weather observations and improve public forecasts and warnings of severe weather events.

The fact is the National Weather Service provides a valuable source of early warning and observations to the American people. Whether a tornado or hurricane, blizzard or tropical storm, this rule and its underlying bill can save countless lives and property by assuring early and accurate warning systems.

Further, atmospheric research programs have helped improve severe weather forecast and warning capabilities, and improved knowledge about severe storms and the science of weather modification, important for U.S. transportation and agriculture.

I would like to commend the gentleman from Wisconsin (Chairman SENSENBRENNER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. BROWN), the ranking member, for their hard work on this legislation. I urge my colleagues to support both this open rule and the underlying bill.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 175 is a fair, completely open rule, and I urge its adoption.

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, this is an open rule. The debate will be equally divided and controlled by the majority, and equally divided, as far as the debate is concerned, between the majority and minority.

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

This bill, Mr. Speaker, is about research to be conducted by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. It has tremendous potential to pay off through improved environmental quality and better weather prediction.

This bill provides no increase in funding in fiscal year 2001 for that research. Consequently, inflation will result in a slight cut in spending power. Funding in important areas of research like this should remain stable. Therefore, it is unfortunate that the committee rejected an amendment to provide a modest 3 percent increase in fiscal year 2001.

This rule waives the requirement for a 3-day layover of the committee report. This was necessary because the report was not filed until Tuesday. Waiving this rule gives Members a little less time to examine the bill and to draft amendments.

Despite these concerns, the bill is relatively uncontroversial. The rule is an open rule which will give Members the opportunity to offer amendment. The rule was adopted by voice vote of the Committee on Rules. For these reasons, I can support the rule.

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on this resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1045

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1999

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. REYNOLDS). Pursuant to House Resolution 174 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. 1654.

The Chair designates the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) as chairman of the Committee of the Whole, and requests the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) to assume the chair temporarily.

□ 1045

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. 1654) to authorize appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal years 2000, 2001, and 2002, and for other purposes, with Mr. COLLINS (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 gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON) each will control 30 minutes.

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

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, this bill is a 3-year authorization for our civil space program. When combined with separate legislation authorizing government-wide programs and high performance computing and information technologies, that represents a 1 percent annual increase over NASA's budget requests.

The bill provides full funding for the baselined International Space Station, which moved from a dream to a reality last year with the successful launch of the first two elements. At the same time, the bill promotes fiscal and programmatic responsibility by prohibiting NASA from adding content to the program in a costly new structure called Trans-Hab. Together, this constraint and the 3-year authorization will provide the Space Station with the stability it needs to achieve the same success fiscally that the program is demonstrating technically.

The bill also includes modest funding increases in areas of key scientific research. In the past few years the administration has cut some $742 million out of life and microgravity research accounts in NASA. This bill restores some $228 million of that over 3 years to take a small step towards ensuring that the science community is prepared to maximize the research potential of the International Space Station.

It also contains increases for space science to put the Near Earth Object Survey back on track, to promote research in space solar power that will have applications here on Earth, and to offset the cost of NASA's emergency Hubble Space Telescope repair mission.

More importantly, the bill increases funding for NASA's work in advanced space transportation technologies. Last year we learned the perils of launching U.S.-built payloads on foreign rockets. In the last 6 months we have seen a string of launch failures that have reminded us how critical reliable, low-cost access to space is for our economy, our scientific endeavors, and our national security.

H.R. 1654 accelerates and increases the funding for NASA's programs to develop a new generation of space transportation vehicles. The NASA administrator and the head of the U.S. Space Command have both said frequently that this must be a high national priority. H.R. 1654 ensures that it is.

We have developed this bill on a bipartisan basis and reached agreement on a wide range of issues. I think our efforts to work together come through in the bill's list of bipartisan original cosponsors and its bipartisan endorsement by the Committee on Science last week.

There are a few remaining points on which the majority and minority disagree, and I want to thank Members of both parties for working together to iron out most of these over the past few days. For now we may have to agree to disagree on the few outstanding issues that remain, but they should not get in the way of such a sound and comprehensive bill upon which to build our future in space.

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

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, I would first like to include for the RECORD a letter from Administrator Goldin of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in which, among other things, he states ''NASA strongly opposes House passage of H.R. 1654.''

The letter is as follows:

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, DC, May 19, 1999.

Hon. GEORGE E. BROWN, Jr.,
Ranking Member, Committee on Science, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. BROWN: This letter is to provide NASA's views on H.R. 1654, the ''National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act of 1999,'' authorizing appropriations for FY 2000–2002, as ordered reported by the Committee on May 13, 1999.

NASA strongly opposes House passage of H.R. 1654. The authorization levels in the bill do not conform to the President's request, which is based on a balanced and affordable space and aeronautics program. H.R. 1654 would authorize a total of $13,625.6 million in FY 2000, $13,747.1 million in FY 2001 and $13,839.4 million in FY 2002. As ordered reported, total funding for FY 2000 exceeds the President's request by a net of $47.2 million; total funding for FY 2001 is below the President's request by a net of $82 million. The majority of the additional funding provided is for Life and micro gravity Sciences and Applications, Advanced Space Transportation Technology, and Academic Programs. At the same time, funding authorized in H.R. 1654 reflects significant reductions ($174.4 million in FY 2000, $211.1 million in FY 2001, and $216.6 million in FY 2002) for High Performance Computing and Communications (HPCC) and Information Technology for the 21st century (IT2).

While the Administration recognizes that the Committee strongly supports NASA program efforts for which they have recommended augmentations, such additional spending must be evaluated against the imperative to maintain an overall balance in NASA's aeronautics and space research program and against the impacts resulting from the resulting reductions in other critical programs. Failure to fund NASA's HPCC and IT2 activities in a timely manner would be unacceptable.

NASA appreciates the Committee's authorization of funding for the International Space Station (ISS) Program consistent with the President's request. That request reflects an Administration policy decision to reduce the level of risk to the ISS with a net increase of $1.4 billion over the next five years, to enhance Station budget reserves and to make NASA's Contingency Plan against potential Russian shortfalls more robust. The Committee's support for these efforts is appreciated, and I look forward to continuing to work together on this very important program.

While NASA supports those portions of H.R. 1654 that are consistent with the President's request, we have serious objections to several provisions that are contrary to the President's budget. I request that you and the Committee take NASA's objections, outlined below, into consideration as this bill proceeds through Congress.

TRIANA

NASA and the Administration are greatly disappointed in the Committee's adoption of an amendment (Section 130) terminating the Triana science mission. Triana is good science, was subject to a rigorous peer review process, and will provide the scientific community with valuable research data. We strongly object to the Committee's arbitrary and partisan recommendation to terminate the Triana science mission.

In October 1998, after an exacting peer-review evaluation of nine competing proposals, NASA selected the Scripps Institution of Oceanography as the Principle Investigator for the Triana mission. The Conference Report accompanying the FY 1999 VA-HUD-Independent Agencies Appropriations Act (P.L. 105–276) directed NASA to identify funding for the initiation of Triana as part of NASA's FY 1999 Operating Plan. NASA identified $35 million in the FY 1999 Operating Plan submitted to this and other Committees, and responded to questions thereon. NASA's FY 2000 budget requests $35 million to complete development of Triana, and launch it in December 2000 as a secondary payload on the Space Shuttle.

Triana has sound science objectives and will present valuable practical applications in: solar influences on climate; solar wind and space weather; ultraviolet (UV) radiation effects of clouds, aerosols, and surface radiation; cloud microphysical properties and the effect of solar radiation on climate models; and vegetation canopy measurements, detecting changes in the amount of vegetation-leaf structure, or fraction of covered land.

NASA is also formulating an Earth Science education initiative using Triana imagery, and is planning to issue an open, competitive solicitation for educational tools and applications this fall. NASA has received inquiries from three commercial firms regarding Triana participation. The Scripps Institution of Oceanography is currently working to structure a commercialization approach.

INTERNATIONAL SPACE STATION RESEARCH

Section 101 of H.R. 1654 limits the flexibility of the ISS program to accommodate unforeseen requirements by restricting the use of ISS research funds. Should program difficulties result in further schedule delays, such a restriction could result in research equipment being developed prior to the Station's readiness to accommodate it. This could exacerbate the delay by not allowing the flexibility to shift research funds and address Station contingencies. Such restrictions could, therefore, prolong delays in research flight opportunities and further harm the research community intended to be helped.

EARTH SCIENCE COMMERCIAL DATA ACQUISITION

Section 126 of H.R. 1654 would require that NASA spend $50 million in FY 2001 and FY 2002 for the purchase of commercial remote sensing data. NASA objects to a mandated minimum level of spending for such acquisitions, at the expense of other research opportunities in the Earth Science enterprise. There is no guarantee that such commercial data will be available for acquisition in such amounts stipulated in the bill. NASA should not be precluded from directing its resources in the most efficient and effective manner.

As a matter of policy, NASA's Earth Science Enterprise will not build new missions where commercial data is available at market prices, and the Enterprise has instituted a process under which all Announcements of Opportunity include statements of data buy preferences. The Earth Science Enterprise will release, in the near future, two Requests for Information (RFI's), one for determining sources of Landsat-class observations, and a second for determining sources of tropospheric wind measurements. The Enterprise is also working toward the objective of having each scientific and application research proposal identify the source of data sets required, and including an estimate of the funding requirement for such data sets. This approach is intended to establish a direct dialog between the providers and users of data, and NASA does not have to second-guess the user requirements and unduly constrain the provider's capabilities.

Finally, the NASA Inspector General recently released a report on the Commercial Remote Sensing Program, and concluded ''additional congressionally directed data buy programs are not warranted.''

TRANS-HAB

Section 128 of H.R. 1654 would prevent NASA from further research on inflatable technology, such as Trans-Hab, which would accommodate humans in space. Inflatable module technology offers the potential for significant stowage volume, crew habitability and safety advantages over current approaches for building pressurized space structures using reinforced aluminum. The technology holds considerable potential for advancement of space exploration. NASA shares the Committee's concern that added cost and risk to the ISS should be avoided. NASA desires to continue to explore potential commercial partnering for the development, construction, and use for the ISS Trans-Hab module. We will not pursue the development of a Trans-Hab module for the ISS unless it can be done through a partnership with industry that results in a cost-neutral solution to the baseline cost for the aluminum Habitation module. Additional technical definition and design work is necessary before potential commercial interests can be assured of the viability of the concepts. H.R. 1654 would preclude any work on this very promising set of technologies.

ULTRA-EFFICIENT ENGINE TECHNOLOGY

I am very concerned that Section 103(4) eliminates the Ultra-Efficient Engine Technology (UEET) program as a Focused Program. We understand that it is the Committee's intent to permit these activities to be conducted within the R&T base. We strongly urge the continuation of this effort as a Focused Program.

UEET as a Focused Program gives all interested parties—other Government agencies (e.g., DoD) and the private sector—assurances that resources have been identified to meet defined goals over a specified period of time. Fully 80% of program funding for UEET will be spent in-house, primarily for the operation of test stands and facilities, in coordination with the ongoing DoD program. The UEET Program is designed to address the most critical propulsion issues: performance and efficiency. The primary benefits of these technologies will be to improve efficiency and reduce emissions for a wide range of civil and military applications.

Loss of the UEET effort could have major consequences for the future competitiveness of the U.S. aircraft engine industry and the U.S. balance of trade. Research associated with understanding the technical issues of engine emissions supports a major portion of U.S. scientific analysis that provides a basis for informed policy making and U.S. influence on international civil aviation policies. Finally, it should be noted that significant interaction and dependencies have been formed over the years in engine technology efforts between NASA's Space Programs, DoD's Acquisition Programs and DOE's Energy Programs; while the impact of the restriction in H.R. 1654 upon these interdependencies has not yet been completely assessed, there will be implications to U.S. strategic interests in these critical areas.

ADMINISTRATION PROPOSALS

H.R. 1654 does not include ten important legislative proposals proposed by the Administration in the draft FY 2000 NASA authorization bill, submitted to the Congress on April 28, 1999. Many of these proposed provisions are legislative ''gap fillers''—providing NASA the same authority already provided to the Department of Defense in title 10 of the U.S. Code and to other civilian agencies in title 41 of the U.S. Code.

NASA is covered by the acquisition provisions of title 10, but is frequently overlooked when amendments to that title are enacted. Section 203 of the Administration's bill

would provide NASA the same authority as that available to DoD and other civilian agencies to withhold contract payments based on substantial evidence of fraud. Section 209 would make NASA's claim payment process consistent with procedures already required by other law and with those used by other agencies. Section 210 would provide NASA the same authority as that available to DoD and other civilian agencies to exempt contractor proposals from release under the Freedom of Information Act.

The remaining provisions contained in the Administration's bill address the need to adapt NASA's legal authorities to the world in which we now operate. The role of the commercial sector has been ever increasing. With the support of this Committee, NASA has been changing the way it does business, looking for opportunities to engage in joint endeavors with industry, and attempting to leverage the private sector investment in space and aeronautics research and development. These activities present new and different working relationships and legal hurdles. We are asking the private sector to invest not only money, but also ideas. We must be able to protect these ideas from disclosure to competitors—foreign as well as domestic—which have not invested their time or capital. In order to attract industry partners and their investments, we must be able to grant them some form of exclusive right to use the software or other inventions arising from their joint endeavor with us before it is released to the general public. Our space program should benefit not only from the increased investment of private capital, but also from the royalties derived from such licensing authority. We must be able to attract more private investment—and thus reduce the cost to the Government—by being able to transfer title to personal property used in our joint endeavors to the partner whom we are asking to invest the capital. I urge the Committee to incorporate these provisions as the bill progresses through Congress.

HPCC AND IT2

As reported, H.R. 1654 deletes all funding for NASA's High Performance Computing and Communication program (HPCC) and Information Technology for the 21st century (IT2) initiative, including the very important Intelligent Synthesis Environment (ISE) program. Although the Committee has indicated its intent to hold hearings and mark up a separate, multi-agency, ''computer research'' bill later this year, in the absence of the introduction of a companion measure that fully funds those activities, NASA's support for H.R. 1654 will continue to be qualified.

Not authorizing funding requested for NASA's HPCC and IT2 would essentially remove all of the Agency's research in information technology, and severely impact NASA's remaining programs and missions. Both programs are structured to contribute to broad Federal efforts, but also to address NASA-specific computational, engineering, and science requirements spanning many programs. Not authorizing HPCC and IT2 would severely limit NASA's ability to deliver key capabilities needed to support Earth, space, and aeronautical programs, with impacts such as the following:

Cut Earth and Space Sciences and directly impact NASA's ability to use advanced computing technology to further our ability to predict the dynamic interaction of physical, chemical and biological processes affecting the Earth, the solar-terrestrial environment, and the universe;

Cut Space Science and eliminate NASA's capability to develop low-power, fault-tolerant, high-performance, scaleable computing technology for a new generation of micro-spacecraft;

Cut Aero-Space Technology and eliminate critical advances in aeronautics algorithms and applications, software, and computing machinery needed to enable more than 1000 fold increases in systems performance in the 21st century;

Cut Aero-Space Technology and limit implementation of the tools and processes for a revolution in engineering practice and science integration in modeling, design, development and execution of all NASA's missions; and,

Cut Space Science and eliminate NASA's Self-Sustaining Robotic Networks program to develop the critical set of technologies necessary to support potential future decisions on establishing outposts of self-tasking, self-repairing, evolvable rover networks at key sites of scientific interest throughout the solar system.

We are preparing a more detailed analysis of additional concerns regarding H.R. 1654, which we believe will hamper our ability to manage our space and aeronautics research programs most effectively. I urge the Committee to consider these concerns as the bill proceeds through the legislative process.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection from the standpoint of the Administration's program to submission of this report for the Committee's consideration.

Sincerely,

DANIEL S. GOLDIN,
Administrator.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, DC, May 19, 1999.

Hon. BART GORDON,
Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics, Committee on Science, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. GORDON: This letter is to provide NASA's views on H.R. 1654, the ''National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act of 1999,'' authorizing appropriations for FY 2000–2002, as ordered reported by the Committee on May 13, 1999.

NASA strongly opposes House passage of H.R. 1654. The authorization levels in the bill do not conform to the President's request, which is based on a balanced and affordable space and aeronautics program. H.R. 1654 would authorize a total of $13,625.6 million in FY 2000, $13,747.1 million in FY 2001 and $13,839.4 million in FY 2002. As ordered reported, total funding for FY 2000 exceeds the President's request by a net of $47.2 million; total funding for FY 2001 is below the President's request by a net of $5.3 million and total funding for FY 2002 exceeds the President's request by a net of $82 million. The majority of the additional funding provided is for Life and Microgravity Sciences and Applications, Advanced Space Transportation Technology, and Academic Programs. At the same time, funding authorized in H.R. 1654 reflects significant reductions ($174.4 million in FY 2000, $211.1 million in FY 2001, and $216.6 million in FY 2002) for High Performance Computing and Communications (HPCC) and Information Technology for the 21st century (IT2).

While the Administration recognizes that the Committee strongly supports NASA program efforts for which they have recommended augmentations, such additional spending must be evaluated against the imperative to maintain an overall balance in NASA's aeronautics and space research program and against the impacts resulting from the resulting reductions in other critical programs. Failure to fund NASA's HPCC and IT2 activities in a timely manner would be unacceptable.

NASA appreciates the Committee's authorization of funding for the International Space Station (ISS) Program consistent with the President's request. That request reflects an Administration policy decision to reduce the level of risk to the ISS with a net increase of $1.4 billion over the next five years, to enhance Station budget reserves and to make NASA's Contingency Plan against potential Russian shortfalls more robust. The Committee's support for these efforts is appreciated, and I look forward to continuing to work together on this very important program.

While NASA supports those portions of H.R. 1654 that are consistent with the President's request, we have serious objections to several provisions that are contrary to the President's budget. I request that you and the Committee take NASA's objections, outlined below, into consideration as this bill proceeds through Congress.

TRIANA

NASA and the Administration are greatly disappointed in the Committee's adoption of an amendment (Section 130) terminating the Triana science mission. Triana is good science, was subject to a rigorous peer review process, and will provide the scientific community with valuable research data. We strongly object to the Committee's arbitrary and partisan recommendation to terminate the Triana science mission.

In October 1998, after an exacting peer-review evaluation of nine competing proposals, NASA selected the Scripps Institution of Oceanography as the Principle Investigator for the Triana mission. The Conference Report accompanying the FY 1999 VA–HUD–Independent Agencies Appropriations Act (P.L. 105–276) directed NASA to identify funding for the initiation of Triana as part of NASA's FY 1999 Operating Plan. NASA identified $35 million in the FY 1999 Operating Plan submitted to this and other Committees, and responded to questions thereon. NASA's FY 2000 budget requests $35 million to complete development of Triana, and launch it in December 2000 as a secondary payload on the Space Shuttle.

Triana has sound science objectives and will present valuable practical applications in: solar influences on climate; solar wind and space weather; ultraviolet (UV) radiation effects of clouds, aerosols, and surface radiation; cloud microphysical properties and the effect of solar radiation on climate models; and vegetation canopy measurements, detecting changes in the amount of vegetation-leaf structure, or fraction of covered land.

NASA is also formulating an Earth Science education initiative using Triana imagery, and is planning to issue an open, competitive solicitation for educational tools and applications this fall. NASA has received inquiries from three commercial firms regarding Triana participation. The Scripps Institution of Oceanography is currently working to structure a commercialization approach.

INTERNATIONAL SPACE STATION RESEARCH

Section 101 of H.R. 1654 limits the flexibility of the ISS program to accommodate unforeseen requirements by restricting the use of ISS research funds. Should program difficulties result in further schedule delays, such a restriction could result in research equipment being developed prior to the Station's readiness to accommodate it. This could exacerbate the delay by not allowing the flexibility to shift research funds and address Station contingencies. Such restriction could, therefore, prolong delays in research flight opportunities and further harm the research community intended to be helped.

EARTH SCIENCE COMMERCIAL DATA ACQUISITION

Section 126 of H.R. 1654 would require that NASA spend $50 million in FY 2001 and FY

2002 for the purchase of commercial remote sensing data. NASA objects to a mandated minimum level of spending for such acquisitions, at the expense of other research opportunities in the Earth Science enterprise. There is no guarantee that such commercial data will be available for acquisition in such amounts stipulated in the bill. NASA should not be precluded from directing its resources in the most efficient and effective manner.

As a matter of policy, NASA's Earth Science Enterprise will not build new missions where commercial data is available at market prices, and the Enterprise has instituted a process under which all Announcements of Opportunity include statements of data buy preferences. The Earth Science Enterprise will release, in the near future, two Requests for Information (RFI's), one for determining sources of Landsat-class observations, and a second for determining sources of tropospheric wind measurements. The Enterprise is also working toward the objective of having each scientific and application research proposal identify the source of data sets required, and including an estimate of the funding requirement for such data sets. This approach is intended to establish a direct dialog between the providers and users of data, and NASA does not have to second-guess the user requirements and unduly constrain the provider's capabilities.

Finally, the NASA Inspector General recently released a report on the Commercial Remote Sensing Program, and concluded ''additional congressionally directed data buy programs are not warranted.''

TRANS-HAB

Section 128 of H.R. 1654 would prevent NASA from further research on inflatable technology, such as Trans-Hab, which would accommodate humans in space. Inflatable module technology offers the potential for significant stowage volume, crew habitability and safety advantages over current approaches for building pressurized space structures using reinforced aluminum. The technology holds considerable potential for advancement of space exploration. NASA shares the Committee's concern that added cost and risk to the ISS should be avoided. NASA desires to continue to explore potential commercial partnering for the development, construction, and use for the ISS Trans-Hab module. We will not pursue the development of a Trans-Hab module for the ISS unless it can be done through a partnership with industry that results in a cost-neutral solution to the baseline cost for the aluminum Habitation module. Additional technical definition and design work is necessary before potential commercial interests can be assured of the viability of the concepts. H.R. 1654 would preclude any work on this very promising set of technologies.

