEHRP, supports social sciences research, and I am aware how this research relates to at-risk populations. This would be addressed in our report.

Not only will this report provide valuable information on what has been accomplished to date, it also will bring into focus what needs to be done in the future to reach those populations that incur more damage in disaster because of their age or their economic status or their physical limitations.

Because disasters affect us all, this bill is one that Congress, as a whole, should be very interested in and totally supportive of. I ask that everyone support H.R. 1184.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON).

Mr. LARSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Texas for yielding me this time, and I rise today to support this bill, the Earthquake Hazard Reduction Act.

A few weeks ago we approved this bill unanimously in the Committee on Science. This bill, as before mentioned by my colleagues, would reauthorize nearly \$40 million in funding over the next 2 years for earthquake preparedness and programs.

I would also like to thank our esteemed chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) for his help, and the venerable ranking member of our committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE BROWN), and my colleagues, of course, who have sponsored and introduced this legislation, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH), and the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) for graciously accepting two amendments I offered during the markup.

My amendments were aimed at making sure information generated under the program is localized and available on the Internet, and specifically that the backbone of the Internet communication system be considered part of the Nation's critical infrastructure. The original law cites communication facilities as lifeline, but not communications infrastructure.

Today, as we all know, there are fiber-optic links dedicated solely to the transfer of information over the Internet. Data traffic is currently increasing about 10 times the rate of phone traffic, therefore creating this need.

We should also be concerned about routers and servers managing and storing this traffic. Disaster recovery plans must account for restoring high-speed links and for backing up critical databases. This increasingly critical data

infrastructure should be recognized as part of the bill language and, as amended, is.

Again, I wish to thank my colleagues on the committee for supporting the amendment and encourage all of my colleagues in the House to support this bill.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU).

Mr. WU. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support today of H.R. 1184, the reauthorization of the National Earthquake Hazard Reduction Program. I particularly applaud the farsightedness of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), the chairman of the Committee on Science, and the gentleman from California (Mr. BROWN), the ranking member, in authorizing \$168 million over the next 5 years for expansion and modernization of the seismic monitoring infrastructure of the United States.

Oregon is, unfortunately, at great risk for earthquakes, and I am looking forward to the benefits that will flow from such a modernization effort in Oregon and nationwide. My amendment, which has been incorporated into the bill, will add an additional \$2.8 million over 2 years to the seismic network to procure two portable seismic networks.

Seismologists routinely deploy temporary mobile networks to monitor aftershocks or to better understand the impact of an earthquake in a particular region. The two networks supported by my amendment would be a natural supplement to the permanent monitoring networks.

The chairman has been conscientious in authorizing the elements of a seismic monitoring system contained in a plan that will be forwarded to us shortly by the administration. I believe these portable networks will also be part of that plan.

These portable networks are very necessary to a comprehensive capability for post-earthquake monitoring. I would hate to see any delay in developing them, and I urge adoption of this amendment.

In closing, I would like to commend the chair and ranking member of the Committee on Science and the chair and ranking member of the Subcommittee on Basic Research for facilitating bipartisan cooperation in this bill within the committee and here. With that, Mr. Chairman, I urge passage of this bill.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. BROWN).

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time. I am enthusiastic about rising to support H.R. 1184 and, of course, it has been a favorite piece of legislation of mine for many years.

I also note that one of our colleagues, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr.

LARSON), has used, I think for the first time on the floor, the description of an elderly member as being venerable. Normally that is an ecclesiastical term, and this is not an ecclesiastical body, but I appreciate the intent.

The point that I wanted to make, I think most strongly, is that in the first 22 years of the existence of this act we actually had a stable and declining funding for this program, much to my regret.

□ 1245

In real terms, the amount authorized for the program decreased by 26 percent over that period of time. Consider the fact that, as has already been mentioned, that in the 1989 Loma Prieta earthquake alone, estimates of the cost of damage and business interruptions were more than \$10 billion. I think it now becomes clear that the U.S. needs to invest more than it has to date in earthquake hazards reduction.

I would like to congratulate the two committees, Science and Resources, that enjoy joint jurisdiction over this legislation for recognizing that this is an area and now is the time in which we should invest more heavily for the benefit of all the people of this country.