ULTRA-EFFICIENT ENGINE TECHNOLOGY

I am very concerned that Section 103(4) eliminates the Ultra-Efficient Engine Technology (UEET) program as a Focused Program. We understand that it is the Committee's intent to permit these activities to be conducted within the R&T base. We strongly urge the continuation of this effort as a Focused Program.

UEET as a Focused Program gives all interested parties—other Government agencies (e.g., DoD) and the private sector—assurances that resources have been identified to meet defined goals over a specified period of time. Fully 80% of program funding for UEET will be spent in-house, primarily for the operation of test stands and facilities, in coordination with the ongoing DoD program. The UEET Program is designed to address the most critical propulsion issues: performance and efficiency. The primary benefits to these technologies will be to improve efficiency and reduce emissions for a wide range of civil and military applications.

Loss of the UEET effort could have major consequences for the future competitiveness of the U.S. aircraft engine industry and the U.S. balance of trade. Research associated with understanding the technical issues of engine emissions supports a major portion of U.S. scientific analysis that provides a basis for informed policy making and U.S. influence on international civil aviation policies. Finally, it should be noted that significant interaction and dependencies have been formed over the years in engine technology efforts between NASA's Space Programs, DoD's Acquisition Programs and DOE's Energy Programs; while the impact of the restriction in H.R. 1654 upon these interdependencies has not yet been completely assessed, there will be implications to U.S. strategic interests in these critical areas.

ADMINISTRATION PROPOSALS

H.R. 1654 does not include ten important legislative proposals proposed by the Administration in the draft FY 2000 NASA authorization bill, submitted to the Congress on April 28, 1999. Many of these proposed provisions are legislative ''gap fillers''—providing NASA the same authority already provided to the Department of Defense in title 10 of the U.S. Code and to other civilian agencies in title 41 of the U.S. Code.

NASA is covered by the acquisition provisions of title 10, but is frequently overlooked when amendments to that title are enacted. Section 203 of the Administration's bill would provide NASA the same authority as that available to DoD and other civilian agencies to withhold contract payments based on substantial evidence of fraud. Section 209 would make NASA's claim payment process consistent with procedures already required by other law and with those used by other agencies. Section 210 would provide NASA the same authority as that available to DoD and other civilian agencies to exempt contractor proposals from release under the Freedom of Information Act.

The remaining provisions contained in the Administration's bill address the need to adapt NASA's legal authorities to the world in which we now operate. The role of the commercial sector has been ever increasing. With the support of this Committee, NASA has been changing the way it does business, looking for opportunities to engage in joint endeavors with industry, and attempting to leverage the private sector investment in space and aeronautics research and development. These activities present new and different working relationships and legal hurdles. We are asking the private sector to invest not only money, but also ideas. We must be able to protect these ideas from disclosure to competitors—foreign as well as domestic—which have not invested their time or capital. In order to attract industry partners and their investments, we must be able to grant them some form of exclusive right to use the software or other inventions arising from their joint endeavor with us before it is released to the general public. Our space program should benefit not only from the increased investment of private capital, but also from the royalties derived from such licensing authority. We must be able to attract more private investment—and thus reduce the cost to the Government—but being able to transfer title to personal property used in our joint endeavors to the partner whom we are asking to invest the capital. I urge the Committee to incorporate these provisions as the bill progresses through Congress.

HPCC AND IT2

As reported, H.R. 1654 deletes all funding for NASA's High Performance Computing and Communication program (HPCC) and Information Technology for the 21st century (IT2) initiative, including the very important Intelligent Synthesis Environment (ISE) program. Although the Committee has indicated its intent to hold hearings and mark up a separate, multi-agency, ''computer research'' bill later this year, in the absence of the introduction of a companion measure that fully funds those activities, NASA's support for H.R. 1654 will continue to be qualified.

Not authorizing funding requested for NASA's HPCC and IT2 would essentially remove all of the Agency's research in information technology, and severely impact NASA's remaining programs and missions. Both programs are structured to contribute to broad Federal efforts, but also to address NASA-specific computational, engineering, and science requirements spanning many programs. Not authorizing HPCC and IT2 would severely limit NASA's ability to deliver key capabilities needed to support Earth, space, and aeronautical programs, with impacts such as the following:

Cut Earth and Space Sciences and directly impact NASA's ability to use advanced computing technology to further our ability to predict the dynamic interaction of physical, chemical and biological processes affecting the Earth, the solar-terrestrial environment, and the universe;

Cut Space Science and eliminate NASA's capability to develop low-power, fault-tolerant, high-performance, scaleable computing technology for a new generation of micro-spacecraft;

Cut Aero-Space Technology and eliminate critical advances in aeronautics algorithms and applications, software, and computing machinery needed to enable more than 1000 fold increases in systems performance in the 21st century;

Cut Aero-Space Technology and limit implementation of the tools and processes for a revolution in engineering practice and science integration in modeling, design, development and execution of all NASA's missions; and,

Cut Space Science and eliminate NASA's Self-Sustaining Robotic Networks program to develop the critical set of technologies necessary to support potential future decisions on establishing outposts of self-tasking, self-repairing, evolvable rover networks at key sites of scientific interest throughout the solar system.

We are preparing a more detailed analysis of additional concerns regarding H.R. 1654, which we believe will hamper our ability to manage our space and aeronautics research programs most efficiently. I urge the Committee to consider these concerns as the bill proceeds through the legislative process.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection from the standpoint of the Administration's program to submission of this report for the Committee's consideration.

Sincerely,

DANIEL S. GOLDIN,
Administrator.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words about H.R. 1654, the NASA Authorization Act. First, I wish to commend Chairman ROHRABACHER for his efforts in developing H.R. 1654. I believe that he made a serious effort to include a number of positive provisions in the bill and to work with the minority.

Thus, while it was by no means a perfect bill, I thought that H.R. 1654 was a reasonably constructive piece of legislation as introduced. In fact, I was a

cosponsor of the bill as introduced, with the understanding that we would continue to work to improve its provisions.

At this point I have to say that I do not think that H.R. 1654 is ready for floor consideration. I have not reached this position easily. As a supporter of NASA, I want to provide a solid, fiscally responsible foundation for the space agency's activities. I also want to make sure that we do not micromanage NASA in ways that will hurt its ability to carry out its programs effectively and efficiently. Unfortunately, I think that H.R. 1654 falls short of the mark in meeting these two goals.

The NASA Administrator has sent over a letter outlining a number of serious concerns with the NASA bill. Let me discuss just a few of them. First, there is the absence of any funding for NASA's information technology programs. While we have received some assurance from the chairman of the Committee on Science that authorization of these programs will be done at a later date, I remain concerned. NASA needs to be on the cutting edge of information technology R&D if it is to deliver missions that are both cost-effective and innovative.

Second, H.R. 1654 would prohibit the Ultra Efficient Energy Technology focused program. That program is a new program that is critical to maintaining NASA's capabilities for long-term aircraft engine R&D. It also is critical to maintaining the competitiveness of the U.S. aeronautics industry.

Moreover, the UEET program will offer important benefits to military aviation by conducting important R&D into improved engine performance. I am afraid that H.R. 1654 attempts to micromanage NASA's aeronautics R&D efforts in ways that can do real damage over the long term.

Third, the bill as amended at full committee would cancel the Triana scientific mission. Triana is an Earth observing spacecraft that would deliver both scientific and educational benefits. This mission was selected out of nine competing proposals, and it has undergone scientific peer review. It already was funded in last year's VA-HUD appropriations conference report. If we cancel it now, we would waste $40 million, which is more than it would cost to save it.

Fourth, H.R. 1654 has a provision that would have the effect of holding NASA's Earth science research program hostage to a ''data buy'' earmark. While I support a healthy commercial remote sensing industry, the bill's provisions will do real harm to NASA's programs while doing little to help grow industry. It is a misguided and ultimately unworkable position.

Fifth, the bill would prohibit NASA from spending any money on the Trans-Hab or other innovative inflatable structure technologies. While I am as careful with taxpayers' dollars as anyone, I do not believe that we should prohibit NASA from doing research to improve our space program.

H.R. 1654's Trans-Hab prohibition would keep NASA from getting the data Congress will need if we are to make informed decisions on these innovative technologies.

Mr. Chairman, I raise these issues not to diminish the efforts of Chairman ROHRABACHER in drafting this bill. I simply believe the bill we have before us today is not ready for prime time. I think that the bill needs more work.

I intend to vote ''no'' on H.R. 1654 on final passage, and I would urge my colleagues to also oppose the bill.

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

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics that handled this bill.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for allotting me this time.

Mr. Chairman, today the House is considering H.R. 1654, the NASA Authorization Act of 1999, which I am pleased to sponsor. I want to publicly thank the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON), the ranking member, for his spirit of cooperation during the process. I am saddened, however, that he is unable to cosponsor the bill and vote for it at this time, but I do understand that there are some areas of disagreement and perhaps some areas that he feels that was not dealt with in the way that he would prefer for it to be dealt with, and I am sorry for that.

But I do think that we do have a spirit of cooperation among the members of the subcommittee, and I am trying my best to maintain that spirit as well as the spirit of cooperation among the staffs on both sides of the aisle. I appreciate the work that they put in to trying to put this bill together, although the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON) cannot support it at this time.

It contains one or two controversial provisions, surely. This bill, however, is overwhelmingly bipartisan. At least it was my intent to make it bipartisan. It includes several provisions and modifications that actually came from the Democratic side.

Furthermore, I plan to offer a manager's amendment which will make a few additional refinements, including one that specifically addresses the concerns of the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON) who has put a tremendous amount of effort into a project that is very meaningful to his district.

This is not a perfect bill, and I admit that. We have asked for an open rule because we want the House to work its will on this legislation. To the degree that we have an open rule and to the degree there are disagreements, I would hope that the open rule would provide us a way of coming to grips with some of the disagreements that are still in place.

If any government agency belongs to the American people, surely it is NASA. I am committed to NASA's programs and policies, to make sure that they are reflecting the priorities of the people in the United States as reflected here in the House of Representatives, the people's House.

Even so, I believe this piece of legislation is a solid piece of legislation because it sends three messages which are supported by the overwhelming majority of the Committee on Science and I believe the House itself.

First, we tell the President and the appropriators that America's civil space agency should be rewarded for the sacrifices and reforms that it has made over the past several years by providing it a steady increase of 1 percent a year, if you take into account the information technology program that we are authorizing separately.

Secondly, H.R. 1654 sets realistic overall funding levels and real priorities to guide appropriators. We focus additional resources on areas that our hearing record shows are underfunded and which have bipartisan support, including life and microgravity research, advanced space transportation technology, space science, and education.

Third, H.R. 1654 pushes NASA to stay on the road to reform, especially on space privatization and commercialization. We do not want to destabilize the International Space Station or set up programs just to keep people busy. This bill does not micromanage NASA, but it does set clear goals and guides NASA towards them.

Mr. Chairman, in closing let me just say that the other body has already marked up a NASA authorization bill and it should be reported to the floor for consideration soon. So after we complete our business today, I hope we can aggressively move forward to negotiate compromises with the Senate and, for the first time since 1992, enact a NASA authorization into law this year.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE), a leader in education in this body.

□ 1100

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to discuss an exciting opportunity I think that this NASA authorization bill provides our Nation's schools to promote math and science education.

However, first I would like to say how disappointed I am that this bill has fallen victim I think to some partisan wrangling because it really did start out as a bipartisan bill. It is my hope that, as we go forward to an eventual conference that will take place with the other body, which will pass a bipartisan bill out of their committee, hopefully, very soon, that we can once again act in a bipartisan way and send a bill to the President that he will sign.

With the exception of the conflict over Triana and some other issues, the committee I think has put together a pretty decent bill. I appreciate the majority's willingness to work with me on my concerns in the area of education and to accept the amendments in those areas that I offered in committee, and I want to thank the chairman and the ranking member for their help.

I will vote for H.R. 1654, with the hope and faith that a bipartisan conference report can be brought back before this body before this year is out.

I am proud to discuss an important education initiative contained in this legislation. This bill directs NASA to develop an educational initiative for our Nation's schools in recognition of the 100th anniversary of the first powered flight, which will take place on December 17, 2003.

On that date in 1903, Orville and Wilbur Wright took their dream of powered flight from the drawing board of their Ohio bicycle shop to the Crystal Coast of North Carolina. It was there at a place called Kitty Hawk that the Wright brothers' dream took flight. On that day, our world was changed forever.

The anniversary of this historic accomplishment provides an excellent opportunity for our Nation's schools to promote the importance of math and science education. And as a North Carolinian and a former educator, I am proud to bring recognition to the Wright brothers and their fantastic accomplishment.

As a former North Carolina superintendent of schools, I worked for many years to help improve math and science education in our State. America's future will be determined by the ability of our citizens to adapt to the changes in technology that would dominate life in the 21st century.

Recent studies show, unfortunately, that America's students are falling behind their counterparts around the world in the areas of math and science. As we watch the sun rise on the dawn of a new millennium, it has never been more important to encourage our children to excel in these important areas. It is no longer good enough for our children to simply be able to read, write, add, and subtract. If today's students are going to succeed in tomorrow's jobs, a firm foundation in math and science is required and it is an imperative.

The Committee on Science has taken a leading role in starting a national dialogue on math and science education. One of the most difficult challenges we face has been to interest students in participating in the most challenging math and science courses. That is not unique. It happens in every State. Such a lack of interest could spell doom down the road as fewer students enter the teaching profession in these important areas. And even fewer are prepared for the jobs of the 21st century.

The 100th anniversary of Flight Educational Initiative is intended to use the history of flight, the benefit of flight on society, and the math and science principles used in flight to generate interest among students in math and science education.

As a young boy, like most Americans, the space program captured my imagination. Unfortunately, today video games and other distractions are more likely to occupy the time of our young people than the space program. However, the 100th anniversary of flight and NASA's plans to send a plane to Mars to coincide with that date provides an excellent springboard to recapture our young people's interest in the space program and in math and science education.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the chairman for bringing this bill, authorizing our Nation's space program, to the floor on the same day that the new Star Wars trilogy has opened in our Nation's theaters. Just as the Star Wars movie has captured the imagination of a generation of Americans, NASA and the 100th anniversary of Flight Educational Initiative will help our students sore in math and science education.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS), the vice chairman of the committee.

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

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

I am very pleased to rise to speak in favor of the bill as presented to the House. The Committee on Science has done a very careful job of analyzing the needs of the NASA program and has come up with a workable allocation of funds.

There are two areas in particular I want to mention. One relates to the work that I put into the science policy study (Unlocking Our Future: Toward a New Science Policy; published by GPO) last year under the auspices of the Science Committee and which has been adopted by the committee and by the House of Representatives. In that study, we emphasized the importance of basic research to the future of this Nation. And I am pleased to say that NASA continues, under this bill, to maintain a strong basic research program.

There has been some criticism that the Space Station has decimated the basic research program at NASA. That is not true. They are continuing with their basic research efforts and they continue to make important discoveries both in space and on this planet.

One of the important parts of this issue, of course, is to make sure that the results of basic research are available to the public, to companies who may make use of it and, that this may benefit the general public in many ways.

The second point I want to make is that I believe NASA has done an excellent job of adding to the education of our students in this Nation regarding math and science. That is an area of great need. We must improve our math and science programs in elementary and secondary schools. It has to be done in a coordinated, thoughtful, careful way as we work toward that goal.

But in the meantime NASA, through its supplementary programs, has aided greatly in the education of students of this Nation. In particular, they have developed experiments that students can do at home or in their schoolroom by accessing NASA data on the Internet and using the results of NASA's satellite research, or data from their Mars Rover, to use in their experiments. This has provided a meaningful, lifetime experience for kids in the elementary and secondary schools. They learn from the Internet what has happened, and they can then use this directly to come to the same scientific conclusion that the NASA scientists operating the experiment have reached.

I rise today in support of H.R. 1654, the NASA Authorization Act. I believe it is a good bill that will continue to support NASA in its science and exploration endeavors while maintaining balance and cost-effectiveness within its priorities. This morning, I would specifically like to address the opportunity provided through this bill to continue NASA's strong and vital emphasis on education initiatives.

As we have discussed earlier this year, our Nation is at a critical juncture in its efforts to provide our children with the quality education that they will require to succeed in the technology-driven economy and culture of tomorrow. To do this, we must find innovative ways to excite and encourage young students about the possibilities open to them through an understanding of mathematics and the sciences. I am not talking strictly about career opportunities, but as consumers, parents and citizens.

NASA has clearly demonstrated their dedication to this responsibility through the multitude of individual programs which they offer to students from grade school to grad school and, importantly, to their teachers. In FY 1998 alone, NASA reached over two million students and over a hundred thousand teachers. Of those, all but a fraction of these students and teachers were at the K–12 level. It is at this level that it is so critical to engage our young people, and it is also at this point that our education system is in need of the most assistance. NASA is offering their help, and they are doing so through the use of inquiry-based methods and real-life applications.

I would also like to highlight that, in developing their educational programs, NASA has shown insight into the complexity of their subject material and the need to balance it with state and regional agendas. To best serve its ''customers'', NASA collaborators with external organizations such as the National Science Foundation and the Department of Education, discipline-specific professional associations,

and State education coalitions to develop materials for local use ''when and where appropriate''. As another indication of their commitment to providing relevant and useful information, NASA solicits evaluations of their programs from its users, the teachers in the classroom.

In closing, it is my hope that other Federal agencies would follow the example set by NASA in its education goals. As Dan Goldin, the NASA administrator, testified at a recent Science Committee hearing on this issue, ''It is our education system that will prepare our future workforce to design and use [the tools for our future]''. By supporting this bill, you will enable the continued development and support of these crucial programs.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank my good friend from Tennessee for yielding me time to speak this morning.

NASA's mission is one of exploration, discovery, and innovation. The innovation of new technology and the continued understanding of our planet and solar system has led to many advances in science that have benefitted our country and our economy.

When we fund NASA activities, we fund our future. We fund the development of new technologies, and we push our educational limits. Because of this, NASA and their continued innovation has made us the world leader in space exploration.

I stand today, though, reluctantly in support of H.R. 1654 because I do have some serious concerns with some of the provisions and possible amendments to the bill.

First, I applaud the Committee on Science for crafting a bill that does look to increase funding for NASA. However, I am very disappointed that they removed any funding for the continued development study of the Trans-Hab program from the Johnson Space Center.

The Trans-Hab is a proposed replacement for the International Space Station habitation module and uses new inflatable structural technology to house a larger living and work space in the limited payload of the Space Shuttle. As drafted, this bill would hinder the development and eliminate the option of this new technology which would give our astronauts more space to work and to live.

One of NASA's greatest assets is their commitment to providing the private sector with technological assistance through the Technology Outreach Program. The program applies scientific and engineering innovations originally developed for space applications to technical problems experienced by other companies that are in all of our districts.

Through the support of its own research laboratories, NASA has solved technical problems of businesses of all sizes and varieties, from making ink dry faster in the manufacture of American flags to improving the fit of a prosthetic foot.

I also know that NASA provides educational assistance and leadership in math and science education and particularly at the Johnson Space Center in Houston. My district is not in that area but it is close, and over the last 2 years I have had two astronauts, Dr. Ellen Ochoa and Dr. Franklin Chang-Diaz, astronauts who took time to spend the day with me in middle schools in my district in Houston, and they motivate students to take math and science.

The schools that participated include Grantham Middle School, Woodland Acres Middle School, Edison Middle School in Houston Independent School District, Burbank in HISD, Galena Park Middle School in Galena Park School District, and Hambrick Middle School.

Watching these 7th and 8th graders, Mr. Chairman, with the astronauts is very rewarding and educational. It is my hope that when these middle school students go to high school they will then be energized to take math and science.

Again, I reluctantly support H.R. 1654. I hope we will continue to work on this legislation and make it better by providing funding for the Trans-Hab project and for the Triana satellite.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON) the vice chair of the subcommittee.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time, and I rise in support of this bill.

I commend the chairman and the ranking member for crafting a bill that I think all Members should be able to support. In particular, I want to commend them for the funding that they have provided for authorized in this bill for ongoing improvements in the Shuttle and Shuttle upgrades. By enhancing the performance of the Shuttle, we can ultimately in the end have a manned space flight system that will perform more safely and more efficiently, clearly something that is in the interest of the American taxpayers.

I am, additionally, pleased for the additional funding for the Space Station program. We now have a large amount of Space Station hardware in the Space Station Processing Facility at Kennedy Space Center that is being tested and that is ready for launch.

I would like to clarify my position on the issue regarding the satellite Triana and why I chose to introduce the amendment in committee calling for the elimination of this program.

I certainly do not enjoy introducing partisanship into a bill that is normally considered to be a nonpartisan issue. But I want Members on both sides of the aisle to know that, in the fall of 1997, it was announced by NASA that they were going to have to lay off 600 people at Kennedy Space Center because of a $100 million funding shortfall.

These layoffs did proceed to go ahead in the winter of 1998. And it was approximately around that time I believe that the President had his dream, the vision for Triana, and NASA was very quickly able to fund tens of millions of dollars to go towards this program and is now looking for the additional funds authorized to complete it.

I personally felt to do nothing and say nothing about this, in light of what happened to the men and women who got laid off in my district, would be an insult.

Now, some people may say, ''Well, congressman, if the Shuttle can continue to fly safely and efficiently with 600 fewer people, then we ought to go ahead and let that happen.'' But I want Members on both sides of the aisle to be aware that the Shuttle managers tell me the principal reason that they are able to continue to fly safely with that many fewer people is because the launch rates are way, way down to only maybe four flights a year because of the delays. And the Shuttle managers tell me that, as we go back up to eight and nine flights a year, as is hoped as the Space Station program gets back on track, that they may need to actually go out and hire additional people to keep the program flying safely.

So I believe that, to me, it was really an insult to the working men and women out at Kennedy Space Center for the agency to be laying off hundreds of people on one day and then finding tens of millions of dollars to fulfill a vision for the vice president.

I have a chart over there that I would like to show later that clearly spells out that we can right now, using current technology, produce an image of the Earth using existing satellite images. And this program was just not necessary and, therefore, I would encourage all my colleagues to support not funding it.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Although I appreciate the comments of my friend from Florida, I think it is ironic that he is concerned about laid off NASA employees yet he is not concerned about the fact that, by his amendment, we are going to waste more money canceling the program than has already been spent and he does not seem to be concerned about those employees and those scientific projects that are going to be laid off and missing because of his amendment. It is really, I think, a disingenuous argument, totally parochial, totally partisan; and this bill and this committee deserves better.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COSTELLO).

□ 1115

Mr. COSTELLO. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in reluctant opposition to the NASA authorization bill before us today. This bill before us today cancels the Triana spacecraft mission. Last year, this Congress approved $35 million for Triana. The

Triana project was competitively awarded and its scientific content has been peer reviewed. It offers important scientific and educational benefits.

Next, the bill prohibits funding for the high performance computing and other information technology initiatives contained in the President's request. Although the gentleman from Wisconsin has agreed to provide for those activities in a forthcoming bill, I want to make it clear that I believe that NASA needs these funds. I support their inclusion within the NASA budget.

Another area of concern in this bill is the prohibition against any funding for the ultraefficient engine technology focus program. Long-term R&D efforts in engine technology, including the construction of engineering models when appropriate, are vitally important to both our national security and to continued competitiveness in worldwide aerospace markets. We should not abandon those efforts.

In addition, I support NASA's aviation safety and system capacity research as well as research directed toward aircraft noise and emission reduction. For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I will vote against this legislation and ask that it be sent back to the committee to address these important issues.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARY MILLER).

(Mr. GARY MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GARY MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1654, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act of 1999. I would like to thank the sponsors of this bill, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER), the gentleman from California (Mr. BROWN), the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON), the gentleman from Utah (Mr. COOK), the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE) for their leadership on this issue.

As a member of the Committee on Science, I am especially pleased with H.R. 1654 because it will be the first reauthorization legislation for NASA spending since 1992. The administration has cut NASA's budget 6 years in a row, leaving the agency to do much more with much less. I commend NASA for rising to the occasion by streamlining and reforming its projects. However, this history of chipping away at NASA's budget is proving to be detrimental to our Nation's technological research and development. To reverse this trend, H.R. 1654 provides increased funding for NASA's programs critical to maintaining and advancing our leadership in space, science and technology through fiscal year 2002, for investing in science and technology today serves to create a better tomorrow for everyone.

At the same time, H.R. 1654 continues to promote the fiscal discipline in our space programs. For example, this legislation fully funds NASA's request for the International Space Station and Space Shuttle operations but it prohibits funding for Trans-Hab as a replacement for the station's habitation module because of its higher cost. H.R. 1654 also redirects funding for the controversial, untested Triana satellite program, which would transmit new pictures of the Earth to the Internet, toward cutting-edge microgravity research that will be used to support human exploration and development of space enterprise. This is a far more useful investment than the $75 million plus Triana screen saver.

A final attribute of this legislation is its commitment of NASA resources to science education. H.R. 1654 allots $20 million for the continuation of the highly successful National Space Grant College and Fellowship Program. This program uses the assets of NASA for education and public service purposes. It has been a highly innovative leader in California, bringing together community-based alliances composed of educational institutions, industry and government to work together on projects which are both related to space and are of community importance. The student-mentor process involved in this program has shown significant results in workforce preparation and science literacy. Once again I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this bill.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to my classmate, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT).

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I have never failed to vote for a bill from this committee of significance. I have eaten some tough votes by some neighboring politicians who have come back and talked about the pork in space, in the Space Station. I have been beat up pretty good on the votes. I am going to vote ''no'' on this bill today. It takes a new and efficient engine technology that is at the John Glenn Center in Cleveland, formerly Lewis, and takes it out of this bill, and I will oppose it.

My purpose standing here today is I am offering a couple of amendments. They are basically sense of the Congress, because, you know what? Congress does not do a whole hell of a lot here. So we are going to encourage them. The encouragement is basically this. If NASA is going to develop any new programs or facilities, do not do them at the existing bases. Take NASA to the people. When you have a supplemental like we had last night, everybody has some of the military and they feel an alignment and a personal relationship with our Pentagon and military structure. That does not exist here at NASA. NASA is a program for America, but it is located in very few facilities, and I think it is good political wisdom and common sense to open this program up to the people.

The Traficant amendment says, whenever possible, on these new facilities, look at other sites other than existing sites and look at those depressed communities that could become a part of this great national program. Look, this ivory tower business is over. These accidents have brought NASA down to earth. Now we are looking at a tough budget climate trying to carve out money.

I will say this to the gentleman from Wisconsin. He has done a remarkable job. This vote is no reflection on his efforts. I think he has done a great job and he is a great chairman of this committee. But I want this committee to look back at that engine technology at the John Glenn Center. I think it is good for the future, and I think it is something in conference you should look at very seriously.

Finally, the second amendment says, buy American wherever you can. I know the committee is working with this, but I do not know how many of my colleagues saw and heard the news from last night. A classified report says Russia is spying on America in the Balkans and sharing the fruits of their gain with Milosevic. How much more money are we going to give to the Russians? How much more technology transfers are there going to be through open, goodhearted, good-faith, spirited work with Russia? I think if these participating countries do not pay, they should be thrown out of the program. If American taxpayers are going to finance these projects, then dammit, save that technology and keep it here.

So the two amendments are straightforward. I would appreciate Members' support on them. But I would appreciate looking at that engine technology that will be taken from the John Glenn Center. Just remember that. The John Glenn Space Center in Cleveland, Ohio, that is a tremendous program up there and that is a tremendous project. I would appreciate it if you would look at that.

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

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, when I read the Washington Post this morning, I learned that the Vice President's spokesman had called the majority a party of troglodytes because we think it is more important to spend $32 million on medical research than on funding the Vice President's late night inspiration for a multimillion-dollar screen saver called Triana. Personally, I do not think that making medical research a higher priority is a reason to descend into name calling.

I am disappointed, however, that the minority in this Chamber has decided to transform a matter of priority-setting into a partisan political dispute. I thought better of them. That is why I have worked for the last 2½ years to mend fences and to build a sense of bipartisanship on the Committee on

Science. For the majority members of the Committee on Science, that meant compromising with the minority and trying to bridge the differences between us. I thought we had made a good-faith effort to do that.

In developing the NASA authorization bill in committee, we made 13 separate changes to accommodate the minority even before the bill was introduced. We rewrote findings on international cooperation that the committee endorsed for 4 years. But when the minority changed its mind, we changed the language at their request.

We added findings on the importance of the Deep Space Network at the request of the minority. We added findings on the Hubble space telescope at the request of the minority. We changed language authorizing upgrades to the Space Shuttle and prohibited obligation of those Shuttle funds pending a report, at the request of the minority. We added funding for space science to offset the added costs associated with an emergency repair mission for the Hubble space telescope, at the request of the minority.

We delayed implementation of the small demonstration program of space science data purchases until fiscal year 2002, at the request of the minority. We reduced the level and details of increased funding for advanced space transportation, at the request of the minority. We changed the language requiring NASA to conduct earth science data purchases, at the request of the minority.

That did not satisfy them. But they made no effort to meet us halfway. We changed the requirement that NASA consider the impact of its international missions on the competitiveness of the U.S. space industry, at the request of the minority. We removed two positions related to the consolidated space operations contract, at the request of the minority.

We rewrote a section directing NASA to begin prioritizing Shuttle upgrades, at the request of the minority. We added a new section establishing in law a White House technology program for human space flight, at the request of the minority. By the way, if we were interested in making this a partisan bill at the Vice President's expense, we never would have done any of that.

In the committee markup, we accepted an amendment increasing funding for space grant universities, by the minority. We accepted an amendment increasing funding for historically black colleges and universities, at the request of the minority. We accepted an amendment changing NASA's educational responsibilities, at the request of the minority. We accepted an amendment on report language, at the request of the minority. And for the last week, the subcommittee chairman and I have been working with other minority members to add or change report language and develop colloquies to support their goals.

How does the minority respond to all of these efforts? Its presidential candidate calls us troglodytes. Democrats withdrew their names as cosponsors of the bill and withdrew their support increasing NASA's budget over the President's request, and the minority mobilizes to defeat the bill along partisan lines, at the same time complaining that we should add more money, add more money, to some of these other programs.

Now, I would hope that we can rise above such tactics and agree to disagree on the one issue that still divides us. This bill increases NASA's funding over the level of the President's request and contains many changes requested by the minority. It should be passed on a bipartisan basis.

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

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

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, let me first concur with the fact that the gentleman has brought a much better atmosphere to our committee. I think that we are working in a much better way. We need to since, when we think, there has not been a bill passed since 1992. Certainly there needs to be some improvements.

Let me also point out that the gentleman said, and he went through a litany, a variety of acceptances of the majority to minority position. Let us put this in perspective. There was never a subcommittee markup. The minority was given a bill 10 days in advance and said, ''Here it is.'' So I hardly think that it is a mammoth undertaking that the majority would accept some positive, I think constructive ways to make this bill better so we can get it passed in a bipartisan way.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Reclaiming my time, I think the gentleman from Tennessee is rewriting history a bit. We gave them a draft of the bill. Before it was introduced there were 13 separate changes made to the text of the bill at the request of the minority, as has been the policy of this chairman of the Committee on Science, to try and narrow some issues and to be as bipartisan as possible and where there is a disagreement, to be able to fight those out and to debate the issue on the merits.

□ 1130

Now we did not call anybody any names during the committee markup or afterwards, and it wrecks the bipartisan nature of dealing with NASA and supporting NASA when I pick up the Washington Post this morning and see the Vice President's spokesman calling the majority party a bunch of dinosaurs because we have a disagreement over the Triana program. Our priority is to put money that my colleagues want to go into Triana into medical research, and that was the amendment that was adopted when the Committee on Science marked this bill up. This may be a legitimate disagreement where we think we should put more money into medical research and less into Triana.

But dealing with the budget, and that is what an authorization bill is, is dealing with priorities. I will lay my priorities against my colleague's priorities, the gentleman from Tennessee, but he ought to tell his former senator and his spokesman that when we have got a disagreement in priorities let us not devolve into name calling.

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

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

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, let me again concur that this should be about issues, not name calling, and I completely agree with the gentleman. I suspect part of this probably resulted from the fact that the chairman of the Republican National Committee had earlier released news releases condemning it and calling the Vice President names. That was wrong, and it was wrong on each side.

As my colleagues know, this is about issues. As my colleague pointed out, this is about a variety of disagreements, this is about trying to get the best bill possible, and we should rise above name calling, and I had no part in that, but I would offer my apologies for anything that goes beyond the real merits of this bill.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I would hope the gentleman from Tennessee would tap his predecessor on the shoulder and tell him to discipline his staff a little bit more, not calling people who are on the Committee on Science and dealing with the issues of setting priorities in good faith the names that appeared in the paper this morning.

Mr. GORDON. If I can just finally thank the gentleman for explaining what that term meant? I read it, but I did not know what it meant, so I thank him for that definition.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, the last time the Congress sent a NASA Authorization Bill to the President was in 1992. Since then the appropriators have worked, year after year, to analyze the needs of NASA and allocate those funds necessary to maintain our nation's aeronautics and space priorities. 1999 looked like the year that the authorizers in the House Science Committee would step up to the plate. In this regard I would like to commend Chairman JAMES SENSENBRENNER and Subcommittee Chairman DANA ROHRABACHER for putting together H.R. 1654 and presenting it to this body.

This original bill eliminated funding for the Ultra-Efficient Engine Technology Program, a focused program by NASA that will set the stage for the development of revolutionary new aircraft engines. The UEET continues the aeronautics research that NASA has pursued for many years, and it deserves widespread support.

First, the UEET is important to the environment. The advanced engines being developed will produce less emissions that are harmful to the environment, and this goal is essential to allow US aircraft to compete with those manufactured in Europe. The next generation of engines will also be quieter, a big step forward for neighborhoods located around airports.

The UEET is also important to consumers and the flying public. Advanced engines will use fuel more efficiently, helping to keep down ticket prices.

The UEET is also important to the competitive position of major American firms. The aerospace and aeronautics industry is one of the few American industries still dominated by US firms in the global marketplace. But that leadership is threatened by foreign manufacturers, working hand-in-glove with foreign governments that provide huge subsidies. We must compete and survive on the basis of high technology and the most sophisticated research available. We must develop the aircraft engines that will allow US airplanes to fly into European airports. This is a major sector of our economy, and hundreds of thousands of high skill jobs hang in the balance.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, the UEET is closely related to our national security and the future of military aircraft. Since its development several years ago, the UEET has been coordinated with the Department of Defense and its High Performance Turbine Engine Program. By supporting the UEET, this Congress is supporting the sort of advanced aircraft that foster our national defense. I join with Representative JAMES TRAFICANT and Representative STEVEN C. LATOURETTE in supporting an amendment to remove the language from the bill that cut funding for this program.

Originally, the bill also cut funding for NASA's Aircraft Noise Research Program. The results of this research are essential to protecting people who live near airports nationwide. Continued funding of the UEET and the Aircraft Noise Reduction programs will ensure that new aircraft will be quieter and less disruptive for people who live near airports.

Air travel is increasing at a dramatic rate across the country. The economy is good; airline ticket prices are affordable; airlines are serving more and more airports. Cleveland Hopkins International Airport, which is in my congressional district, is expected to experience an increase of 200 daily flights this summer. 200 more flights means that the residents and schools surrounding the airport will experience 200 times the aircraft noise. The current level of aircraft noise is already very disruptive to these people's lives, and an increase will cause them even more suffering.

I joined with Representative ANTHONY WEINER in supporting an amendment to restore NASA's Aircraft Noise Research program to last year's funding level by adding $11 million in FY 2000, $10 million in 2001 and $8.5 million in 2002. NASA has set a goal of reducing aircraft noise by one-half over the next ten years. Without full funding, this goal will not be attained. Great strides have already been made in making aircraft engines quieter and more efficient. By maintaining funding for the Noise Research program, we can ensure that the next phase of engines, State IV, will soon be able to provide relief to neighborhoods and schools surrounding airports.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Chairman, I submit the following letters for the RECORD:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN NETHERCUTT: Without support for life science research, the investment in the Space Station won't pay off. Just as the National Institutes of Health long-term commitment to basic research has revolutionized medicine, NASA can do the same for maintaining people in space. As president-elect of the American Society for Gravitational and Space Biology, I encourage you to support the $32 million increase in the life science research budget (HR 1654). We strongly oppose any amendment to strike those funds.

Life science research at NASA benefits more than our space program. The problems seen during and after spaceflight—trouble with balance, muscle loss, bone loss, low blood pressure and radiation damage to cells—affect millions on the ground too. The basic research on how the body senses and adapts to gravity will pay off in the long run against problems like osteoporosis and balance disorders.

Recently, I flew in space on the Neurolab Space Shuttle mission (STS–90). This dedicated life sciences mission demonstrated the quality and importance of the science that NASA can do in space. The results from this mission's experiments on balance, sleep, blood pressure and nervous system development are changing how we understand the brain and nervous system.

NASA's and the United States' goal is to keep people in space for longer periods of time and we need to learn how to do it effectively. The key to this is a strong research program that (1) maintains an active ground-based research program with a 9–10/1 ground to flight experiment ratio, (2) supports new students and fellows (I personally started my career with a NASA-supported fellowship program), (3) increases the percentage of high-scoring scientific proposals that can be funded (the current level is quite low).

We appreciate the support life science research has received in the past and encourage you to vote to increase funding for research that will be the foundation for success on the International Space Station.

Sincerely,

JAY C. BUCKEY, JR., M.D.,
President-Elect, American Society for Gravitational and Space Biology.

JUVENILE DIABETES FOUNDATION INTERNATIONAL, THE DIABETES RESEARCH FOUNDATION,

May 19, 1999.

Hon. GEORGE R. NETHERCUTT, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN NETHERCUTT: On behalf of the Juvenile Diabetes Foundation International (JDF), I wish to express our support for increased funding for NASA's Office of Life and Microgravity Science.

As you know, JDF enjoys a mutually beneficial relationship with NASA to conduct diabetes research. The JDF–NASA partnership has successfully led to research projects exploring diabetes-related eye disease, noninvasive blood glucose sensors, islet cell transplantation and other areas of research that may benefit people with diabetes. Your role as Co-Chairman of the Congressional Diabetes Caucus has continued to reinforce this essential partnership,

I applaud your championing of sound and scientific medical research policies. I hope that your work to increase funding for Life and Microgravity science research will speed the path to a cure for diabetes and its complications. I realize that funding decisions are difficult because many of the programs are meritorious and promising. However, the JDF and I are thankful that you have made finding cures for disease and saving lives your priority in Congress.

Sincerely,

LEAH MULLIN,
Chair, Government Relations Committee.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1654, the NASA Authorization Bill. Although the bill authorizes funding for NASA's priorities including the International Space Station, the Space Shuttle Program and the Hubble Space Telescope, I am concerned with the bill's provision barring funding for the Triana Satellite, a project directed by the Scripps Institution of Oceanography in La Jolla, California in conjunction with the Goddard Space Flight Center in Greenbelt, Maryland.

The Triana Mission, named for the sailor on Columbus' voyage who first spotted the New World, will provide not only a real-time view of the Earth for distribution on the internet, but will also include instruments to study solar influences on climate, ultraviolet radiation, space weather, the microphysical properties of clouds, and the measurement of vegetation canopies. $35 million is already being spent on this project in FY'99 and researchers and scientists at Goddard Space Flight Center are working hard on the design of the spacecraft and the ground system for the satellite as well as providing program integration and support.

I am disappointed that this important project has become mired in a partisan debate over the Vice President's involvement.

Despite the absence of the Triana program, the bill does support many worthwhile programs important to NASA and to the Goddard Space Flight Center. With continued funding of projects in the fields of earth and space science like funding for the Earth Orbiting System (EOS) and an additional $30 million in FY'00 for the Hubble Space Telescope servicing mission, the bill authorizes funding crucial to these programs' continued success.

The bill also authorizes funding to repair an aging infrastructure at Goddard. The $2.9 million for repair of the steam distribution network and $3.9 million for chilled water distribution are key construction projects for maintaining the Space Flight Center's status as one of NASA's premier facilities.

Despite the many beneficial projects in this authorization bill, I cannot support a bill that puts politics before programs intended to provide a better understanding of our last true frontier.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, in 1803, President Thomas Jefferson successfully gained approval from Congress for a truly visionary project. This project was to become one of America's greatest explorations. Congress appropriated funds for the small U.S. Army unit, led by Lewis and Clark, to explore the Missouri and Columbia rivers. From this exploration, we gained invaluable information for future settlement.

Exploration is as engrained into American heritage as freedom is. America is a nation that has been supportive of exploration from our earliest years. Congress is again challenged to appropriate funding for America's continued exploration. The return we receive from every dollar we invest in space exploration is an average of 9 dollars. Space exploration is an extraordinary investment.

For the last ten years, I have had the privilege of aiding in the continuation of American exploration. The Space Program is one of the most important areas of exploration that we can support. The benefits of the space program to improving human life are innumerable.

Two of the more important results to me personally are in the health field—pacemakers and laser eye surgery. Pacemakers have saved thousands of lives, including the life of one of my staff's father. The technology gained by electronics testing during space

flights is priceless. The innovations implemented after space testing has revolutionized life for thousands with pacemakers.

Another life improving benefit is laser eye surgery. Lasers being developed by NASA would aid in the early detection of eye disease and spot cataracts before they are severe enough to require surgery. Cataracts in Florida, especially among the elderly are a constant threat, but thanks to a NASA-developed laser light, opthamologists are beginning clinical trials on investigating the early formation, detection and treatment of cataracts.

These examples barely scratch the surface. I could continue listing benefits, but time will simply not allow it. The technology created from the space program will improve the lives of all Americans—in many ways—and will be the basis for profound technological advances for generations to come.

The space program deserves our continued support.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I rise to address provisions added to H.R. 1654, which are in the jurisdiction of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, specifically Section 219, the ''100th Anniversary of Flight Educational Initiative.''

I wish to thank the Chairman of the Science Committee and the Chairman of the Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics, Mr. ROHRABACHER, for working with me to modify this section. The provision, as originally adopted by the Committee on Science, would have called for federal curriculum development regarding a specific subject matter. As I have been an opponent of federal involvement in curriculum development and as Section 438 of the General Education Provisions Act currently prohibits such federal activity, I am pleased that these provisions have been modified to recognize the importance of educating our nation's children regarding the 100th Anniversary of Powered Flight, without the intrusion of oppressive federal authority. Again, I wish to thank the gentleman for working with me and the Committee on Education and the Workforce and I look forward to working with you in conference negotiations with the other body.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the bill is considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment and is considered read.

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

H.R. 1654

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act of 1999''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
Sec. 2. Findings.
Sec. 3. Definitions.

TITLE I—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Subtitle A—Authorizations

Sec. 101. International Space Station.
Sec. 102. Launch Vehicle and Payload Operations.
Sec. 103. Science, Aeronautics, and Technology.
Sec. 104. Mission Support.
Sec. 105. Inspector General.
Sec. 106. Total authorization.
Sec. 107. Aviation systems capacity.

Subtitle B—Limitations and Special Authority

Sec. 121. Use of funds for construction.
Sec. 122. Availability of appropriated amounts.
Sec. 123. Reprogramming for construction of facilities.
Sec. 124. Limitation on obligation of unauthorized appropriations.
Sec. 125. Use of funds for scientific consultations or extraordinary expenses.
Sec. 126. Earth science limitation.
Sec. 127. Competitiveness and international cooperation.
Sec. 128. Trans-hab.
Sec. 129. Consolidated Space Operations Contract.
Sec. 130. Triana funding prohibition.