As has been mentioned, I was involved with the passage of the original bill in 1977, which focused almost exclusively on the research necessary for earthquake prediction. We were motivated at the time by rumors that the Chinese had developed novel ways of predicting earthquakes, and we were intrigued by the fact that they could be ahead of us in this regard.

It did not turn out to be true, but it did lead us to some focus on the research necessary for prediction, which is still of great interest but unlikely to bear the economic return that reducing hazards would bear.

The current act which we are considering still contains provisions for research but has been broadened to include seismic safety standards, coordination with State and local governments, dissemination of information, and public education and awareness. And all of these features will add new value to this important piece of legislation.

Looking back at the evolution of the act of 1977, I believe that with its renewed focus on mitigation and preparedness, Congress is now on the right path to reducing the risk to life and property caused by earthquakes.

Mr. Chairman, I thank all of those who have participated in bringing the bill to the floor, and I urge the passage of this important bill.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT).

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I support the legislation. There is some money in here for procurement. I will offer a buy-American amendment. It has been standard language.

I remind the Congress that the last month quantified was February 1999

and we set another record trade deficit, close to \$20 billion. China and Japan alone accounted for \$10 billion in February of 1999.

So it is just a simple, straightforward amendment and says any money expended under this, if they possibly could find it in their heart to buy American, we encourage that. But if they affix a fraudulent made-in-America laden label, then they would have trouble with the further contract.

It is not a major thing, we passed it before, and I would appreciate the support for it.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to this amendment; and I have no further requests for time, so I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 1184, a bill to reauthorize the National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program—a multi-agency effort to reduce the terrible effects of earthquakes on life and property.

Of particular interest to the Resources Committee, the bill would authorize appropriations for FY 2000 and 2001 to the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) to carry out its responsibilities under the Act, including a related USGS grant program and another program to develop a prototype real-time seismic warning system. Finally the bill would require the USGS Director to establish a Scientific Earthquake Studies Advisory Committee.

The Clinton Administration has testified in strong support of reauthorization of the National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program. This program has made significant progress and contributions in the reduction of earthquake risks during its 23-year history. While the Resources Committee's jurisdiction in this matter is limited to activities of the USGS, the effort to reduce earthquake risks is shared among other federal agencies including the Federal Emergency Management Agency, the National Science Foundation, and the National Institute of Standards and Technology. As a native Californian, I am grateful to the fine work done by all of these agencies.

Under this critical program, USGS produces earthquake hazard assessments and national seismic hazard maps for earthquake loss reduction; provides timely and accurate notifications of earthquakes and information on their location, size, and damage potential, and carries out studies and research on earthquake occurrence and effects.

For example, during 1999–2001, USGS will develop more detailed, larger scale products that depict variations in the expected ground shaking across the San Francisco Bay urban area. The data compiled will enable local officials and planners to see probabilities of earthquake occurrence, amplification or extension of shaking caused by geologic deposits and structures, and susceptibility of these deposits to liquefy and slide during an earthquake.

In another major partnership authorized by this program, the USGS, National Science Foundation, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the Southern California Earthquake Center are installing a state-of-the-art geodetic network to monitor fault movements and Earth strain in Southern California. Utilizing a satellite navigation system operated

by the Department of Defense, which permits points on the Earth's surface to be located to a precision of a millimeter, the network will track the movement of 250 stations concentrated along a corridor through the Los Angeles basin, but also extending south to the Mexican border and east to the Colorado River. Basically, the data derived from this effort will not only improve general understanding of large-scale tectonic processes responsible for earthquakes but will also provide indications where earthquakes might occur in the near future.

Earthquakes are one of the most devastating natural hazards known to man and pose a severe threat to life and property in many regions of our Nation and around the world—and in particular in my home state of California. The United States has a fundamental responsibility and self-interest in reducing the risks associated with earthquakes. Mitigation and finding new applications should continue to be an integral factor in efforts to lessen the terrible consequences of earthquakes on our populace.

At the same time, we must continue to develop a strong scientific understanding of where earthquakes will occur, why they occur, how big they can be, and to learn more about the effects that they will generate. Basic research and monitoring have contributed significantly to our improved mitigation capacity. Good science has also led to application and informed decision-making. The USGS Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program addresses many of the more serious earthquake risks, and I am pleased to support its reauthorization.

I recommend an "aye" vote on its passage.