TITLE II—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Sec. 201. Requirement for independent cost analysis.
Sec. 202. National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 amendments.
Sec. 203. Commercial space goods and services.
Sec. 204. Cost effectiveness calculations.
Sec. 205. Foreign contract limitation.
Sec. 206. Authority to reduce or suspend contract payments based on substantial evidence of fraud.
Sec. 207. Space Shuttle upgrade study.
Sec. 208. Aero-space transportation technology integration.
Sec. 209. Definitions of commercial space policy terms.
Sec. 210. External tank opportunities study.
Sec. 211. Eligibility for awards.
Sec. 212. Notice.
Sec. 213. Unitary Wind Tunnel Plan Act of 1949 amendments.
Sec. 214. Innovative technologies for human space flight.
Sec. 215. Life in the universe.
Sec. 216. Research on International Space Station.
Sec. 217. Remote sensing for agricultural and resource management.
Sec. 218. Integrated safety research plan.
Sec. 219. 100th anniversary of flight educational initiative.
Sec. 220. Internet availability of information.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The National Aeronautics and Space Administration should continue to pursue actions and reforms directed at reducing institutional costs, including management restructuring, facility consolidation, procurement reform, and convergence with defense and commercial sector systems.

(2) The National Aeronautics and Space Administration must continue on its current course of returning to its proud history as the Nation's leader in basic scientific, air, and space research.

(3) The overwhelming preponderance of the Federal Government's requirements for routine, unmanned space transportation can be met most effectively, efficiently, and economically by a free and competitive market in privately developed and operated space transportation services.

(4) In formulating a national space transportation service policy, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration should aggressively promote the pursuit by commercial providers of development of advanced space transportation technologies including reusable space vehicles, and human space systems.

(5) The Federal Government should invest in the types of research and innovative technology in which United States commercial providers do not invest, while avoiding competition with the activities in which United States commercial providers do invest.

(6) International cooperation in space exploration and science activities serves the United States national interest—

(A) when it—

(i) reduces the cost of undertaking missions the United States Government would pursue unilaterally;

(ii) enables the United States to pursue missions that it could not otherwise afford to pursue unilaterally; or

(iii) enhances United States capabilities to use and develop space for the benefit of United States citizens; and

(B) when it—

(i) is undertaken in a manner that is sensitive to the desire of United States commercial providers to develop or explore space commercially;

(ii) is consistent with the need for Federal agencies to use space to complete their missions; and

(iii) is carried out in a manner consistent with United States export control laws.

(7) The National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the Department of Defense can cooperate more effectively in leveraging their mutual capabilities to conduct joint space missions that improve United States space capabilities and reduce the cost of conducting space missions.

(8) The Deep Space Network will continue to be a critically important part of the Nation's scientific and exploration infrastructure in the coming decades, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration should ensure that the Network is adequately maintained and that upgrades required to support future missions are undertaken in a timely manner.

(9) The Hubble Space Telescope has proven to be an important national astronomical research facility that is revolutionizing our understanding of the universe and should be kept productive, and its capabilities should be maintained and enhanced as appropriate to serve as a scientific bridge to the next generation of space-based observatories.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this Act—

(1) the term ''Administrator'' means the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration;

(2) the term ''commercial provider'' means any person providing space transportation services or other space-related activities, primary control of which is held by persons other than Federal, State, local, and foreign governments;

(3) the term ''institution of higher education'' has the meaning given such term in section 1201(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1141(a));

(4) the term ''State'' means each of the several States of the Union, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and any other commonwealth, territory, or possession of the United States; and

(5) the term ''United States commercial provider'' means a commercial provider, organized under the laws of the United States or of a State, which is—

(A) more than 50 percent owned by United States nationals; or

(B) a subsidiary of a foreign company and the Secretary of Commerce finds that—

(i) such subsidiary has in the past evidenced a substantial commitment to the United States market through—

(I) investments in the United States in long-term research, development, and manufacturing (including the manufacture of major components and subassemblies); and

(II) significant contributions to employment in the United States; and

(ii) the country or countries in which such foreign company is incorporated or organized, and, if appropriate, in which it principally conducts its business, affords reciprocal treatment to companies described in subparagraph (A) comparable to that afforded to such foreign company's subsidiary in the United States, as evidenced by—

(I) providing comparable opportunities for companies described in subparagraph (A) to participate in Government sponsored research and development similar to that authorized under this Act;

(II) providing no barriers to companies described in subparagraph (A) with respect to local investment opportunities that are not provided to foreign companies in the United States; and

(III) providing adequate and effective protection for the intellectual property rights of companies described in subparagraph (A).

TITLE I—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Subtitle A—Authorizations

SEC. 101. INTERNATIONAL SPACE STATION.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for International Space Station—

(1) for fiscal year 2000, $2,482,700,000, of which $394,400,000, notwithstanding section 121(a)—

(A) shall only be for Space Station research or for the purposes described in section 103(2); and

(B) shall be administered by the Office of Life and Microgravity Sciences and Applications;

(2) for fiscal year 2001, $2,328,000,000, of which $465,400,000, notwithstanding section 121(a)—

(A) shall only be for Space Station research or for the purposes described in section 103(2); and

(B) shall be administered by the Office of Life and Microgravity Sciences and Applications; and

(3) for fiscal year 2002, $2,091,000,000, of which $469,200,000, notwithstanding section 121(a)—

(A) shall only be for Space Station research or for the purposes described in section 103(2); and

(B) shall be administered by the Office of Life and Microgravity Sciences and Applications.

SEC. 102. LAUNCH VEHICLE AND PAYLOAD OPERATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for Launch Vehicle and Payload Operations the following amounts:

(1) For Space Shuttle Operations—

(A) for fiscal year 2000, $2,547,400,000;

(B) for fiscal year 2001, $2,649,900,000; and

(C) for fiscal year 2002, $2,629,000,000.

(2) For Space Shuttle Safety and Performance Upgrades—

(A) for fiscal year 2000, $456,800,000, of which $18,000,000 shall not be obligated until 45 days after the report required by section 207 has been submitted to the Congress;

(B) for fiscal year 2001, $407,200,000; and

(C) for fiscal year 2002, $414,000,000.

(3) For Payload and Utilization Operations—

(A) for fiscal year 2000, $169,100,000;

(B) for fiscal year 2001, $182,900,000; and

(C) for fiscal year 2002, $184,500,000.

SEC. 103. SCIENCE, AERONAUTICS, AND TECHNOLOGY.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for Science, Aeronautics, and Technology the following amounts:

(1) For Space Science—

(A) for fiscal year 2000, $2,202,400,000, of which—

(i) $10,500,000 shall be for the Near Earth Object Survey;

(ii) $472,000,000 shall be for the Research Program;

(iii) $12,000,000 shall be for Space Solar Power technology; and

(iv) $170,400,000 shall be for Hubble Space Telescope (Development);

(B) for fiscal year 2001, $2,315,200,000, of which—

(i) $10,500,000 shall be for the Near Earth Object Survey;

(ii) $475,800,000 shall be for the Research Program; and

(iii) $12,000,000 shall be for Space Solar Power technology; and

(C) for fiscal year 2002, $2,411,800,000, of which—

(i) $10,500,000 shall be for the Near Earth Object Survey;

(ii) $511,100,000 shall be for the Research Program;

(iii) $12,000,000 shall be for Space Solar Power technology; and

(iv) $5,000,000 shall be for space science data buy.

(2) For Life and Microgravity Sciences and Applications—

(A) for fiscal year 2000, $333,600,000, of which $2,000,000 shall be for research and early detection systems for breast and ovarian cancer and other women's health issues, and $5,000,000 shall be for sounding rocket vouchers;

(B) for fiscal year 2001, $335,200,000, of which $2,000,000 shall be for research and early detection systems for breast and ovarian cancer and other women's health issues; and

(C) for fiscal year 2002, $344,000,000, of which $2,000,000 shall be for research and early detection systems for breast and ovarian cancer and other women's health issues.

(3) For Earth Science, subject to the limitations set forth in sections 126 and 130—

(A) for fiscal year 2000, $1,382,500,000;

(B) for fiscal year 2001, $1,413,300,000; and

(C) for fiscal year 2002, $1,365,300,000.

(4) For Aero-Space Technology—

(A) for fiscal year 2000, $999,300,000, of which—

(i) $532,800,000 shall be for Aeronautical Research and Technology, with no funds to be used for the Ultra-Efficient Engine, and with $412,800,000 to be for the Research and Technology Base;

(ii) $334,000,000 shall be for Advanced Space Transportation Technology, including—

(I) $61,300,000 for the Future-X Demonstration Program; and

(II) $105,600,000 for Advanced Space Transportation Program; and

(iii) $132,500,000 shall be for Commercial Technology;

(B) for fiscal year 2001, $908,400,000, of which—

(i) $524,000,000 shall be for Aeronautical Research and Technology, with no funds to be used for the Ultra-Efficient Engine, and with $399,800,000 to be for the Research and Technology Base, and with $54,200,000 to be for Aviation System Capacity;

(ii) $249,400,000 shall be for Advanced Space Transportation Technology, including—

(I) $109,000,000 for the Future-X Demonstration Program; and

(II) $134,400,000 for Advanced Space Transportation Program; and

(iii) $135,000,000 shall be for Commercial Technology; and

(C) for fiscal year 2002, $994,800,000, of which—

(i) $519,200,000 shall be for Aeronautical Research and Technology, with no funds to be used for the Ultra-Efficient Engine, and with $381,600,000 to be for the Research and Technology Base, and with $67,600,000 to be for Aviation System Capacity;

(ii) $340,000,000 shall be for Advanced Space Transportation Technology; and

(iii) $135,600,000 shall be for Commercial Technology.

(5) For Mission Communication Services—

(A) for fiscal year 2000, $406,300,000;

(B) for fiscal year 2001, $382,100,000; and

(C) for fiscal year 2002, $296,600,000.

(6) For Academic Programs—

(A) for fiscal year 2000, $128,600,000, of which $11,600,000 shall be for Higher Education within the Teacher/Faculty Preparation and Enhancement Programs, of which $20,000,000 shall be for the National Space Grant College and Fellowship Program, and of which $62,100,000 shall be for minority university research and education, including $33,600,000 for Historically Black Colleges and Universities;

(B) for fiscal year 2001, $128,600,000, of which $62,100,000 shall be for minority university research and education, including $33,600,000 for Historically Black Colleges and Universities; and

(C) for fiscal year 2002, $130,600,000, of which $62,800,000 shall be for minority university research and education, including $34,000,000 for Historically Black Colleges and Universities.

(7) For Future Planning (Space Launch)—

(A) for fiscal year 2001, $144,000,000; and

(B) for fiscal year 2002, $280,000,000.

SEC. 104. MISSION SUPPORT.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for Mission Support the following amounts:

(1) For Safety, Reliability, and Quality Assurance—

(A) for fiscal year 2000, $43,000,000;

(B) for fiscal year 2001, $45,000,000; and

(C) for fiscal year 2002, $49,000,000.

(2) For Space Communication Services—

(A) for fiscal year 2000, $89,700,000;

(B) for fiscal year 2001, $109,300,000; and

(C) for fiscal year 2002, $174,200,000.

(3) For Construction of Facilities, including land acquisition—

(A) for fiscal year 2000, $181,000,000, including—

(i) Restore Electrical Distribution System (ARC), $2,700,000;

(ii) Rehabilitate Main Hangar Building 4802 (Dryden Flight Research Center (DFRC)), $2,900,000;

(iii) Rehabilitate High Voltage System (Glenn Research Center), $7,600,000;

(iv) Repair Site Steam Distribution System (GSFC), $2,900,000;

(v) Restore Chilled Water Distribution System (GSFC), $3,900,000;

(vi) Rehabilitate Hydrostatic Bearing Runner, 70 meter Antenna, Goldstone (JPL), $1,700,000;

(vii) Upgrade 70 meter Antenna Servo Drive, 70 meter Antenna Subnet (JPL), $3,400,000;

(viii) Rehabilitate Utility Tunnel Structure and Systems (Johnson Space Center (JSC)), $5,600,000;

(ix) Connect KSC to CCAS Wastewater Treatment Plant (KSC), $2,500,000;

(x) Repair and Modernize HVAC System, Central Instrument Facility (KSC), $3,000,000;

(xi) Replace High Voltage Load Break Switches (KSC), $2,700,000;

(xii) Repair and Modernize HVAC and Electrical systems, Building 4201 (Marshall Space Flight Center (MSFC)), $2,300,000;

(xiii) Repair Roofs, Vehicle Component Supply buildings (MAF), $2,000,000;

(xiv) Minor Revitalization of Facilities at Various Locations, not in excess of $1,500,000 per project, $65,500,000;

(xv) Minor Construction of New Facilities and Additions to Existing Facilities at Various Locations, not in excess of $1,500,000 per project, $5,000,000;

(xvi) Facility Planning and Design, $19,200,000;

(xvii) Deferred Major Maintenance, $8,000,000;

(xviii) Environmental Compliance and Restoration, $40,100,000;

(B) for fiscal year 2001, $181,000,000; and

(C) for fiscal year 2002, $191,000,000.

(4) For Research and Program Management, including personnel and related costs, travel, and research operations support—

(A) for fiscal year 2000, $2,181,200,000;

(B) for fiscal year 2001, $2,195,000,000; and

(C) for fiscal year 2002, $2,261,600,000.

SEC. 105. INSPECTOR GENERAL.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for Inspector General—

(1) for fiscal year 2000, $22,000,000;

(2) for fiscal year 2001, $22,000,000; and

(3) for fiscal year 2002, $22,000,000.

SEC. 106. TOTAL AUTHORIZATION.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, the total amount authorized to be appropriated to the National Aeronautics and Space

Administration under this Act shall not exceed—

(1) for fiscal year 2000, $13,625,600,000;

(2) for fiscal year 2001, $13,747,100,000; and

(3) for fiscal year 2002, $13,839,400,000.

SEC. 107. AVIATION SYSTEMS CAPACITY.

In addition to amounts otherwise authorized, there are authorized to be appropriated to the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration $5,000,000 for fiscal year 2001 for aviation systems capacity.

Subtitle B—Limitations and Special Authority

SEC. 121. USE OF FUNDS FOR CONSTRUCTION.

(a) AUTHORIZED USES.—Funds appropriated under sections 101, 102, 103, and 104(1) and (2), and funds appropriated for research operations support under section 104(4), may be used for the construction of new facilities and additions to, repair of, rehabilitation of, or modification of existing facilities at any location in support of the purposes for which such funds are authorized.

(b) LIMITATION.—No funds may be expended pursuant to subsection (a) for a project, the estimated cost of which to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, including collateral equipment, exceeds $1,000,000, until 30 days have passed after the Administrator has notified the Committee on Science of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate of the nature, location, and estimated cost to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration of such project.

(c) TITLE TO FACILITIES.—If funds are used pursuant to subsection (a) for grants to institutions of higher education, or to nonprofit organizations whose primary purpose is the conduct of scientific research, for purchase or construction of additional research facilities, title to such facilities shall be vested in the United States unless the Administrator determines that the national program of aeronautical and space activities will best be served by vesting title in the grantee institution or organization. Each such grant shall be made under such conditions as the Administrator shall determine to be required to ensure that the United States will receive therefrom benefits adequate to justify the making of that grant.

SEC. 122. AVAILABILITY OF APPROPRIATED AMOUNTS.

To the extent provided in appropriations Acts, appropriations authorized under subtitle A may remain available without fiscal year limitation.

SEC. 123. REPROGRAMMING FOR CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Appropriations authorized for construction of facilities under section 104(3)—

(1) may be varied upward by 10 percent in the discretion of the Administrator; or

(2) may be varied upward by 25 percent, to meet unusual cost variations, after the expiration of 15 days following a report on the circumstances of such action by the Administrator to the Committee on Science of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate.

The aggregate amount authorized to be appropriated for construction of facilities under section 104(3) shall not be increased as a result of actions authorized under paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection.

(b) SPECIAL RULE.—Where the Administrator determines that new developments in the national program of aeronautical and space activities have occurred; and that such developments require the use of additional funds for the purposes of construction, expansion, or modification of facilities at any location; and that deferral of such action until the enactment of the next National Aeronautics and Space Administration authorization Act would be inconsistent with the interest of the Nation in aeronautical and space activities, the Administrator may use up to $10,000,000 of the amounts authorized under section 104(3) for each fiscal year for such purposes. No such funds may be obligated until a period of 30 days has passed after the Administrator has transmitted to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Science of the House of Representatives a written report describing the nature of the construction, its costs, and the reasons therefor.

SEC. 124. LIMITATION ON OBLIGATION OF UNAUTHORIZED APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—

(1) REQUIREMENT.—Not later than—

(A) 30 days after the later of the date of the enactment of an Act making appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal year 2000 and the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(B) 30 days after the date of the enactment of an Act making appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal year 2001 or 2002,

the Administrator shall submit a report to Congress and to the Comptroller General.

(2) CONTENTS.—The reports required by paragraph (1) shall specify—

(A) the portion of such appropriations which are for programs, projects, or activities not authorized under subtitle A of this title, or which are in excess of amounts authorized for the relevant program, project, or activity under this Act; and

(B) the portion of such appropriations which are authorized under this Act.

(b) FEDERAL REGISTER NOTICE.—The Administrator shall, coincident with the submission of each report required by subsection (a), publish in the Federal Register a notice of all programs, projects, or activities for which funds are appropriated but which were not authorized under this Act, and solicit public comment thereon regarding the impact of such programs, projects, or activities on the conduct and effectiveness of the national aeronautics and space program.

(c) LIMITATION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no funds may be obligated for any programs, projects, or activities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal year 2000, 2001, or 2002 not authorized under this Act until 30 days have passed after the close of the public comment period contained in a notice required by subsection (b).

SEC. 125. USE OF FUNDS FOR SCIENTIFIC CONSULTATIONS OR EXTRAORDINARY EXPENSES.

Not more than $30,000 of the funds appropriated under section 103 may be used for scientific consultations or extraordinary expenses, upon the authority of the Administrator.

SEC. 126. EARTH SCIENCE LIMITATION.

Of the funds authorized to be appropriated for Earth Science under section 103(3) for each of fiscal years 2001 and 2002, $50,000,000 shall be for the Commercial Remote Sensing Program at Stennis Space Center for commercial data purchases, unless the National Aeronautics and Space Administration has integrated data purchases into the procurement process for Earth science research by obligating at least 5 percent of the aggregate amount appropriated for that fiscal year for Earth Observing System and Earth Probes for the purchase of Earth science data from the private sector.

SEC. 127. COMPETITIVENESS AND INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION.

(a) LIMITATION.—As part of the evaluation of the costs and benefits of entering into an obligation to conduct a space mission in which a foreign entity will participate as a supplier of the spacecraft, spacecraft system, or launch system, the Administrator shall solicit comment on the potential impact of such participation through notice published in Commerce Business Daily at least 45 days before entering into such an obligation.

(b) NATIONAL INTERESTS.—Before entering into an obligation described in subsection (a), the Administrator shall consider the national interests of the United States described in section 2(6).

SEC. 128. TRANS-HAB.

(a) REPLACEMENT STRUCTURE.—No funds authorized by this Act shall be obligated for the definition, design, or development of an inflatable space structure to replace any International Space Station components scheduled for launch in the Assembly Sequence released by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration on February 22, 1999.

(b) GENERAL LIMITATION.—No funds authorized by this Act for fiscal year 2000 shall be obligated for the definition, design, or development of an inflatable space structure capable of accommodating humans in space.

SEC. 129. CONSOLIDATED SPACE OPERATIONS CONTRACT.

No funds authorized by this Act shall be used to create a Government-owned corporation to perform the functions that are the subject of the Consolidated Space Operations Contract.

SEC. 130. TRIANA FUNDING PROHIBITION.

None of the funds authorized by this Act may be used for the Triana program, except that $2,500,000 of the amount authorized under section 103(3)(A) for fiscal year 2000 shall be available for termination costs.

TITLE II—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 201. REQUIREMENT FOR INDEPENDENT COST ANALYSIS.

Before any funds may be obligated for Phase B of a project that is projected to cost more than $100,000,000 in total project costs, the Chief Financial Officer for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall conduct an independent cost analysis of such project and shall report the results to Congress. In developing cost accounting and reporting standards for carrying out this section, the Chief Financial Officer shall, to the extent practicable and consistent with other laws, solicit the advice of expertise outside of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

SEC. 202. NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ACT OF 1958 AMENDMENTS.

(a) DECLARATION OF POLICY AND PURPOSE.—Section 102 of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 (42 U.S.C. 2451) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (f) and redesignating subsections (g) and (h) as subsections (f) and (g), respectively; and

(2) in subsection (g), as so redesignated by paragraph (1) of this subsection, by striking ''(f), and (g)'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''and (f)''.

(b) REPORTS TO THE CONGRESS.—Section 206(a) of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 (42 U.S.C. 2476(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''January'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''May''; and

(2) by striking ''calendar'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''fiscal''.

SEC. 203. COMMERCIAL SPACE GOODS AND SERVICES.

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall purchase commercially available space goods and services to the fullest extent feasible, and shall not conduct activities that preclude or deter commercial space activities except for reasons of national security or public safety. A space good or service shall be deemed commercially available if it is offered by a United States commercial provider, or if it could be supplied by a United States commercial provider in response to a Government procurement request. For purposes of this section, a purchase is feasible if it meets mission requirements in a cost-effective manner.

SEC. 204. COST EFFECTIVENESS CALCULATIONS.

In calculating the cost effectiveness of the cost of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration engaging in an activity as compared to

a commercial provider, the Administrator shall compare the cost of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration engaging in the activity using full cost accounting principles with the price the commercial provider will charge for such activity.

SEC. 205. FOREIGN CONTRACT LIMITATION.

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall not enter into any agreement or contract with a foreign government that grants the foreign government the right to recover profit in the event that the agreement or contract is terminated.

SEC. 206. AUTHORITY TO REDUCE OR SUSPEND CONTRACT PAYMENTS BASED ON SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE OF FRAUD.

Section 2307(i)(8) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''and (4)'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''(4), and (6)''.