Mr. COOK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1184, the National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program. In addition to authorizing funding for basic earthquake programs, H.R. 1184 provides 5-year authorizations for a new program—the Advanced National Seismic Research and Monitoring System. H.R. 1184 authorizes USGS to spend \$170.8 million over the next 5 years to modernize the current antiquated system.

The Utah Geological Survey estimates that my district, Salt Lake County, Utah is due for a magnitude 7 earthquake. The UGS estimates that a major quake of this magnitude could kill up to 7,600 people, injure 44,000 more and cause nearly \$20 billion in damages.

With this new monitoring system we could send out early warning of impending earthquakes that utilities could use to shut off valves, and schools to rush our children to safety. There also is additional money for the University of Utah to continue their earthquake research on the Wasatch Front. The Wasatch Front is the newest range in the Rocky Mountains and it is getting bigger. It was created by earthquakes and it will continue to grow with the help of earthquakes. Earthquakes occur regularly in my district and we need to be prepared for them. 80% of Utah's population resides on top of active earthquake faults. The University of Utah is one of our nation's leading earthquake research centers. This money will also be used to collect information needed to deploy resources after an earthquake. We will be able to map the severity and location of an earthquake to know how and where to send emergency response teams. This bill is a good investment in protecting our citizens

from a disaster that we know is coming. It would be a disaster for the American people for Congress to run away from their responsibilities and not prepare our country for earthquakes.

I urge all my colleagues to support H.R. 1184.

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

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the bill shall be considered by sections as an original bill for the purpose of amendment, and pursuant to the rule, each section is considered read.

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

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone a request for a recorded vote on any amendment and may reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the time for voting on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote, provided that the time for voting on the first question shall be a minimum of 15 minutes.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute be printed in the RECORD and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Earthquake Hazards Reduction Authorization Act of 1999".

SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY.—Section 12(a) of the Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act of 1977 (42 U.S.C. 7706(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking "(1) GENERAL.—" and all that follows through "(7) There" and inserting "GENERAL.—There";

(2) by striking "1998, and" and inserting "1998,"; and

(3) by inserting ", \$19,800,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and \$20,400,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001" after "September 30, 1999".

(b) UNITED STATES GEOLOGICAL SURVEY.—(1) Section 12(b) of the Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act of 1977 (42 U.S.C. 7706(b)) is amended—

(A) by inserting "There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Interior for purposes of carrying out, through the Director of the United States Geological Survey, the responsibilities that may be assigned to the Director under this Act \$46,100,000 for fiscal year 2000, of which \$3,500,000 shall be used for the Global Seismic Network and \$100,000 shall be used for the Scientific Earthquake Studies Advisory Committee established under section 6 of the Earthquake Hazards Reduction Authoriza-

tion Act of 1999; and \$47,500,000 for fiscal year 2001, of which \$3,600,000 shall be used for the Global Seismic Network and \$100,000 shall be used for the Scientific Earthquake Studies Advisory Committee established under section 6 of the Earthquake Hazards Reduction Authorization Act of 1999." after "operated by the Agency.";

(B) by striking "and" at the end of paragraph (1);

(C) by striking the comma at the end of paragraph (2) and inserting a semicolon; and

(D) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraphs:

"(3) \$9,000,000 of the amount authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2000; and

"(4) \$9,500,000 of the amount authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2001.".

(2) Section 2(a)(7) of the Act entitled "An Act to authorize appropriations for carrying out the Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act of 1977 for fiscal years 1998 and 1999, and for other purposes" is amended by inserting ", \$1,600,000 for fiscal year 2000, and \$1,650,000 for fiscal year 2001" after "1998 and 1999".

(c) NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION.—Section 12(c) of the Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act of 1977 (42 U.S.C. 7706(c)) is amended—

(1) by striking "1998, and" and inserting "1998,"; and

(2) by striking the period at the end and inserting "; and (5) \$19,000,000 for engineering research and \$10,900,000 for geosciences research for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000. There are authorized to be appropriated to the National Science Foundation \$19,600,000 for engineering research and \$11,200,000 for geosciences research for fiscal year 2001.".

(d) NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF STANDARDS AND TECHNOLOGY.—Section 12(d) of the Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act of 1977 (42 U.S.C. 7706(d)) is amended—

(1) by striking "1998, and"; and inserting "1998,"; and

(2) by inserting ", \$2,200,000 for fiscal year 2000, and \$2,265,000 for fiscal year 2001" after "September 30, 1999".