SEC. 207. SPACE SHUTTLE UPGRADE STUDY.

(a) STUDY.—The Administrator shall enter into appropriate arrangements for the conduct of an independent study to reassess the priority of all Phase III and Phase IV Space Shuttle upgrades.

(b) PRIORITIES.—The study described in subsection (a) shall establish relative priorities of the upgrades within each of the following categories:

(1) Upgrades that are safety related.

(2) Upgrades that may have functional or technological applicability to reusable launch vehicles.

(3) Upgrades that have a payback period within the next 12 years.

(c) COMPLETION DATE.—The results of the study described in subsection (a) shall be transmitted to the Congress not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 208. AERO-SPACE TRANSPORTATION TECHNOLOGY INTEGRATION.

(a) INTEGRATION PLAN.—The Administrator shall develop a plan for the integration of research, development, and experimental demonstration activities in the aeronautics transportation technology and space transportation technology areas. The plan shall ensure that integration is accomplished without losing unique capabilities which support the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's defined missions. The plan shall also include appropriate strategies for using aeronautics centers in integration efforts.

(b) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall transmit to the Congress a report containing the plan developed under subsection (a). The Administrator shall transmit to the Congress annually thereafter for 5 years a report on progress in achieving such plan, to be transmitted with the annual budget request.

SEC. 209. DEFINITIONS OF COMMERCIAL SPACE POLICY TERMS.

The Administrator shall ensure that the usage of terminology in National Aeronautics and Space Administration policies and programs is consistent with the following definitions:

(1) The term ''commercialization'' means the process of private entities conducting privatized space activities to expand their customer base beyond the Federal Government to address existing or potential commercial markets, investing private resources to meet those commercial market requirements.

(2) The term ''commercial purchase'' means a purchase by the Federal Government of space goods and services at a market price from a private entity which has invested private resources to meet commercial requirements.

(3) The term ''commercial use of Federal assets'' means the use by a service contractor or other private entity of the capability of Federal assets to deliver services to commercial customers, with or without putting private capital at risk.

(4) The term ''contract consolidation'' means the combining of two or more Government service contracts for related space activities into one larger Government service contract.

(5) The term ''privatization'' means the process of transferring—

(A) control and ownership of Federal space-related assets, along with the responsibility for operating, maintaining, and upgrading those assets; or

(B) control and responsibility for space-related functions,

from the Federal Government to the private sector.

SEC. 210. EXTERNAL TANK OPPORTUNITIES STUDY.

(a) APPLICATIONS.—the Administrator shall enter into appropriate arrangements for an independent study to identify, and evaluate the potential benefits and costs of, the broadest possible range of commercial and scientific applications which are enabled by the launch of Space Shuttle external tanks into Earth orbit and retention in space, including—

(1) the use of privately owned external tanks as a venue for commercial advertising on the ground, during ascent, and in Earth orbit, except that such study shall not consider advertising that while in orbit is observable from the ground with the unaided human eye;

(2) the use of external tanks to achieve scientific or technology demonstration missions in Earth orbit, on the Moon, or elsewhere in space; and

(3) the use of external tanks as low-cost infrastructure in Earth orbit or on the Moon, including as an augmentation to the International Space Station.

A final report on the results of such study shall be delivered to the Congress not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act. Such report shall include recommendations as to Government and industry-funded improvements to the external tank which would maximize its cost-effectiveness for the scientific and commercial applications identified.

(b) REQUIRED IMPROVEMENTS.—The Administrator shall conduct an internal agency study, based on the conclusions of the study required by subsection (a), of what—

(1) improvements to the current Space Shuttle external tank; and

(2) other in-space transportation or infrastructure capability developments,

would be required for the safe and economical use of the Space Shuttle external tank for any or all of the applications identified by the study required by subsection (a), a report on which shall be delivered to Congress not later than 45 days after receipt of the final report required by subsection (a).

(c) CHANGES IN LAW OR POLICY.—Upon receipt of the final report required by subsection (a), the Administrator shall solicit comment from industry on what, if any, changes in law or policy would be required to achieve the applications identified in that final report. Not later than 90 days after receipt of such final report, the Administrator shall transmit to the Congress the comments received along with the recommendations of the Administrator as to changes in law or policy that may be required for those purposes.

SEC. 211. ELIGIBILITY FOR AWARDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall exclude from consideration for grant agreements made by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration after fiscal year 1999 any person who received funds, other than those described in subsection (b), appropriated for a fiscal year after fiscal year 1999, under a grant agreement from any Federal funding source for a project that was not subjected to a competitive, merit-based award process, except as specifically authorized by this Act. 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 the receipt of Federal funds by a person due to the membership of that person in a class specified by law for which assistance is awarded to members of the class according to a formula provided by law.

(c) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term ''grant agreement'' means a legal instrument whose principal purpose is to transfer a thing of value to the recipient to carry out a public purpose of support or stimulation authorized by a law of the United States, and does not include the acquisition (by purchase, lease, or barter) of property or services for the direct benefit or use of the United States Government. Such term does not include a cooperative agreement (as such term is used in section 6305 of title 31, United States Code) or a cooperative research and development agreement (as such term is defined in section 12(d)(1) of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 3710a(d)(1))).

SEC. 212. NOTICE.

(a) NOTICE OF REPROGRAMMING.—If any funds authorized by this Act are subject to a reprogramming action that requires notice to be provided to the Appropriations Committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate, notice of such action shall concurrently be provided to the Committee on Science of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate.

(b) NOTICE OF REORGANIZATION.—The Administrator shall provide notice to the Committees on Science and Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and the Committees on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and Appropriations of the Senate, not later than 15 days before any major reorganization of any program, project, or activity of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

SEC. 213. UNITARY WIND TUNNEL PLAN ACT OF 1949 AMENDMENTS.

The Unitary Wind Tunnel Plan Act of 1949 is amended—

(1) in section 101 (50 U.S.C. 511) by striking ''transsonic and supersonic'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''transsonic, supersonic, and hypersonic''; and

(2) in section 103 (50 U.S.C. 513)—

(A) by striking ''laboratories'' in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof ''laboratories and centers'';

(B) by striking ''supersonic'' in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof ''transsonic, supersonic, and hypersonic''; and

(C) by striking ''laboratory'' in subsection (c) and inserting in lieu thereof ''facility''.

SEC. 214. INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGIES FOR HUMAN SPACE FLIGHT.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.—In order to promote a ''faster, cheaper, better'' approach to the human exploration and development of space, the Administrator shall establish a Human Space Flight Commercialization/Technology program of ground-based and space-based research and development in innovative technologies.

(b) AWARDS.—At least 75 percent of the amount appropriated for the program established under subsection (a) for any fiscal year shall be awarded through broadly distributed announcements of opportunity that solicit proposals from educational institutions, industry, nonprofit institutions, National Aeronautics and Space Administration Centers, the Jet Propulsion Laboratory, other Federal agencies, and other interested organizations, and that allow partnerships among any combination of those entities, with evaluation, prioritization, and recommendations made by external peer review panels.

(c) PLAN.—The Administrator shall include as part of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's budget request to the Congress for fiscal year 2001 a plan for the implementation of the program established under subsection (a).

SEC. 215. LIFE IN THE UNIVERSE.

(a) REVIEW.—The Administrator shall enter into appropriate arrangements with the National Academy of Sciences for the conduct of a review of—

(1) international efforts to determine the extent of life in the universe; and

(2) enhancements that can be made to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's efforts to determine the extent of life in the universe.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The review required by subsection (a) shall include—

(1) an assessment of the direction of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's astrobiology initiatives within the Origins program;

(2) an assessment of the direction of other initiatives carried out by entities other than the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to determine the extent of life in the universe, including other Federal agencies, foreign space agencies, and private groups such as the Search for Extraterrestrial Intelligence Institute;

(3) recommendations about scientific and technological enhancements that could be made to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's astrobiology initiatives to effectively utilize the initiatives of the scientific and technical communities; and

(4) recommendations for possible coordination or integration of National Aeronautics and Space Administration initiatives with initiatives of other entities described in paragraph (2).

(c) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall transmit to the Congress a report on the results of the review carried out under this section.

SEC. 216. RESEARCH ON INTERNATIONAL SPACE STATION.

(a) STUDY.—The Administrator shall enter into a contract with the National Research Council and the National Academy of Public Administration to jointly conduct a study of the status of life and microgravity research as it relates to the International Space Station. The study shall include—

(1) an assessment of the United States scientific community's readiness to use the International Space Station for life and microgravity research;

(2) an assessment of the current and projected factors limiting the United States scientific community's ability to maximize the research potential of the International Space Station, including, but not limited to, the past and present availability of resources in the life and microgravity research accounts within the Office of Human Spaceflight and the Office of Life and Microgravity Sciences and Applications, and the past, present, and projected access to space of the scientific community; and

(3) recommendations for improving the United States scientific community's ability to maximize the research potential of the International Space Station, including an assessment of the relative costs and benefits of—

(A) dedicating an annual mission of the Space Shuttle to life and microgravity research during assembly of the International Space Station; and

(B) maintaining the schedule for assembly in place at the time of enactment.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall transmit 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 results of the study conducted under this section.

SEC. 217. REMOTE SENSING FOR AGRICULTURAL AND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT.

The Administrator shall—

(1) consult with the Secretary of Agriculture to determine data product types that are of use to farmers which can be remotely sensed from air or space;

(2) consider useful commercial data products related to agriculture as identified by the focused research program between the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's Stennis Space Center and the Department of Agriculture; and

(3) examine other data sources, including commercial sources, LightSAR, RADARSAT I, and RADARSAT II, which can provide domestic and international agricultural information relating to crop conditions, fertilization and irrigation needs, pest infiltration, soil conditions, projected food, feed, and fiber production, and other related subjects.

SEC. 218. INTEGRATED SAFETY RESEARCH PLAN.

(a) REQUIREMENT.—Not later than March 1, 2000, the Administrator and the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall jointly prepare and transmit to the Congress an integrated civil aviation safety research and development plan.

(b) CONTENTS.—The plan required by subsection (a) shall include—

(1) an identification of the respective research and development requirements, roles, and responsibilities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the Federal Aviation Administration;

(2) formal mechanisms for the timely sharing of information between the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the Federal Aviation Administration, including a requirement that the FAA-NASA Coordinating Committee established in 1980 meet at least twice a year; and

(3) procedures for increased communication and coordination between the Federal Aviation Administration research advisory committee established under section 44508 of title 49, United States Code, and the NASA Aeronautics and Space Transportation Technology Advisory Committee, including a proposal for greater cross-membership between those 2 advisory committees.

SEC. 219. 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF FLIGHT EDUCATIONAL INITIATIVE.

(a) EDUCATION CURRICULUM.—In recognition of the 100th anniversary of the first powered flight, the Administrator, in coordination with the Secretary of Education, shall develop and provide for the distribution, for use in the 2000–2001 academic year and thereafter, of an age-appropriate educational curriculum, for use at the kindergarten, elementary, and secondary levels, on the history of flight, the contribution of flight to global development in the 20th century, the practical benefits of aeronautics and space flight to society, the scientific and mathematical principles used in flight, and any other topics the Administrator considers appropriate. The Administrator shall integrate into the educational curriculum plans for the development and flight of the Mars plane.

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than May 1, 2000, the Administrator shall transmit a report to the Committee on Science of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate on activities undertaken pursuant to this section.

SEC. 220. INTERNET AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION.

The Administrator shall make available through the Internet home page of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration the abstracts relating to all research grants and awards made with funds authorized by this Act. Nothing in this section shall be construed to require or permit the release of any information prohibited by law or regulation from being released to the public.

The CHAIRMAN. 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.

Are there any amendments to the bill?

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. ROHRABACHER

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 6 offered by Mr. ROHRABACHER:

In section 103(2)—

(1) in subparagraph (A), insert ", and of which $77,400,000 may be used for activities associated with International Space Station research" after "rocket vouchers";

(2) in subparagraph (B), insert ", and of which $70,000,000 may be used for activities associated with International Space Station research" after "health issues"; and

(3) in subparagraph (C), insert ", and of which $80,800,000 may be used for activities associated with International Space Station research" after "health issues".

In section 103(4)(A)(i), insert "focused program" after "Ultra-Efficient Engine".

In section 103(4)(A)(ii)(I), insert ", including $30,000,000 for Pathfinder Operability Demonstrations" after "Demonstration Program".

In section 103(4)(B)(i), insert "focused program" after "Ultra-Efficient Engine."

In section 103(4)(C)(i), insert "focused program" after "Ultra-Efficient Engine."

In section 209(1), insert "encouraging" after "process of".

In section 219—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) strike "EDUCATION CURRICULUM.—" and insert "EDUCATIONAL INITIATIVE.—";

(B) strike "an age-appropriate educational curriculum" and insert "age-appropriate educational materials";

(C) insert "related" after "and any other"; and

(D) strike "the educational curriculum plans" and insert "the educational materials plans"; and

(2) in subsection (b), strike "Committee on Science of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate" and insert "Congress".

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, my amendment makes five minor changes to the language of H.R. 1654, most of which are clarifications rather than substantive changes.

One substantive change is that I specify that the bill's increase of $30 million for Future-X in Fiscal Year 2000 should go toward fast Pathfinder class operability demonstrations. My purpose here is to tell NASA that they should not only fund Future-X concepts which demonstrate advanced component technology but which are innovative in using existing technology to prove out the all important issue of

flexibility, reliability and low cost operations. So we are talking about money that would go for full-scale prototypes and operational systems and an overall system rather than just on a small segment of that development.

My amendment then makes four different clarifying changes to H.R. 1654, the first three of which I will briefly summarize.

It makes clear that the additional funding the bill provides for life and microgravity research would be available to fund research experiments to go on to the International Space Station.

It adds the word ''encourage'' to the definition of space commercialization to make it clear that we expect government to take affirmative steps to encourage the private sector to commercially develop space.

Third, we clarify the language describing an educational initiative on the centennial flight that is 1903, which we have heard about already this morning, so that the provisions address concerns raised by another committee of the House.

Finally, my amendment clarifies H.R. 1645's limitation on the Ultra Efficient Engine Technology program, and I would like to spend the remainder of this statement on that item, which I included in this address specifically to deal with the concerns of the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON), who has put out a tremendous effort dealing with this specific issue.

First and foremost, let me say there is no prohibition, and I heard earlier a statement on the floor suggesting that there is a prohibition in this bill on the use of funds for the ultra efficient technology engine. That analysis does Mr. LARSON a great disservice, and I would hope that the Members on the other side of the aisle realize that when they are making that argument, it is going into the RECORD, that is not an accurate portrayal of what we are doing at all.

In Fiscal Year 2000 NASA proposed the creation of a new 5-year focused program out of the remnants of two other focused astronautic programs in which NASA had abruptly canceled. The committee is concerned that frequently NASA will defend focused aeronautics program to the death even as they grow in cost and scope and then suddenly cancel them when the priorities of the agency changes.

My goal with this amendment is to make it clear that NASA has the discretion whether or not to spend these resources and these funds on this project and that it is encouraged to pursue this engine in question and that the requested funding of $50 million per year will be spent within the aeronautics research and technology base.

What we are then doing is providing NASA with the discretion, but in no way are we prohibiting NASA from moving forward with this engine project. The resulting language only prohibits a focused program. The bill and report language are not prejudicial in any way regarding using these funds to build or demonstrate this model engine.

In short, we have not eliminated, as my colleagues know, we have not eliminated this program. What we have eliminated is the mandate that NASA spend its funds on this project, but in no way do we prohibit these funds from being spent in developing this engine or showing or building a prototype of this ultra efficient jet engine.

I would hope that the NASA Administrator uses this discretion, which is the purpose of why we put this change in, and uses fully the funds requested for these next 3 years to obtain industry cost sharing. We are trying to encourage industry to get in by giving NASA some discretion here, because this will make this whole project a much better deal for the taxpayers, and in the end it will be better for the engine project to make sure the private sector is putting some money in.

So finally I would like to thank the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON) because had he not put so much time and energy in, we would not be just making sure that we have clarified this position, and it would not be as good as it is today. But please do not, and there should be no interpretation of this, that this is some type of eliminating these funds. We are actually giving more discretion to NASA, trying to attract public sector investment.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that none of the changes are controversial, and I believe that all of them improve the base of the bill, and I respectfully request the adoption of this manager's amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am not opposed to this amendment, but I will take time since the chairman discussed the ultra efficient engine technology so belaboredly to see if I am right in my assessment of this bill, and if there is some staff that might give me that information, I would appreciate it because around here what they say is, as my colleagues know, red is white or white is blue.

The information I have says H.R. 1654, the NASA authorization bill reported out of the Committee on Science, specifically eliminates funding. I want to use the terms again: specifically eliminates funding for the ultra efficient engine technology as a focused NASA program.

Now I want someone to, if they could answer that question, am I right or am I wrong?

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

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

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Yes, that is correct.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, and I reclaim my time.

We give these administrators all kinds of discretion, and we get screwed too. We are the policymakers. We have foreign manufacturers subsidizing their aviation industries, their space industries completely, their aircraft engine technology, putting strict environmental restrictions and regulations in their country on American craft, knocking out our business and economic infrastructure, and we are going to let someone have discretion.

Where is the analytical data to support that this program deserves to be taken off the focus program list? What data, what studies, what conclusions, what empirical evidence has been brought forward, what oversight body has made the decision to throw out this ultra efficient technology engine and let some bureaucrat at NASA make the decision?

I do not think that is the way to govern here, Mr. Chairman. That happens to be in northeast Ohio. That is not my district. But that is a great space center up there, and that is a great program, and it speaks to the core, the economic core, of some of the beating up we are getting overseas.

So I am not going to oppose the gentleman's amendment, but I will say this to him:

We are going to start having some rough and tumble times here with this space program if we do not come to some oversight agreements, and I have never taken exception.

Finally, in closing my little comments, just very briefly here:

The luster and the glory of space has all Americans cheering, but they are now starting to come down to earth, and they are starting to look at the budget and line items, and they better not just do that. Congress better start providing very, very stringent oversight.

I think the joy ride at NASA is over, and I think the time for some monitoring and oversight is at hand.

I will again leave by making this statement:

I am going to ask the chairman to change that language in conference, but that language cannot be changed today, and I will look and see if that language can be inserted in the form of amendment.

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

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

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Does the gentleman realize that this is being done in an effort to save the taxpayers money, to put more so that we can attract more money into the project by an investment from the private sector rather than having the focus program?

Mr. TRAFICANT. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, if it is the intent to save taxpayer money and to leverage participation with the private sector, maybe that should have been listed in the bill as a priority in this regard, but not take it out as a focus program.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. It is in the report language.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

Mr. Chairman, there has been a lot of confusion relative to what the bill does in this area, and I would like to dwell on two points.

First of all, the manager's amendment that the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) has introduced makes it clear that NASA will be able to continue research in the ultra efficient engine.

□ 1145

There is $50 million a year that is authorized for that. I think that that is a very wise move, because I do not think we should back away from this program altogether.

The second misconception that I am afraid is floating around here is that if NASA designates a program as a focus program, then that program is protected against raids by NASA or OMB or the Congress or anybody else to take the money away from a focus program and put it into something else. That is not the case.

OMB in the past has canceled focus programs and stuck the money into other NASA programs, and there have been reprogramming requests that have come up from the administrator and which have been approved either by the Congress by not acting or have been in transfer authority in appropriation bills.

The one that immediately comes to mind is the high speed research and advanced subsonic focus program which was in the aeronautics budget that NASA canceled and put the money in the International Space Station when the International Space Station ran short.

So I think that what is being done here is to continue the research but not to make it a focus program, and thus not to have what effectively is an earmark but an earmark without teeth.

Now having said all of that, one of the things that the science policy study attempts to do, which received overwhelming support on both sides of the aisle when it was approved last year, is to leverage government dollars with private sector dollars and dollars from other sources so that we have a bigger research pot, and that is what the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) is trying to do in this program.

We do not have enough government money to do everything that we want to do, and the NASA administrator has criticized this bill for being above the President's request. What we would like to do is we would like to bring the private sector in, and it is the private sector that is going to be able to reap the financial rewards of a successful development of an ultra-efficient engine. To have the taxpayers pay for the entire cost of developing the ultra-efficient engine is going to give the private sector a free ride, let us face it.

So this is a way to bring about cost sharing, to bring about the fact that the private sector has to put their money where their benefits will flow, and I think is a very, very constructive step in the right direction to start this program out.

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

Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to oppose the amendment of the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER), and I want to compliment him for trying to provide some wiggle room for the ultra-efficient energy technology program. However, I think it simply falls short, in that NASA has pointed out that anything less than a focused effort on the ultra-efficient energy technology would not be as efficient or effective a program.

So although the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) has good intentions, I am afraid his intention falls short; yet it certainly does no harm and, if anything, can be more good than bad. So I would support his amendment.

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

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

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I think we can both compliment the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON) on the hard work that he has put into this. We would not be having this discussion right now if it was not for the diligence on the part of the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON) to oversee this project. We want to make sure that we are on the record knowing that although the designation has changed, the Congress certainly wants this project to move forward.

Mr. GORDON. I agree, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON) has done yeoman's work in trying to educate us to really the benefits of this program. Hopefully that education will continue as we go through conference and as we try to bring a final bill to this floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TRAFICANT

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TRAFICANT:

In § 103(4)(A)(i) strike out '', with no funds to be used for the Ultra-Efficient Engine''.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, the amendment strictly strikes and simply strikes the sentence from the bill that takes out the ultra-efficient technology engine and it would, in fact, put it back in to focus and leave the project as it was last year. The amendment strictly says that the project would continue; it would be and continue to be a focus project. It would not be at the discretion of the administrator. Copies of the amendment can be delivered from the desk.

The language in the bill says, starting on line 4, section (i), it says $532 million shall be for Aeronautical Research and Technology, with no funds to be used for the Ultra-Efficient Engine, comma.