SEC. 3. REPEALS.

Section 10 and subsections (e) and (f) of section 12 of the Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act of 1977 (42 U.S.C. 7705d and 7706 (e) and (f)) are repealed.

SEC. 4. ADVANCED NATIONAL SEISMIC RESEARCH AND MONITORING SYSTEM.

The Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act of 1977 (42 U.S.C. 7701 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 13. ADVANCED NATIONAL SEISMIC RESEARCH AND MONITORING SYSTEM.

"(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Director of the United States Geological Survey shall establish and operate an Advanced National Seismic Research and Monitoring System. The purpose of such system shall be to organize, modernize, standardize, and stabilize the national, regional, and urban seismic monitoring systems in the United States, including sensors, recorders, and data analysis centers, into a coordinated system that will measure and record the full range of frequencies and amplitudes exhibited by seismic waves, in order to enhance earthquake research and warning capabilities.

"(b) MANAGEMENT PLAN.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of the Earthquake Hazards Reduction Authorization Act of 1999, the Director of the United States Geological Survey shall transmit to the Congress a 5-year management plan for establishing and operating the Advanced National Seismic Research and Monitoring System. The plan shall include annual cost estimates for both modernization and operation, milestones, standards, and performance goals, as well as plans for securing the participation of all existing networks in the Advanced National Seismic Research and Monitoring System and for establishing new, or enhancing existing, partnerships to leverage resources.

"(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

"(1) EXPANSION AND MODERNIZATION.—In addition to amounts appropriated under section 12(b), there are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Interior, to be used by the Director of the United States Geological Survey to establish the Advanced National Seismic Research and Monitoring System—

"(A) \$33,500,000 for fiscal year 2000;

"(B) \$33,700,000 for fiscal year 2001;

"(C) \$35,100,000 for fiscal year 2002;

"(D) \$35,000,000 for fiscal year 2003; and

"(E) \$33,500,000 for fiscal year 2004.

"(2) OPERATION.—In addition to amounts appropriated under section 12(b), there are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Interior, to be used by the Director of the United States Geological Survey to operate the Advanced National Seismic Research and Monitoring System—

"(A) \$4,500,000 for fiscal year 2000; and

"(B) \$10,300,000 for fiscal year 2001.".

SEC. 5. NETWORK FOR EARTHQUAKE ENGINEERING SIMULATION.

The Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act of 1977 (42 U.S.C. 7701 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 14. NETWORK FOR EARTHQUAKE ENGINEERING SIMULATION.

"(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Director of the National Science Foundation shall establish a Network for Earthquake Engineering Simulation that will upgrade, link, and integrate a system of geographically distributed experimental facilities for earthquake engineering testing of full-sized structures and their components and partial-scale physical models. The system shall be integrated through networking software so that integrated models and databases can be used to create model-based simulation, and the components of the system shall be interconnected with a computer network and allow for remote access, information sharing, and collaborative research.

"(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—In addition to amounts appropriated under section 12(c), there are authorized to be appropriated, out of funds otherwise authorized to be appropriated to the National Science Foundation, \$7,700,000 for fiscal year 2000 for the Network for Earthquake Engineering Simulation. In addition to amounts appropriated under section 12(c), there are authorized to be appropriated to the National Science Foundation for the Network for Earthquake Engineering Simulation—

"(1) \$28,200,000 for fiscal year 2001;

"(2) \$24,400,000 for fiscal year 2002;

"(3) \$4,500,000 for fiscal year 2003; and

"(4) \$17,000,000 for fiscal year 2004.".

SEC. 6. SCIENTIFIC EARTHQUAKE STUDIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Director of the United States Geological Survey shall establish a Scientific Earthquake Studies Advisory Committee.

(b) ORGANIZATION.—The Director shall establish procedures for selection of individuals not employed by the Federal Government who are qualified in the seismic sciences and other appropriate fields and may, pursuant to such procedures, select up to ten individuals, one of whom shall be designated Chairman, to serve on the Advisory Committee. Selection of individuals for the Advisory Committee shall be based solely on established records of distinguished service, and the Director shall ensure that a reasonable cross-section of views and expertise is represented. In selecting individuals to serve on the Advisory Committee, the Director shall seek and give due consideration to recommendations from the National Academy of Sciences, professional societies, and other appropriate organizations.

(c) MEETINGS.—The Advisory Committee shall meet at such times and places as may be designated by the Chairman in consultation with the Director.

(d) DUTIES.—The Advisory Committee shall advise the Director on matters relating to the

United States Geological Survey's participation in the National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program, including the United States Geological Survey's roles, goals, and objectives within that Program, its capabilities and research needs, guidance on achieving major objectives, and establishing and measuring performance goals. The Advisory Committee shall issue an annual report to the Director for submission to Congress on or before September 30 of each year. The report shall describe the Advisory Committee's activities and address policy issues or matters that affect the United States Geological Survey's participation in the National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program.

SEC. 7. BUDGET COORDINATION.

Section 5 of the Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act of 1977 (42 U.S.C. 7704) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(1)—

(A) by striking subparagraph (A) and redesignating subparagraphs (B) through (F) as subparagraphs (A) through (E), respectively; and

(B) by moving subparagraph (E), as so redesignated by subparagraph (A) of this paragraph, so as to appear immediately after subparagraph (D), as so redesignated; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(c) BUDGET COORDINATION.—

“(1) GUIDANCE.—The Agency shall each year provide guidance to the other Program agencies concerning the preparation of requests for appropriations for activities related to the Program, and shall prepare, in conjunction with the other Program agencies, an annual Program budget to be submitted to the Office of Management and Budget.

“(2) REPORTS.—Each Program agency shall include with its annual request for appropriations submitted to the Office of Management and Budget a report that—

“(A) identifies each element of the proposed Program activities of the agency;

“(B) specifies how each of these activities contributes to the Program; and

“(C) states the portion of its request for appropriations allocated to each element of the Program.”.

SEC. 8. REPORT ON AT-RISK POPULATIONS.

Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and after a period for public comment, the Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency shall transmit to the Congress a report describing the elements of the Program that specifically address the needs of at-risk populations, including the elderly, persons with disabilities, non-English-speaking families, single-parent households, and the poor. Such report shall also identify additional actions that could be taken to address those needs, and make recommendations for any additional legislative authority required to take such actions.

SEC. 9. PUBLIC ACCESS TO EARTHQUAKE INFORMATION.

Section 5(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act of 1977 (42 U.S.C. 7704(b)(2)(A)(ii)) is amended by inserting “, and development of means of increasing public access to available locality-specific information that may assist the public in preparing for or responding to earthquakes” after “and the general public”.

SEC. 10. LIFELINES.

Section 4(b) of the Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act of 1977 (42 U.S.C. 7703(b)) is amended by inserting “and infrastructure” after “communication facilities”.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to the bill?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TRAFICANT

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, and 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TRAFICANT:

At the end of the bill add the following new sections:

SEC. . COMPLIANCE WITH BUY AMERICAN ACT.

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

SEC. . SENSE OF CONGRESS; REQUIREMENT REGARDING NOTICE.

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

(b) NOTICE TO RECIPIENTS OF ASSISTANCE.—In providing financial assistance under this Act, the Secretary of Transportation shall provide to each recipient of the assistance a notice describing the statement made in subsection (a) by the Congress.

SEC. . PROHIBITION OF CONTRACTS.

If it has been finally determined by a court or Federal agency that any person intentionally affixed a label bearing a “Made in America” inscription, or any inscription with the same meaning, to any product sold in or shipped to the United States that is not made in the United States, such person shall be ineligible to receive any contract or sub-contract made with funds provided pursuant to this Act, pursuant to the debarment, suspension, and ineligibility procedures described in section 9.400 through 9.409 of title 48, Code of Federal Regulations.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, the amendment has been explained in the general debate time. It is a straightforward, buy-American amendment. It has passed on several other pieces of legislation. I encourage the committee to accept it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER).

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

We are pleased to accept this constructive amendment.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON).

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I urge an “aye” vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any other amendments?