The Traficant amendment says $532-plus million shall be for Aeronautical Research and Technology, and with $412 million to be for the Research and Technology Base. It simply removes the sentence that says, and I quote, ''with no funds to be used for the Ultra-Efficient Engine.'' It would strictly take the sentence from the bill. It would leave it as a focus program, and the gentleman should support it.

Lastly, I would like to say for the Members, because we may have a vote on this but I would hope not, and I would hope that the wisdom of the Chair would very carefully review it, I want to read a quote from the aviation industry.

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

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

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, let me ask a couple of questions, if I could, and I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The amendment that the gentleman has offered, if it is adopted, would not increase the total amount of money that was authorized for NASA; am I correct in that?

Mr. TRAFICANT. That is correct. That is correct.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. It would give the NASA administrator the authority to use some of the aerospace technology funds, which is almost a billion dollars, for the ultra-efficient engine at the discretion of the NASA administrator?

Mr. TRAFICANT. What the amendment specifically states is this: That the language, ''with no funds to be used for the Ultra-Efficient Engine,'' would be stricken from the bill and the engine would thus be a part of the focus program of the administrator.

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. I yield to the gentleman from California, the subcommittee Chair.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, is that last part in the amendment of the gentleman or is that what the gentleman is explaining to us?

Mr. TRAFICANT. The amendment is very simple.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, we need to see a copy of the amendment.

Mr. TRAFICANT. A removal of this sentence, and I want the gentleman to listen, there is a sentence in here that says, quote, and this is the language verbatim to be stricken, ''with no funds to be used for the Ultra-Efficient Engine.'' The Traficant language removes that sentence.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Okay. That is it.

Mr. TRAFICANT. The intent of the Traficant language would thus be to

place the discretion with the administrator as it was focused under last year, and to remain with the same priority that it was in the past year's bill.

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

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

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, with that understanding, I am prepared to accept the amendment.

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

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

MR. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say that the report language already, we tried to discuss earlier and put this on the record.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, there is report language and there is bill language. If the intention of the gentleman is to do it in the report, then certainly this language that is so specific, there should be no problem about it being removed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) has expired.

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, finally, let me say this: There would have to be a reduction for the R&T base, and I believe that reduction would have to be in the amount of $362,800,000 from $412 million. As the chairman had asked, those would be the figures.

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

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

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, we need to see the language of this amendment. The gentleman just stated a couple of things that we did not know were in his amendment. Could we have a copy of this amendment, please?

Mr. TRAFICANT. Absolutely. It is at the desk.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Could the Clerk reread the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would announce that the Clerk is preparing copies for the majority and for distribution.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, while the gentleman is looking at the amendment, the gentleman had stricken the language for the ultra-efficient engine and put in $50 million for these new participatory private sector types of agreements. What the Traficant language says is we do not need to spend the additional $50 million, but if it be the decision of the committee that they want to retain the money in there and just strike the language for the engine, this Member will accept that.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Could the gentleman please repeat that?

Mr. TRAFICANT. There was an increase and $50 million was put into the Research and Technology Base fund in this bill.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. That is correct.

Mr. TRAFICANT. What I am doing is just simply wanting to strike that sentence that says ''with no funds to be used for the Ultra-Efficient Engine.'' My amendment would take that out.

Actually, the additional $50 million that was put in should be either taken out or the legislative history should show that my colleagues want to leave it in for their purposes. That is fine with me.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. That is acceptable.

Mr. TRAFICANT. That is acceptable to the gentleman?

Mr. ROHRABACHER. That is acceptable.

Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I will be very happy to yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) after I make a point.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I just wanted to say that is acceptable.

So the amendment would strictly be with no funds to be used for ultra-efficient engine. That would be removed; nothing to deal with the funds.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I think this is a very acceptable amendment because it actually goes to the purpose of the bill originally.

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

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. It is understood that that would be for all 3 years of the bill as well? It would be for all 3 years, a 3-year bill?

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Well, it eliminates that language for the bill for all 3 years, sure, it does.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Fine.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Reclaiming my time, the purpose of this segment of the bill and the purpose of the changes that we have made was aimed not at prohibiting funds from being used for this ultra-efficient jet engine. That, in fact, is not the purpose at all and that is why the gentleman's suggestion is accepted.

However, with the gentleman's amendment being accepted, this in no way suggests this program is becoming a focus program or that we are mandating that the money be spent.

□ 1200

What the purpose of this whole enterprise was all about was to try to give discretion to the people over at NASA to attract not just government money, but to attract private sector money into this project.

This is not the first time that this method has been used. Let me mention that we had a project, the EELV project, and, I might add, a lot of it would be built in my district, and I opposed it for the very reason that there was not any incentive to get the private sector involved and to get some extra money from the private companies involved in the development of this new rocket system. That project was changed and we managed to save the taxpayers $500 million and to get a better rocket as a result, because we brought the private sector in.

The purpose of our changes here were to try to save the taxpayers some money by getting the private sector to invest into a project from which those companies would benefit. To the point that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) eliminates some language that might suggest that there is some sort of prohibition on spending funds for this engine, we accept that language, but it in no way suggests that this will be a focus program and that NASA must spend the money on the program.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF MICHIGAN

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 8 offered by Mr. SMITH of Michigan:

In section 217—

(1) insert ''(a) INFORMATION DEVELOPMENT.—'' before ''The Administrator shall''; and

(2) add at the end the following new subsections:

(b) PLAN.—After performing the activities described in subsection (a) the Administrator and the Secretary of Agriculture shall develop a plan to inform farmers and other prospective users about the use of availability of remote sensing products that may assist with agricultural and forestry applications identified in subsection (a). The Administrator shall transmit such plan to the Congress not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) IMPLEMENTATION.—Not later than 90 days after the plan has been transmitted under subsection (b), the Administrator and the Secretary of Agriculture shall implement the plan.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, my amendment to help farmer and ranchers is in the bill before us. It provides that the Administrator of NASA shall discover and catalog the kind of remote sensing information, commercial and otherwise, that might be usable to help farmers and others determine potential crop shortages and surpluses and ultimately how much of what crop to plant in this country.

We have advanced tremendously over the last 30 years in our ability to discover what yields to expect from crop production around the world by means of satellite and other remote sensing monitoring. We are now able to estimate yields of some of the major crops within a plus or minus 10 percent deviation, up to sixty days before harvest. This information could be of great use to farmers.

The amendment now before us simply provides a way to disseminate this information to farmers.

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, part of this amendment is in the jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture.

Has the gentleman from Michigan obtained the consent of the chairman of that committee to offer this amendment today?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, we have obtained the consent of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COMBEST), the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), the ranking member, who support this amendment, as well as the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER), a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, with that understanding, I am prepared to accept the amendment as well. It is a constructive addition.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 AND AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. TRAFICANT

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I offer two amendments, and I ask unanimous consent that both amendments be taken together.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendments.

The text of the amendments is as follows:

Amendment No. 10 and amendment No. 11 offered by Mr. TRAFICANT:

AMENDMENT NO. 10: At the end of the bill, insert the following new section:

SEC. 221. 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 Administrator shall provide to each recipient of the assistance a notice describing the statement made in subsection (a) by the Congress.

In the table of contents, after the item relating to section 220, insert the following new item:

Sec. 221. Sense of Congress; requirement regarding notice.

AMENDMENT NO. 11: At the end of the bill, insert the following new section:

SEC. 221. USE OF ABANDONED AND UNDERUTILIZED BUILDINGS, GROUNDS, AND FACILITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In meeting the needs of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for additional facilities, the Administrator shall select abandoned and underutilized buildings, grounds, and facilities in depressed communities that can be converted to National Aeronautics and Space Administration facilities at a reasonable cost, as determined by the Administrator.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section, the term ''depressed communities'' means rural and urban communities that are relatively depressed, in terms of age of housing, extent of poverty, growth per capita income, extent of unemployment, job lag, or surplus labor.

In the table of contents, after the item relating to section 220, insert the following new item:

Sec. 221. Use of abandoned and underutilized buildings, grounds, and facilities.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) working with me on the language of the previous amendment. I appreciate that very much. The gentleman has been very fair and thankful, and I will vote for final passage of the bill.

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

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

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

This is kind of a tough act to follow, but this is going to be an easier sell than the last amendment that the gentleman from Ohio sold to us. It is my understanding that these amendments relate to a buy-American provision and a utilization of abandoned buildings provision in the bill. Am I correct in that assumption?

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, that is correct.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, these are also two very constructive additions and we are prepared to accept them as well.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

In meeting the needs of NASA, the Administrator shall, whenever feasible, select abandoned and under-utilized buildings, grounds and facilities for projects not at existing facilities. In other words, he does not have to, but wherever possible. We do not want some existing base to come in and say we are in a depressed community, which is the legislative history here, and say, therefore, send the business here. So wherever feasible and possible, select sites outside of the existing structure where there are economic hardships and give them an opportunity and a shot.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the support of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER).

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. COOK

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Mr. COOK:

At the end of the bill, insert the following new section:

SEC. 221. SPACE STATION COMMERCIALIZATION.

In order to promote commercialization of the International Space Station, the Administrator shall—

(1) allocate sufficient resources as appropriate to accelerate the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's initiatives promoting commercial participation in the International Space Station;

(2) instruct all National Aeronautics and Space Administration staff that they should consider the potential impact on commercial participation in the International Space Station in developing policies or program priorities not directly related to crew safety; and

(3) publish a list, not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter with the annual budget request of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, of the opportunities for commercial participation in the International Space Station consistent with safety and mission assurance.

In the table of contents, after the item relating to section 220, insert the following new item:

Sec. 221. Space Station commercialization.

Mr. COOK. Mr. Chairman, the space program has brought enormous growth to our economy and has created many high-wage, high-tech jobs for American workers. Throughout the world, commercial spending on space activity is booming. NASA and the taxpayers can both benefit from this trend through increased commercialization of the new International Space Station.

My amendment directs the NASA Administrator to commit appropriate resources to accelerate its International Space Station commercialization activities. It directs NASA staff to consider the commercial impact of their management decisions unrelated to safety. Finally, it requires NASA to publish within 90 days of enactment of this act a list of commercial opportunities to participate in the space station during 2000 and every year afterwards.

Primarily, the space program has brought high-tech jobs to the American aerospace and communications industry. To keep our American economy healthy and strong, we need to expand these benefits of space exploration to other areas of the private sector. NASA has made a good start in determining how to commercialize the ISS with the release of its draft plan last fall, but we need to push NASA to follow through on its successful planning efforts so that we do not lose the momentum on station commercialization.

By requiring NASA to publish its list of commercial opportunities to use the International Space Station consistent with safety and mission assurance, this amendment will reduce the cost of the space program to the American people by making the private sector a much larger partner.

ADAM SMITH taught us that we need competition to keep costs down and quality up. This amendment will help ensure that competition keeps our

space program the best and the most competitive in the world. Dan Goldin has done an excellent job managing NASA, but we need to get the private sector more involved. By doing this, we can use the benefits of competition to make our space program even better.

This amendment will ensure that our economic boom will continue into the next century by bringing home the benefits of space research to the American people. My amendment is supported by NASA.

I want to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) for allowing me to offer this amendment and commend him for his hard work in bringing this bill to the floor today.

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

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

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's amendment is a very good one. Again, it is supported by NASA. I would hope that the committee would approve it.

Mr. COOK. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin, and I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to support the amendment of the gentleman from Utah (Mr. COOK), with some qualifications.

First, I want the legislative record to be clear that I do not regard this language as a blank check for NASA to spend as much as it wants on open-ended initiatives to promote commercial participation in the space station. We have a duty to protect the taxpayers' pocketbook and vague language can be dangerous in that regard.

Second, I read paragraph two to simply mean that NASA will also consider impacts on commercial participation in the space station when it makes policies, along with all other impacts it may consider. These other impacts include the impact of the station's research capabilities on the utilization of the station, on international agreements and so forth. It is my understanding that this amendment makes commercial participation neither the only consideration when making station policies, nor the highest priority consideration.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment and congratulate the gentleman from Utah for putting it forward and also for laying down a marker. I think that what we are talking about here is a fundamental consciousness that we are trying to instill, not only in America's space program, but in most government activities.

Mr. Chairman, the time has passed when we could look at projects just as a bureaucratic endeavor or just something that would be taxpayer-funded totally. If there is any challenge that we have in maintaining a balanced budget and making sure that we put taxpayer dollars to the best use, it is that we have to attract dollars from the private sector into these endeavors to make sure that they are done efficiently, so that they are done in a way that will be beneficial not only to the people who work in the government, but the people who work in the private sector, so that there can be a multiplier effect in terms of the jobs that are created.

So for making an investment on the one hand into things such as the space station, we must always be conscious that that space station did not just mean the jobs that were created in building the space station, but it also means the jobs that will be created by economic activity in the private sector that will result from the space station's existence. The gentleman from Utah (Mr. COOK) is making sure that we put these dollars to maximum use, so I applaud him for it.

Mr. Chairman, I will be, in the near future, proposing a revolutionary new tax concept called Zero Gravity, Zero Tax. It has not been actually introduced as yet, but it is along this same principle, and that is what we would like to do, is to make sure that there is the maximum incentive for private investment in America's space program. As I say, it creates jobs not only in the projects, but it serves as a multiplier effect to create even more jobs once the project is in operation.

So again, I commend the gentleman from Utah (Mr. COOK).

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. COOK).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WEINER

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WEINER:

In section 103(4)(A), strike ''$999,300,000'' and insert ''$1,010,300,000''.

In section 103(4)(A)(i), strike ''$532,800,000'' and insert ''$543,800,000''.

In section 103(4)(A)(i), strike ''$412,800,000 to be for the Research and Technology Base'' and insert ''$423,800,000 to be for the Research and Technology Base, including $36,000,000 for aircraft noise reduction technology''.

In section 103(4)(B), strike ''$908,400,000'' and insert ''$918,400,000''.

In section 103(4)(B)(i), strike ''$524,000,000'' and insert ''$534,000,000''.

In section 103(4)(B)(i), strike ''$399,800,000 to be for the Research and Technology Base'' and insert ''$409,800,000 to be for the Research and Technology Base, including $36,000,000 for aircraft noise reduction technology''.

In section 103(4)(C), strike ''$994,800,000'' and insert ''$1,003,300,000''.

In section 103(4)(C)(i), strike ''$519,200,000'' and insert ''$527,700,000''.

In section 103(4)(C)(i), strike ''$381,600,000 to be for the Research and Technology Base'' and insert ''$390,100,000 to be for the Research and Technology Base, including $27,500,000 for aircraft noise reduction technology''.

In section 106(1), strike ''$13,625,600,000'' and insert ''$13,636,600,000''.

In section 106(2), strike ''$13,747,100,000'' and insert ''$13,757,100,000''.

In section 106(3), strike ''$13,839,400,000'' and insert ''$13,847,900,000''.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Chairman, first I want to thank the chairman of the full committee and the chairman of the subcommittee for their great help and efforts that they have committed themselves to to try to make this bill as good as it can be, and while there are some areas of contention, they have at all times, in consideration of this bill, been cordial and decent about trying to deal with these concerns.

At this time I am going to be offering an amendment with some of my colleagues, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH); the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL); the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. RIVERS); the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY); the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) and others, to try to deal in a timely fashion with the very important and pressing matter that has emerged in recent years and shows no signs of abating, and that is the problem of noise emanating from our airports.

As we have increased almost exponentially the amount of air traffic that there has been, we have also similarly increased the burden that is created to those of us who represent areas around airports, large and small.

What my amendment would do, it would take the very valuable research that is done by NASA on noise research and bring it back up to last year's level and ensure that it stays there for at least the duration of this authorization.

There was some concern raised in the full committee about whether we were taking from one program to add to another, and what we would do here is in fiscal year 2000 simply add $11 million for these programs that wind up being funded in this way.

□ 1215

Mr. Chairman, this amendment does not in any level bust the budget. In fact, it restores last year's level for noise reduction. The overall aggregate number of the NASA authorization would again be the same as it was last year, but what this will do is allow us at this important time to continue research on the next generation of the most quiet aircraft that we can have.

We are now, by the end of this year, going to be phasing in the Phase III aircraft, which are the most modern, the most quiet aircraft, but still are akin to having a thunderclap over one's head whenever they take off. This will allow us to do the research for

Stage IV. This will allow us to have even more quiet aircraft in the years to come.

The research that is being done by NASA may some day help us strike the delicate balance that we have been trying to reach in this House between the rights of air travelers, the rights of those who depend on air traffic for commerce, and those of us, and there are dozens of us in this House, who have areas that are nearby airports.

We are in negotiations now with the European community, we are in negotiations now with the private sector to encourage the development of this quieter aircraft. Now is not the time for us to weaken that research by reducing the funding that this authorization does.

This is an opportunity for us to send a message also to the private sector that we seek to have their participation as well. We send entirely the wrong message if we in our budget say, we are going to ratchet back our research into these important matters when we are trying to bring the private sector along.

The chairman of the subcommittee has done great work in trying to encourage the private sector to do their research. I consider these funds to be leveraging those, and I think it would be helpful for us to do that now.

This is an opportunity, and perhaps our last opportunity this year. We are going to be passing an FAA reauthorization bill that I believe is going to, regardless of how it emerges, increase air traffic. There are proposals to almost entirely deregulate all of our airports.

That is going to mean another increase in air noise. This is, I would remind my colleagues, perhaps the last opportunity for us to go on record as being in support of whatever technological advantages we can support to bring about the quietest aircraft possible.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in reluctant opposition to this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the heart of gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER) is in the right place on this amendment, but this is not a fiscally responsible way of going about addressing this problem, since the amendment is an add-on of approximately $10 million additional authorization for each of the next 3 years.

NASA is committed to spending $25 million for aircraft noise reduction in fiscal year 2000. So it is not a question of whether we spend nothing on aircraft noise reduction research or some money, because NASA has got that money allocated within one of their accounts.

The bulk of NASA's aeronautic research into aircraft noise reduction technology was conducted within the research and technology base of the advanced subsonic technology program. The administration, and I emphasize the administration, decided to terminate the advanced subsonic technology program when a determination was made that NASA needed additional funding for the International Space Station.

That was budget discipline. That was setting priorities. That was something that the administration decided that it had to do in terms of meeting its obligations.

For us to turn and go around and say we should forget about budget priorities, we should simply add to the authorization, I think diminishes the credibility of the efforts of the Committee on Science to figure out how we will be able to give NASA the money that is available for this year to the highest and best effect.

NASA has already testified before Congress that they are meeting their goals on aircraft noise reduction technology research within the money that is available. Because of this, we should accept the fact that they know how much they can spend on it. We should not be dealing with this problem simply by throwing more money at it.

I would love to be able to meet everyone's desires, but that is not the way life is in the real world and in the budget climate we are facing. We have to be responsible. This amendment is not fiscally responsible. It runs counter to NASA's expert opinion on their requirements. It breaks our obligations to the taxpayers, and I would ask the committee to reject it.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Weiner-Udall-Crowley, et al., amendment to increase funding for airport noise reduction research and technology in the research and technology base of the NASA authorization bill.

Mr. Chairman, airport noise is perhaps the single most important local quality of life issue to my constituents. Every day my district office receives calls from people living near LaGuardia Airport who complain about the noise from planes landing and taking off. In fact, along with my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER), I have worked hard to preserve the high-density rule and mitigate airport noise in Queens County.

Mr. Chairman, NASA has listed airport noise reduction as one of its top 10 goals. They want to reduce perceived aircraft noise by 50 percent over a 10-year period, beginning in 1997. Under current funding this goal will not be realized.

The Weiner amendment would restore funding for aircraft noise reduction research to roughly fiscal year 1999 levels. It would bring NASA's overall budget to a 13.655 billion, which is exactly the same dollar amount that it was appropriated at in fiscal year 1999.

I applaud my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER) for bringing this important issue to the floor of the House. The people who invented the rocket engine are the best people to study aircraft noise and ways to reduce it.

I urge my fellow Members of Congress to support this increase in funding for airport noise reduction, research, and technology. Their constituents who live near airports will appreciate their vote to make their homes, schools, parks, and neighborhoods quieter. The Weiner amendment would do just that.

I would just like to add, taking away the high-density ruling will increase air traffic in high-density airports like LaGuardia, Kennedy Airport, O'Hare Airport in Chicago. Unless we are moving realistically towards a Stage IV engine and unless there is real effort on the part of NASA to develop new technologies to reduce aircraft engines' jet noise, what we are doing to inner cities like New York City is unconscionable. It really, truly is unconscionable, to be increasing air traffic.

Putting aside for the moment the air traffic safety issues and focusing simply on the level of noise that is created by these engines taking off and landing at airports like LaGuardia Airport in my district, it is unconscionable to be standing here at the same time and supporting a bill that will reduce the effort to bring about technology to reduce the level of noise emitting from those jet airplanes.

I cannot support a bill that will gut and take away monies from that very needed project, and leaving it in the hands of NASA to develop that needed technology.

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

When we are looking at the arguments on this amendment, Mr. Chairman, let us take a look. We are not talking about gutting money for research into jet engine noise.

Again, this has often been the case in the past where people on the other side of the aisle have taken a look at money that was projected to be spent, increases that were projected, and then when the increase is reduced, that is portrayed as some kind of gutting of a program. That is just not the case.

In fact, NASA documents provided to Congress suggest that there would be a $46 million figure spent for this type of research from fiscal year 2000 to 2002. However, updated documents from that agency suggest that NASA will now be spending $71.3 million for noise reduction, which means even without the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER), NASA is planning to spend $25 million more than what it was on this particular issue.

So while I believe that the amendment is well-intended, I do believe that, number one, it is an inaccurate portrayal to suggest that we are reducing the spending; but number two, it is irresponsible in an overall budgetary sense.

What we have here is an attempt by the administration to set priorities.

The money is necessary for the International Space Station, so it decided to reduce the increase in spending, so the administration was trying to act responsibly. Now we have an amendment here to undercut the administration when they have tried to set priorities with a limited budget.