If not, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BONILLA) having assumed the chair, Mr. LAHOOD, 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. 1184) to authorize appropriations for carrying out the Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act of 1977 for fiscal years 2000 and 2001, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 142, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

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

Is a separate vote demanded on the amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute amendment was agreed to.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 414, nays 3, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 95]

YEAS—414

Abercrombie	Bilbray	Campbell
Ackerman	Bilirakis	Canady
Aderholt	Bishop	Cannon
Allen	Blagojevich	Capps
Andrews	Biley	Capuano
Archer	Blumenauer	Cardin
Armey	Blunt	Carson
Bachus	Boehert	Castle
Baird	Boehner	Chabot
Baker	Bonilla	Chambliss
Baldacci	Bonior	Clay
Baldwin	Bono	Clayton
Ballenger	Borski	Clement
Barcia	Boswell	Clyburn
Barr	Boucher	Coble
Barrett (NE)	Boyd	Coburn
Barrett (WI)	Brady (PA)	Collins
Bartlett	Brady (TX)	Combest
Barton	Brown (CA)	Condit
Bass	Brown (FL)	Conyers
Bateman	Brown (OH)	Cook
Becerra	Bryant	Cooksey
Bentsen	Burr	Costello
Bereuter	Burton	Cox
Berkley	Buyer	Coyne
Berman	Callahan	Cramer
Berry	Calvert	Crane
Biggert	Camp	Crowley

Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Heger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inlee

Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Klecza
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Largent
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Millender-
McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz

Ose
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Scarborough
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman

Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)

NAYS—3

Duncan Paul Sanford

NOT VOTING—16

Chenoweth Metcalf Radanovich
Deal Miller, Gary Saxton
Gekas Nethercutt Souder
Hastings (FL) Nussle Young (FL)
Klink Owens
Lantos Oxley

□ 1315

Mr. DUNCAN changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. GARY MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 95, I attempted to return from lunch to vote; however, there was an accident and I arrived one minute after the vote was taken. This was unavoidable and beyond my control. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, today, April 21, 1999, I was unavoidably detained during rollcall No. 95, and thus my vote on the passage of H.R. 1184 was not recorded. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" in support of the legislation.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. 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. 1184, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 850

Mr. HOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 850, the Security and Freedom Through Encryption Act.

My name was erroneously added as a cosponsor to this legislation.

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

There was no objection.

VIOLENCE AMONG OUR YOUTH, AND THE INCIDENT IN LITTLETON, COLORADO

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address

the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as we have heard my colleagues rising to the Floor of the House, I, too, stand with a heavy heart to offer my sympathy and concern to the families of the deceased, to the children, to the students, to all who have been impacted by yesterday's tragic incident in Littleton, Colorado. We are shocked by the sheer randomness of it.

We realize that our schools in America should be safe places for our children to learn, and we are disturbed that these shootings were out of revenge, and because someone made fun of these young people.

Let us now not point the finger of blame, but let the people of America like and organizations like the National Rifle Association, children's advocacy groups, churches, synagogues, and parishes, let us look to solutions such as more health services for juveniles. Two-thirds of our children in America are denied real mental health counseling services when they need it. Let us, on Friday, April 23, 1999, Children's Memorial Day, commemorate the thousands of children and youth who are killed by violence.

As one who works with the Congressional Children's Caucus and chairs it, I ask that all of the caucuses in this House that are concerned about children gather for one meeting to begin a real agenda that deals with safety in schools, getting mental health services to our children, counseling to the families, and stop the blame game.

This is an American crisis. We must heal our Nation. To the people of Littleton, Colorado, my prayers are with you.

Mr. Speaker, I stand today with a heavy heart to talk about the tragic incidents of yesterday in Littleton, Colorado. First of all, I would like to extend my deepest sympathy to the families of the victims of yesterday's horrific shootings.

Along with being shocked by the sheer randomness and senselessness of the violence yesterday, I am dismayed by the string of violent incidents that have occurred in our schools within the past 18 months.

The statistics on adolescent death trends are startling: homicide deaths for teenagers between 15–19 accounted for 85 percent or 2,457 deaths by firearms and suicide rates have increased by more than 300 percent in the last three decades. In yesterday's shootings, more than 20 people were killed including the two suspects who killed themselves.

Schools should be safe and secure places for all students, teachers and staff members. All children should be able to go to and from school without fear for their safety.

According to news reports, these young suspects were outcasts in the school community. During the shooting, the suspects reportedly said that they were "out for revenge" for having been made fun of last year. This is truly a cry for help that was not heard in time.

This incident underscores the urgent need for mental health services to address the needs of young people like the suspects from