I have one more point to make in regard to that. The administration has had to set priorities because it is trying not to bust the budget, not to put us back on this road to irresponsibility that led to such massive deficits in the past.

Instead, what is happening here, and again, we have amendments similar to this in the full committee, we find that we cannot just spend money. It just does not come out of nowhere. In this particular case, the gentleman now has decided to try to add on money, rather than take it out of other research areas in the science budget.

But then, where does that extra $11 million come from? It comes from what we have designated, we have tried to hold off and protect, not as the social security trust fund, but social security surplus money. We have said we are going to try to keep all the money we do not spend and put it back into social security as a protection of that system.

This $11 million is just one example of, yes, it is just a little bit of money, but everybody here has a little bit of money here, a little bit of money there, and eventually we have that surplus that we hope to spend on social security and to solidify social security just being whittled away to nothing again. I do not think that would be responsible.

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

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. Just so we do not lose perspective here, I agree, we should keep things in mind. We should keep in mind that the bill the gentleman is bringing forward is above the President's request, so the outrage that I hear about we are changing the President's priorities, I think perhaps the chairman doth protest too much.

I also want to point out exactly the parameters we are talking about. I am talking about restoring to last year's level, not above, to last year's level of roughly $10 million in the context of a bill in the aggregate that is $42 billion. It is $14 billion this year.

What we are saying is, look, at the same time that we are taking this technology and devoting a significant portion of it to thinking about the problems we are going to be encountering in the future, ought we not to be thinking of the problems we are going to be encountering in a couple of months when we pass the FAA reauthorization, which is something NASA admits they did not take into their calculation when they estimated whether or not the funds provided for noise reduction were sufficient? This is a relatively small amount of money.

I would just respond to one other point that the gentleman made. In this research and technology base, which, just to keep perspective, is about $362 million, there was criticism, and legitimate criticism, raised in the committee consideration of this bill about whether we were taking from one pocket to fund this program.

I accepted that criticism as valid, so now I am saying, in the aggregate, let us do this one-one thousandth increase for this purpose.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman was responsive to the debates that we had, and I applaud him for this. This is a learning process around here. But then again, the money, by plussing it up in the way the gentleman now is suggesting, it does again come from another source. That source is money that we had hopefully to protect social security.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) has expired.

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

Mr. ROHRABACHER. One last point, Mr. Chairman. NASA has listened to the gentleman, and people have been listening to the gentleman's arguments, because NASA has already agreed to a plus-up or an increase in their spending, in their prioritized spending, of $25 million in this area. I would believe it probably is in reaction to the arguments that the gentleman has been presenting. So in a way the gentleman has won this fight. Adding another $11 million I think is not necessarily the right way to go. I appreciate very much the gentleman's sincerity, but I would have to oppose this amendment.

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

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

□ 1230

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment of the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER), the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL), and the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY), and do so because their amendment is about quality of life, quality of life not just in space but here on Earth, not just for six astronauts housed in an International Space Station but for people in inner city conditions, in poor areas.

This amendment is about balance and perspective and fairness. It is also fiscally responsible. It merely takes us back up to last year's level. It is a concern about noise reduction for aircraft, especially in big airports, that fly over inner city areas.

Mr. Chairman, if we are not careful and if we do not come back and abide by the concerns expressed by the gentleman from New York in the aeronautics area of this bill, this bill is soon going to be called not the NASA bill, ''aeronautics'' is going to be dropped out, it is just going to be the National Space Administration. We are not going to be able to help our aeronautics industries in this country, where they are competing more and more every day with Airbus and the fledgling industries in Japan and Korea and the southeast countries of Asia.

It used to be, when I got on the Committee on Science 8 years ago, that we provided a $30 million or a $40 million or a $50 million plus-up for the aeronautics. Now we cannot seem to find any money to help.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER) is simply saying let us take us back to last year's level. Let us increase this slowly, $10 million a year. Let us make sure that money in the NASA budget goes in a fair and qualified and quality of life manner.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) said that the administration made the decision to take the money away from aeronautics because of the Space Station. That is one of my concerns, that the Space Station continues to eat up more and more and more of the available funds to do wonderfully enriching scientific and space-oriented and aeronautics programs.

So we are going to have the opportunity later today to cap funding on the Space Station, that is one option; to get the Russians out of the critical path, that is a second option; or to kill the Space Station, the third option. We will see if this body wants to go along with any of those options.

Finally, I say, Mr. Chairman, that the administration has issued a statement of administration policy. In that the President has said the authorization levels in the bill do not conform to the President's request, which is based on a balanced and affordable space and aeronautics program.

That is exactly the point of the amendment of the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER). We are losing that balance for aeronautics. We are losing that support for our aircraft industry in this country. Boeing competes more and more on the cutting edge every day with Airbus.

We have people living in inner city conditions with loud aircraft flying over their homes every single day, hour upon hour upon hour. We want to provide some more research monies to help alleviate the noise of those engines. I think that is a fair request. I think that we should be able to find $10 million this year. The gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER) did not propose it, but I would propose take that $10 million away from the International Space Station that has gone from $8 billion in costs to $98 billion in life cycle costs.

So with that, Mr. Chairman, I encourage my colleagues to support the responsible, balanced quality of life

amendment of the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER), and let us keep the aeronautics portion of this bill in the bill.

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

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) is very articulate, and he is a very responsible Member of this House and has kept our feet to the fire on the Space Station program for many years. I might add that his focus on the Space Station has, I think, improved the Space Station in the end, because people have known that he has been there and watching very closely.

However, this money does not come from Space Station. As designed, it is coming out of money that, again, would come right off the top of the bat, which we were hoping to secure for Social Security. So the points the gentleman from Indiana made are very valid, but that is not why the money is coming.

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER).

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Arizona for yielding to me. I just want to respond to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

First of all, I appreciate his comments about our efforts to control the costs on the Space Station, try to make sure that it can do what it was supposed to do scientifically.

But, secondly, Mr. Chairman, I think that the NASA budget, which has gone between about $13.4 billion and slightly over $14 billion, has had more and more erosion in that budget from now the Space Station growing from in previous years $2.1 billion being allocated, to $2.4 billion being allocated this year for it.

So that is where I am saying the growth is coming in the Space Station, and good programs like what the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER) is trying to accomplish with noise reduction are falling by the wayside.

Shuttle safety we are concerned about. Education grants we are concerned about. Science programs and space science we are concerned about. So those are some of the things we are talking about.

I share the gentleman's concern for Social Security and the trust fund, and I hope he will work with us to put as much of the budget surplus as possible back in that surplus.

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I think that the arguments that the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) are making are certainly valid arguments. When we decided to move forward, and this body has decided on many occasions to move forward with the International Space Station, all of us who were voting on that should very well have remembered that we were prioritizing our spending and that it was going to have an impact in other areas just like the areas the gentleman is suggesting and I might add just like the areas that the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER) is bringing up today.

We are foregoing spending in certain areas in order to be responsible and not suck up money that should be going into bolstering Social Security. The gentleman is absolutely right. This is part of the cost of the Space Station. The amendment of the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER) does not, however, take this out of Space Station.

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

Mr. SALMON. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Chairman, if I could just respond to the chairman of the subcommittee, my good friend, would he then not object to an amendment which took the money out of the research and technology base?

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I do not support taking it out of Space Station. But we have to realize what the gentleman's amendment is actually doing. It is not taking it out of Space Station. It is adding to that. The money does not come from anywhere. The gentleman from New York is doing a diligent job in trying to meet those objections.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SALMON) would further yield, I will gladly change my amendment and take it from that huge pot of money that is Research and Technology Base. If he will support that, I will be glad to do it. But it seems like I have a moving target here. We cannot take money from a $400 million Research and Technology Base because then any numbers of projects could fall from the sky. But, on the other hand, if I say let us plus it up just to last year's level and no higher, then that, too, raises an objection.

It seems to me that what we are trying to say here, and I will try to do anything that I can to meet the objections of the subcommittee Chair, is to try to say, look, all we want to do is take the level that we had last year in this important program and meet it this year. I will do it the gentleman's way, and I stand ready here to amend my amendment in any way necessary.

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, again I compliment the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER) for showing due diligence to the arguments that were offered in committee and trying to find another funding level.

I would just suggest that he come forward with a specific suggestion. It is not, as has been implied by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) that this is not being funded out of Space Station. His arguments about Space Station are valid, in that it is eating money up from programs like the one the gentleman were offering.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SALMON) has expired.

(On request of Mr. WEINER, and by unanimous consent, Mr. SALMON was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

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

Mr. SALMON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Chairman, I am willing and able, and I think my colleagues who are cosponsoring this amendment would be more than willing. The gentleman said where shall it come from. The gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) said I have not proposed it comes from the Space Station, although I will be glad to accept that proposal as well. I understand from the gentleman's concerns that he would accept it if I took that $10 million from the existing Research and Technology Base.

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, let me put it this way: I will seriously consider any proposal that the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER) has that takes money specifically from something that I believe has lower priority than what he is suggesting, but it is up to the gentleman to come up with a specific.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SALMON) would further yield, I just did.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SALMON) would further yield, let me put it this way: Taking from the overall research and develop budget is not acceptable because it is not specific. It would not be specific, for example, that money would have to come from another research project. Maybe the project of the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON) then would be defunded by what the gentleman from New York is proposing, if we went the route that he is suggesting. Unless the gentleman from New York can be more specific than that, I could not.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Weiner-Udall-Crowley-Kucinich-Rivers amendment. I would like to talk on two points of the amendment. One is just the fiscal issues that we have been discussing here. I would also like to speak to the point of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) about the discussion about the quality of life issues that are at stake.

Let us again remind ourselves that the Weiner amendment would restore funding for aircraft noise reduction research to fiscal 1999 levels in the NASA budget. If we look out a little further, it would increase in fiscal year 2000 by $11 million; fiscal 2001, $10 million; and fiscal 2002, $8.5 million for aircraft noise reduction research and technology.

Now, in 1999, this noise reduction technology was funded at a level of $36 million. In fiscal year 2000, it is scheduled only for $25 million; in fiscal year 2001 for $26 million; and fiscal year 2002, $19 million.

The amendment of the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER) would restore the funding for aircraft noise reduction to levels that are commensurate with 1999. The Weiner amendment would bring us back up to NASA's overall budget levels of $13.655 billion, which is exactly the same amount of money that was appropriated in fiscal year 1999.

So with all due respect, this is not a budget buster. This is in fact being fiscally responsible. In the long run, we are going to save money by making sure that we put these monies into investing in reducing noise at our airports.

The Department of Transportation estimates that over 3 million Americans are affected by airport noise every day. This FAA authorization bill that we are facing later on in our session is likely to increase traffic at our Nation's busiest airports. By supporting this amendment, we are going to provide some relief for the people that live around those airports.

I want to talk briefly about my State. We have Denver International Airport, known as DIA. It is the jewel of our Nation's airport system at this point. But we want to build a sixth runway. We cannot do that right now because increased noise has become an issue, not only for urban residents but for farmers, for business people, and for all the people that live in the mountains of Colorado.

We ought to be doing all we can to solve that problem now so that people all over the country who use Denver International Airport know that that airport is going to be open in all kinds of weather conditions.

Historically, the FAA has been great at running the trains, if you will, running the airports in our country, but NASA has done the important research and development. We ought to be encouraging that combination, and this amendment will do that.

If we want to reduce opposition to airport operations and expansion, we ought to pass this amendment now. This is going to be our only chance this session to reduce the din around our cities and airports. Rather than create more delay and litigation over our airports, let us encourage the development of quieter engines so our air transportation system can help us meet the challenges and the opportunities facing us in this next century.

□ 1245

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

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to join the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER), the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL), the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY), and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) in sponsoring this amendment, and I rise in support of its passage here today.

I think anyone who is interested in economic development in this country should give very close consideration to this particular proposal. I am convinced that progress in noise reduction is imperative to continued economic growth in this country.

The tension exists today between growth in traffic in the air and concerns about quality of life on the ground, and this tension represents a formidable barrier to economic expansion all across the country.

We all know that increased air traffic is inevitable, whether it is through legislation of this body or through simple population increase over the next several years. We know that we have a problem and it is going to get bigger.

The FAA currently puts monies towards abatement and remediation efforts but, in fact, they have not been adequate, and those efforts may end up being negated to some extent as the FAA moves to change traffic patterns and navigation methodology into the future. And we may see traffic movement from the existing contours and this problem spread to more and more families.

The NASA bill that we are talking about is about researching new technologies, not about abating problems that currently exist but dealing with the future. And, of course, we need both. We need remediation of existing problems, and we must eliminate any future problems before they start.

What we are hoping to see developed here is next-stage aircrafts, necessary, absolutely necessary, if we hope to support both quality of life for the families who are affected by this problem, as we just heard 3 million and growing, as well as the economic needs of communities, regions of the country, and indeed the country as a whole.

If my colleagues are interested in economic development, if they are interested in protecting both the growth of air travel and the economic growth that is incumbent with that, as well as the quality of life for people on the ground, this is a very good place to spend a vote today.

I urge that my colleagues support it.

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

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER).

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Chairman, I just want to summarize here what we have had a chance to learn. We have learned that there is virtual consensus in this body, even on those that are opposed to my amendment, that aircraft noise has reached almost chronic proportions. We have agreed that we need to do more about it. We have agreed in the years to come there will be even more aircraft taking off, more people living in those paths, and more people being harmed every day several times an hour by that air traffic.

But what we have heard is that my amendment to add $10 million this year to a package that includes $42 billion of spending, including $14 billion just this year alone, is somehow too rich. And we found out that instead of offering this amendment in the way that I have to bring it up to last year's level, no higher, that instead I should identify places in the budget and seek to have this funded from those areas.

Well, perhaps I can have it funded from the Advanced Space Transportation Technology section of this bill. $80 million plus-up, an $80 million additional allocation is in this bill, above and beyond what the President proposed. Perhaps it can come from that research and technology base that I had a brief colloquy with my chairman about, which is a $362 million pot of money that is essentially fungible that we are saying, as this Congress, we want to give the authority to NASA to decide how that should be spent.

But if we agree on the fundamental premise that we need to do more research, that we need to ensure that when the stage-four aircraft are ready that we in the United States are able to put them on our aircraft as quickly as possible, then perhaps this is the place to start.

There is concern, and it is legitimate concern, that we not bust the budget. Well, we are not busting the budget by restoring this to last year's level. We are not busting the budget if we are going to be approving a bill with this amendment, which is exactly at the same level as it was this year. And all of the protest about us not paying enough diligence, not paying enough respect to the request that the President submitted I believe is a false concern.

I believe that there are many areas in this budget where we exceed the President's request. This is an opportunity for us to touch people's lives all over this country. It might be our last chance this year to say, in addition to trying to foster greater air commerce, in addition to trying to foster growth at airports, in addition to trying to track new jobs, we should do a little bit, a very little bit, to add to the amount of research that we do that, perhaps with the great assets that we have in this country, intellectual and otherwise, in years to come we might be able to look back at this bill and say give us the extra push to get even quieter aircraft flying over our country.

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

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

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, is the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER) now amending his amendment or proposing a new amendment that suggests that the $11 million come from the Advanced Space Transportation Technology section?

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentleman, would he support that amendment if I did?

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would yield, is that the proposal of the gentleman?

Mr. WEINER. Well, I am always guided by the wisdom of my subcommittee chair. Would the chairman support that amendment if I crafted it in that manner?

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Well, let me suggest this, if the gentleman would continue to yield:

I had extensive meetings on this budget with Mr. Goldin, who, of course, is the head of NASA. And I know that we have a big budget and I know $10 million or $11 million seems like it is a small portion, but believe it or not, the people in government who have to deal with this budget actually have ideas of how this money should be spent and have ideas and know that if it is not spent in another way it will come out of these other priorities.

Mr. Goldin has emphasized to me, as the chairman of the subcommittee, that the Advanced Space Technology portion is third highest priority. And frankly, this is something that we should have been discussing and going through for the last two or three weeks rather than here on the floor of trying to find an area.

So I would imagine Dan Goldin and the administration would oppose it coming out of that themselves. It is something that, and I agree with the gentleman, I mean, I think that he has hit an area that needs research. In fact, as I mentioned earlier, NASA has already decided to increase, due to probably some of the arguments he has provided, by $25 million.

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

Mr. LAMPSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Chairman, first of all, as the chairman is aware, we did not mark this up in the subcommittee so we did not have an opportunity to fully vet it. And when we did offer a similar amendment, the type that my colleague seems to be supporting, I won on a tie vote, a moral victory perhaps; and that is why I chose to draft it this way using the guidance of the gentleman.

And I am comfortable with the idea of a $14 billion NASA budget this year, having an additional $10 million that does not exceed last year's level. I am comfortable with that amendment and I would urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Weiner/Kucinich/Udall/Rivers amendment. I have been actively working to ameliorate aircraft noise and pollution problems affecting my district and the New Jersey/New York Region for many years.

Recently, I helped secure language in the FAA reauthorization act to urge the FAA to complete its redesign of the New York/New Jersey airspace as expeditiously as possible. I also joined other Members in signing a letter to the Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee urging full funding for the airport improvement program.

Recently, too, I have met with NASA representatives to better understand their ongoing research efforts that would help reduce aircraft noise. These efforts are leading to the next phase of quieter aircraft, often referred to as ''state IV''. However, NASA is many years away from deploying this technology. To increase their ability to develop this technology more rapidly, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the Weiner amendment. The amendment would restore funding for NASA's aircraft noise research program to last year's appropriated level, and would only do so over the next three years. This funding is critical to providing noise relief to our citizens, improving air quality and reducing greenhouse gas emissions, and increasing safety of residents and flight passengers nationwide.

This amendment is important not only for residents in the New Jersey/New York region, but for our entire nation. And I commend my freshman colleague from New York for initiating this important amendment that will improve the quality of life for people across the U.S. Help begin the new millennium with greater noise and pollution relief for our constituents by voting ''Yes'' today on the Weiner/Kucinich/Udall/Rivers amendment.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the amendment offered by Mr. WEINER to the FY 2000 NASA Authorization bill. This measure would restore funding for NASA's Aircraft Noise Research Program to last year's level. The research conducted by this program would be of great benefit for all those who live, work, or travel near airports throughout the country.

The New York metropolitan area air space is the busiest in the nation. While many people enjoy the benefits of frequent flights into and out of New York, my constituents are forced to endure the noise of a plane landing or taking off every 30 seconds at LaGuardia Airport. Moreover, the FY 2000 FAA Re-Authorization bill which the House will be considering in the next few weeks, may well increase this flight activity. The issue of airplane noise is a quality of life issue for the people who live, work, and go to school in the areas surrounding our nation's airports. The least we can do is work to make these planes quieter, and lessen the burden on those who reside near airports in my district, as well as throughout the country.

I want to thank the gentleman from New York, Mr. WEINER, for his initiative and leadership on this critical issue for so many New Yorkers and others throughout the country. I urge my colleagues to support this critical issue and vote ''yes'' on the Weiner amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER).

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

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 174, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER) will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. SALMON

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 7 offered by Mr. SALMON:

At the end of the bill, insert the following new section:

SEC. 221. ANTI-DRUG MESSAGE ON INTERNET SITES.

Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator, in consultation with the Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy, shall place anti-drug messages on Internet sites controlled by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

In the table of contents, after the item relating to section 220, insert the following new item:

Sec. 221. Anti-drug message on Internet sites.

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is very straightforward. It requires the NASA Administrator to consult with the Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy to place antidrug messages on NASA Internet sites.

The NASA Internet site is the most popular Government Web site, receiving hundreds of millions of hits. For example, the Mars Pathfinder Web site logged roughly 750 million hits during its mission to Mars. John Glenn's return to space generated 732,000 Web pages being downloaded from NASA's server, and each week about 250,000 Web pages are downloaded from NASA's server.

Many of these hits on the NASA site are from children, our young people. Thousands of schools around the country have incorporated the NASA Web site into their science curriculum. Furthermore, NASA has targeted students with interactive Web sites designed to engage young minds.

In an era where our children are constantly bombarded and surrounded by the influence of drugs and where more than half of all high school students are found to have dabbled with illicit drugs by the time they have graduated, now is the time to step up our prevention efforts to protect our children from the scourge of drugs. The NASA Web site is an excellent and cost-free way to send these antidrug messages to our young children.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

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

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, the amendment of the gentleman from Arizona is a very constructive one and I am happy to accept it.

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

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

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, I also recommend accepting the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SALMON).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. ROEMER

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 4 offered by Mr. ROEMER:

After section 130, insert the following new section:

SEC. 131. COST LIMITATION FOR THE INTERNATIONAL SPACE STATION.

(a) LIMITATION OF COSTS.—Except as provided in subsection (c), the total amount appropriated for—

(1) costs of the International Space Station through completion of assembly may not exceed $21,900,000,000; and

(2) space shuttle launch costs in connection with the assembly of the International Space Station through completion of assembly may not exceed $17,700,000,000 (determined at the rate of $380,000,000 per space shuttle flight).

(b) COSTS TO WHICH LIMITATION APPLIES.—

(1) DEVELOPMENT COSTS.—The limitation imposed by subsection (a)(1) does not apply to funding for operations, research, and crew return activities subsequent to substantial completion of the International Space Station.

(2) LAUNCH COSTS.—The limitation imposed by subsection (a)(2) does not apply to space shuttle launch costs in connection with operations, research, and crew return activities subsequent to substantial completion of the International Space Station.

(3) SUBSTANTIAL COMPLETION.—For purposes of this subsection, the International Space Station is considered to be substantially completed when the development costs comprise 5 percent or less of the total International Space Station costs for the fiscal year.

(c) AUTOMATIC INCREASE OF LIMITATION AMOUNT.—The amounts set forth in subsection (a) shall each be increased to reflect any increase in costs attributable to—

(1) economic inflation;

(2) compliance with changes in Federal, State, or local laws enacted after the date of enactment of this Act;

(3) the lack of performance or the termination of participation of any of the International countries participating in the International Space Station; and

(4) new technologies to improve safety, reliability, maintainability, availability, or utilization of the International Space Station, or to reduce costs after completion of assembly, including increases in costs for on-orbit assembly sequence problems, increased ground testing, verification and integration activities, contingency responses to on-orbit failures, and design improvements to reduce the risk of on-orbit failures.

(d) NOTICE OF CHANGES.—The Administrator shall provide with each annual budget request a written notice and analysis of any changes under subsection (c) to the amounts set forth in subsection (a) to the Senate Committees on Appropriations and on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and to the House of Representatives Committees on Appropriations and on Science. The written notice shall include—

(1) an explanation of the basis for the change, including the costs associated with the change and the expected benefit to the program to be derived from the change; and

(2) an analysis of the impact on the assembly schedule and annual funding estimates of not receiving the requested increases.

(e) REPORTING AND REVIEW.—

(1) IDENTIFICATION OF COSTS.—

(A) SPACE SHUTTLE.—As part of the overall space shuttle program budget request for each fiscal year, the Administrator shall identify separately the amounts of the requested funding that are to be used for completion of the assembly of the International Space Station.

(B) INTERNATIONAL SPACE STATION.—As part of the overall International Space Station budget request for each fiscal year, the Administrator shall identify the amount to be used for development of the International Space Station.

(2) ACCOUNTING FOR COST LIMITATIONS.—As part of the annual budget request to the Congress, the Administrator shall account for the cost limitations imposed by subsection (a).

(3) VERIFICATION OF ACCOUNTING.—The Administrator shall arrange for a verification, by the General Accounting Office, of the accounting submitted to the Congress within 60 days after the date on which the budget request is transmitted to the Congress.

(4) INSPECTOR GENERAL.—Within 60 days after the Administrator provides a notice and analysis to the Congress under subsection (d), the Inspector General of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall review the notice and analysis and report the results of the review to the committees to which the notice and analysis was provided.

In the table of contents, after the item relating to section 130, insert the following new item:

Sec. 131. Cost limitation for the International Space Station.

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

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, there is a quote from Justice Louis Brandeis and it goes like this: ''Publicity is justly commended as a remedy for social and industrial diseases. Sunlight is said to be the best of disinfectants, electric light the most efficient policeman.''

Sunlight, policing, publicity, how can we be against that? This amendment is about all three of those things. This is not my annual amendment to kill the Space Station. This is an amendment to responsibly cap the costs of the Space Station.

Mr. Chairman, we need to do something about the Space Station; and this body, in its eminent wisdom and sense of fair play, has a number of options today. We can cap the costs of the Space Station for the assembly at $21.9 billion. We can cap the Shuttle costs in connection with the assembly at $17.7 billion and follow the lead of the other body.

The other body put these caps into their bill. Senator MCCAIN, a Republican, who I believe supports the Space Station, put this language into the Senate bill. I do not think that it was even contested. I think it was voice voted. And probably people that support the Space Station, although I do not, I admit it, I do not support the Space Station, this simply tries to get a fencing and a cap and some accountability and some sunshine on the rising and escalating inefficiencies and cost overruns in the Space Station.

Now, we just had a debate on a reasonable amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER) to try to plus up to last year's level an aeronautic account to try to do more research on noise and its impact from engines, commercial engines, on inner city people.

Both the respected chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) and the respected subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) have, in effect, said that we must prioritize the Space Station. And it has gone from $2.1 billion in this bill to $2.4 billion in this bill. So, naturally, when the bill is only $13.4 billion, lots of other things are going to fall by the wayside.

So this amendment that I respectfully offer simply says let us fence this money, let us cap this money, let us make NASA accountable for this money.

□ 1300

I remind my colleagues, I gently remind my colleagues that this is the same Space Station that was supposed to cost $8 billion when it was first designed in 1984. Now the General Accounting Office says the total cost for launching and construction assembly are going to be $98 billion. Mr. Chairman, we have had cost overruns in the last couple of years equal to the entire cost that the Space Station was originally designed to cost the American taxpayer.

This amendment simply says, if you are going to build it, be accountable to the taxpayer. Do not continue to have a program replete with inefficiencies and infected with cost overruns. Let us make sure that NASA does it the way they have done so many other things so efficiently, with the hope and the glory and the promise of the Pathfinder that went to Mars recently for $263 million on the dot.

Are we going to be able to do those anymore if the Space Station continues to escalate in cost and eats up the rest of the $13.4 billion that we have for NASA? I ask my colleagues, will we even have a NASA that has an aeronautics component? Maybe we should just rename the bill the National Space Administration and not help out our aeronautics companies anymore. That is where we are moving. That is what happened to the gentleman from New York's amendment. Let us make sure we prioritize accountability and disinfectant and fairness in this budget.

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

Mr. Chairman, this is one of the rites of spring that occurs in our Nation's

capital city every year. The cherry blossoms come up, there are a lot of tourists, particularly schoolchildren, that come to see our Nation's capital, and the gentleman from Indiana starts to kill the Space Station again.

First, there is a cap for the next 3 years contained in the bill that is before us. That cap is contained in the authorization amounts of $2,482,700,000 for fiscal year 2000, $2.328 billion for fiscal year 2001 and $2.91 billion for fiscal year 2002. That cap is there. That fully funds the administration's request on this subject. We are being very bipartisan on that.

Secondly, the amendment that the gentleman is proposing now will be directly in conflict with the next amendment that the gentleman intends to propose which gets the Russian government out of the critical path, because the budgets that NASA has put together assume that the Russians will be able to fulfill their obligations under the Space Station agreement. The gentleman from Indiana and I happen to agree that the Russians have not done that. But if he removes the Russians from the program, it is going to cost more money.

So the cap that he puts on will prevent NASA from spending more money which will be caused by the next amendment that the gentleman from Indiana intends to propose. Really, I think the gentleman ought to go to his third amendment which kills the Space Station altogether, because that implements what he wants to do. What he wants to do there is wrong and has been rejected overwhelmingly by the House of Representatives in the past, and I would hope would be rejected again in the future.

The conflicting messages that are being sent by the different caps that are being discussed here is not going to do NASA any good, is not going to do the program any good, and it is just going to confuse everyone in terms of responsible budgeting. I hope that that is not what the gentleman from Indiana has in mind.

Because in determining how much the Space Station costs, an essential element is going to be the economic and political direction that Russia takes and how the United States of America, which includes the President, the Congress and the American people, respond to it. I just would hope that NASA's hands would not be tied through the adoption of the amendment that the gentleman from Indiana is proposing at the present time, that NASA be able to have the flexibility in dealing with Russian contingencies head-on.

For that reason, I would urge the committee to reject the amendment that he has proposed.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Let me thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) as well as the chairman and ranking member of our Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics. Let me also acknowledge the gentleman from California (Mr. BROWN) and wish him a speedy recovery and thank him for his leadership.

I enjoy the friendship of the gentleman from Indiana, and of course I enjoy his constant reminder that we must be vigilant and diligent in the use of the people's money. I vigorously rise, Mr. Chairman, to oppose his amendment on the capping of development funds and launching funds for the Space Station, and prospectively rise to oppose what might be an amendment to eliminate the Space Station, and ask my colleagues to consider where we are.

In committee, someone made a very important note that the gentleman from Indiana's eloquence was missed in the Committee on Science, and they thought because of his leadership of past years he had gotten promoted to another committee. Maybe we should not say it on the floor, but I know he misses us and he knows the good work that this committee does, and that is why he is back with us again.

But I would share with my colleagues that we went through this even before I came to Congress, when we in essence did not support the continuation of the super collider, of course, costing a lot of dollars. But yet there is much evidence that suggests superconductivity research, which is now international, would have generated into many, many jobs and as well would have brought us a large amount of research and input.

I say that this is the same thing that we have with the Space Station. I support the NASA reauthorization, with certainly a number of concerns. But I would think at this point in the furtherance of what we have done, where we have gotten the Space Station, the efficiency, the effectiveness, the tight budget.

I just happened to visit one of our contractors a couple of weeks or so ago. I walked through their plant, I watched their employees, saw the fine line of the budgeting process that they watch, the around-the-clock workers that they have there at USA, United Space Alliance, and saw that they had an attention to detail with respect to doing this job right.

The research that we are getting out of the Space Station on diabetes, HIV, heart disease, the fact that the NASA Johnson Space Center, in fact, using International Space Station as an umbrella, is able to solve some of the problems that impact individuals. For example, there is sort of a connection between the small business community where there are outreach members who go to the small business community and say, ''Do you have a problem? If you have a problem, let's see if we can solve it through the umbrella of the Johnson Space Center and the umbrella of the International Space Station.''

One of those had to do with a gentleman that had a surgery on his arm and had to have various tubes. He could not take a clean bath. This is one of our hospitals. He could not take a shower because infections would start up. We have been able to, under the umbrella of all the research that is done under the Space Station, to be able to solve that individual problem. And so I think it is important. I think, however, that to gut the Space Station, we would be in trouble.

The bill fully funds the Space Shuttle at $2.5 billion. Included in the package is an additional $456 million for the Shuttle. Furthermore, this bill contains a substantial increase from the administration's request for NASA's academic program. I was able to secure further participation for our minority universities, minority-serving universities, Hispanic and African American. The overall bill responds to our concerns about fiscal responsibility.

Yet let me comment, Mr. Chairman, that this bill is not altogether perfect. It steals from Administrator Dan Goldin by prohibiting him from pursuing programs that have the potential to bring great rewards to the United States. The Triana program, Mr. Chairman, I hope, which is a 2-year program which was funded last year in the amount of $40 million, snatched out of the jaws of success, I hope that when we get into conference we can realize the importance of this. Taking away NASA's authority to follow through on this program merely because it was an initiative of the Vice President is certainly irresponsible and a waste of taxpayer dollars. It reminds me of the big hole in north Texas because of opposition to the super collider. Section 126 of the bill also contains a limitation on NASA's earth science program.

So we have many problems, Mr. Chairman, but I would say to you, we do not have a problem with the International Space Station. I would ask my colleagues to defeat this amendment, prospectively to defeat the amendment to eliminate the Space Station, and pass the bill, and work on supporting the Triana project.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill, which authorizes the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) for the next three years.

This bill authorizes one of our proudest institutions, NASA. It is an agency that spearheads our search for an understanding about our universe, an agency dedicated to quench our insatiable thirst for knowledge. It is an agency that has done more with less over the past decade, and done so convincingly well. I wish that Congress could perform for them as they have for us, and pass a bill that does not micro-manage, and that does not place new obstacles in the path to achievement.

Thankfully, however, this bill maintains or increases funding for several projects that have consistently been performing well despite yearly budget cutbacks, namely the International Space Station and the Space Shuttle. Up until now, it has been fairly easy to criticize our progress on the station because NASA remained in stages of planning and preparation—but all of that has changed in the past

few months we finally have two pieces of the ISS in orbit—*Zariya* and *Unity.* Under this bill, the funding for the Space Station is set at $1.4 billion for FY2000, of which $394 million is specifically earmarked for microgravity research—which is at the core of station research that will benefit the health of humankind.

This bill also fully funds the Space Shuttle program at $2.5 billion in FY2000, with a slight increase in FY2001. Included in this package is an additional $456 million for shuttle upgrades, which seek to improve the safety of the shuttle, and which can increase efficiency. These upgrades will guarantee that the space shuttle will be more-than-capable in its duties for the next 10 years, while at the same time reduce operating costs and decrease flight turnaround time. These are important in an era where we want to increase access to space while at the same time lowering cost, so that we can better complete worldwide for launch dollars. We should be promoting the use of U.S. launch facilities whenever possible, so as to further develop our launch industry and make our economy more robust than ever.

Furthermore, this bill contains a substantial increase from the Administration's request in the funding for NASA's Academic programs. Although the $128 million is slightly below the appropriated amount last year, it still represents an overall increase in those academic programs when looking at our overall spending pattern over the past five years.

I was also thankful to pass an amendment during Full Committee markup that set aside a proportional amount of funding for minority academic programs. These programs are extremely important, especially when you look at the numbers. African-Americans only represent 6% of the students enrolled in graduate-level science and engineering programs, and Hispanics only 4%. In the workforce, both of those groups together represent less than 6% of those working in the science and engineering fields even though they represent more than 20% of all our workers combined.

My amendment ensured that NASA would spend at least $62 million on minority education efforts, of which $33.6 million would go to Historically Black Colleges and Universities. This is especially important in my district, which lies just outside of the Johnson Space Center and which contains Texas Southern University and the University of Houston, both of which serve minority youth from all over the country. NASA can have a significant impact on these children's lives—most of you have seen the reaction of the children who were lucky enough to attend the preview of the new ''Star Wars'' movie last night—now imagine NASA being able to dazzle them with real-life possibilities and technology.

This bill is far from perfect, however. NASA has always been an agency about research, setting goals, and solving problems. This bill, however, steals authority from Administrator Dan Goldin by prohibiting him from pursuing programs that have the potential to bring great rewards to the United States.

The first program that is cut by this program is the Triana program, which is a two-year program which was funded last year in the amount of $40 million. By taking away NASA's authority to follow through on this program, merely because it was in some way an initiative of the Vice President is more than irresponsible, it is a waste of taxpayer dollars.

Section 126 of this bill also contains a limitation on NASA's Earth Science program, who is in charge of leveraging our space technology to give us a better understanding of the Earth. The limitation places hard requirements on NASA to commercialize portions of its remote sensing data, but the reality is that the market has not developed to the point where data buys are commonplace. As a result, the entire Earth Science program's future will be in serious jeopardy in Section 126 is not stricken from the bill.

The bill as currently written also contains prohibitions on the development of TransHab, a new technology that has direct application to the Space Station and future space technologies. TransHab is essentially an expandable construct that can be used in outer space to house astronauts or other equipment. Because it is expandable, its capacity for use is greater than conventionally built modules, and at the same time it saves us precious payload space when put into orbit. TransHab technology opens many options for NASA, and makes the lives of astronauts far more bearable. While we should make sure that this technology does not jeopardize our current space station construction timeline or cause cost overruns, this House should not preempt the sound reasoning of our best-trained scientists by prohibiting the development of TransHab.

NASA is an important tile on the American quilt. It permeates the consciousness of a whole generation that watched Neil Armstrong walk on the moon and dreamed they were there with him. NASA continues in the American traditions of exploration and ingenuity—and we should not abandon those traditions by placing limits on our best and our brightest. I urge my colleagues to support NASA, but to do so responsibly and without undue interference.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of all three Roemer amendments. Every year, as the gentleman from Wisconsin has pointed out, we come to the floor and debate this issue.

I urge my colleagues to vote down additional funds for the International Space Station. I realize we are going to be facing three amendments today. One is to cap funding, one is to end our partnership with Russia in this program, and the third is to end funding for the Space Station altogether.

But we continue to shovel money into this growing black hole of taxpayer dollars. Two modules have already been launched, but where is the next module? The launch of the third segment, Russia's service module, has been delayed again and again because of Russia's funding problems.

Should we throw more U.S. taxpayer dollars to the Russians to finish their work? I fear that such assistance may become lost, like the $4.8 billion in IMF funds which were squandered by Russian officials. The Clinton administration's ill-fated decision to bring Russia aboard, a decision which they claimed would result in accelerating the Space Station completion by 2 years and reducing costs by $4 billion, has backfired badly. Instead, costs have accelerated and delays have increased.

In the fiscal year 1994 VA-HUD bill which passed the House overwhelmingly, there was report language which said, and I stress this point, Congress stated that Russian participation, and this is where I am quoting, ''should enhance, not enable, the Space Station.'' Despite our best intentions, Russian participation has caused huge U.S. cost overruns and has in effect disabled the program, which is now dependent on Russia.

Will the American taxpayer get their money's worth out of this project? I doubt it. The original scientific justifications for building the station have eroded. The presidents of 10 different scientific societies have called the Space Station a project of little scientific or technical merit that threatens valuable space-related projects and drains the scientific vitality of nations.

I believe the $75 billion not yet spent on the Space Station could provide an enormous benefit to other programs within NASA and other earth-based scientific research. How many more delays, cost overrun and unfulfilled promises must we endure? I continue to support NASA and space exploration, but we must recognize the cost of this particular project far exceeds the potential benefits. I urge my colleagues to support the Roemer amendments and restore common sense to our space program.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman from Indiana's scrutiny of the Space Station over the past few years. I think because of that that we have a better Space Station program, that NASA is more accountable.

But I do have concerns with this amendment, in that, as has been pointed out, two segments of the Space Station have already been launched and placed in orbit. This particular cap would result in a 12 percent approximate reduction in the budget for the projected completion of the Space Station. I think to take 12 percent out really raises questions of safety and efficiency. For those reasons, I think this is just too big a cut and would oppose the amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, as we all know, the gentleman from Indiana has been a strong opponent of the Space Station program for years, and for many years traditionally introduced the amendment to kill the funding for the Space Station. He was consistently defeated by the will of this body.

The people of the United States, through the expressed will of the Congress, have chosen to proceed with the construction of the Space Station. Now, today, as we speak, we do have two elements on orbit. We have much

of the construction cost already expended, and most of the hardware is at the Space Station processing facility at Kennedy Space Center and ready to be launched.

□ 1315

Now what was correctly pointed out by the gentleman from Michigan is that we do have significant delays caused by the Russians, and that has been something that I have been very, very concerned about, as have been many Members of this body. We are very, very close to obtaining the delivery of the service module. NASA has worked out a very, very successful program to work around any further Russian delays in the outyears of the program and to ultimately get them out of the critical pathway.

I strongly encourage my colleagues to oppose this amendment because of what it really is, and what it is is an attempt on the part of those who have tried to kill the space station for years to instead put forward an amendment that does not appear to do that but what in reality will do that. By putting this cap in place it would require very significant cuts in funding, and I can tell my colleagues as a Member who represents an area of the country where a lot of this work is done, this program is pretty much cut to the bone. They have really done a tremendous job, I believe, in getting it completed with the funding that has been available and that this particular amendment will essentially kill the space station program.

I am told that there is nothing that motivates our kids more to study math and science in our schools than our manned space flight program, and I would encourage our colleagues to defeat this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I have before me here the official House of Representatives dictionary, and I have turned to page 240 and looked up the word ''boondoggle.''

Boondoggle: work of little or no value done merely to keep or look busy; a project funded by the Federal Government out of political favoritism that is of no real value to the community or the Nation.

Boondoggle, Mr. Chairman, that is what we are talking about here in the three amendments offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) to kill, cut or sever the relationship with the Russians in work performed by the Russians on the space station.

Mr. Chairman, I will tell my colleagues I was a member of the Committee on Science back in 1994. We began talking about the space station. The work was already under way at that time. I was told at that time that the work to be done, to be completed, was going to run a cost of $20 billion to complete the space station. That was in 1995, when I first came to Congress. Today we have just received a study by GAO with revised estimates saying that the space station will cost U.S. taxpayers $95.6 billion over its lifetime, a fourfold increase in 4 years, Mr. Chairman.

This, I believe, should be an added definition for boondoggle in this dictionary that I have before me.

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

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

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I am afraid the gentleman is kind of confusing apples with oranges because the earlier figure was the construction cost. The later figure that the gentleman from Oklahoma is using is the construction cost plus the operations cost over the full 15 to 20-year life cycle of the station.

I will be the first to concede that as a result of the Russian failures to do what they agreed to the construction costs to the U.S. taxpayers have gone up, but the 1994 figures that the gentleman from Oklahoma gave did not include any operations cost whatsoever.

So there has not been a fourfold increase.

Mr. LARGENT. But is it true that the taxpayers will be spending $95.6 billion over the next 15 years or over the lifetime of the space station?

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. That is the current estimate, but to say that the cost has gone up by four times, as my colleagues know, uses a figure in the beginning that did not include any operational cost and the figure in the end that does. So it is not a comparable comparison between the current cost estimate and the cost estimate that was utilized in 1994.

Mr. LARGENT. Then in 1994 what were the costs plus operational expenses projected to be?

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. I do not know.

Mr. LARGENT. I can assure the gentleman it was not $95.6 billion of the taxpayers' money.

I can also tell him that one of the reasons that was given for building the space station was that we could do all these elaborate experiments on crystal formation in a weightless environment, and so the reason for that is that we would be able to develop all these cures for cancer and so forth, and so what I did is I just kind of on my own began calling a number of the drug manufacturing companies in this country and asking them: ''How important is it for you to be able to conduct these experiments to develop these chemicals and these different crystalline formations that are going to cure cancer?''

Their response, all of them across the board, was: ''We could care less. That is not what we are into. We could care less about space station funding.''

So I would just say, Mr. Chairman, that I am rising in support of all the Roemer amendments, and I would ask my colleagues to consider the ramifications of continuing to spend nearly $100 billion of taxpayers' money on a project that is overdue, overfunded and not needed.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise this afternoon to voice my very strong opposition to all of the amendments offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) to H.R. 1654, and I will talk about all of them right now in one fell swoop.

With all due respect to my colleague from Indiana, cancelling or capping the International Space Station, whether it is dealing with the partnership with Russia, killing funding authorization for the space station or setting caps on development of and launch of costs associated with the station is wrongheaded. It is wrongheaded domestic and foreign policy.

When we began the International Space Station, we knew it would be a challenging project, to say the least. To stop now would be sort of like halting the construction of the transcontinental railroad shortly after the engineering survey work had begun and the first few miles of track had been laid in the 1860s.

Mr. Chairman, it would be shortsighted and even foolish to terminate the program now that we are on the verge of realizing its many rewards. We have launched Zarya and Unity, the initial elements of the space station, into orbit where they are now operating, and moreover, shipment of the service module, the permanent crew quarters, will be placed in orbit next year. It is presently under way. NASA experts predict that the space station will be completed and can serve as an outpost for humans to develop, use and explore the last frontier within 5 years.

Mr. Chairman, think about the advances that can positively affect the lives of all Americans that would be prematurely halted. For example, the new space life sciences doctoral program at the University of Texas medical branch in Galveston, my district, could be terminated, and the chances of improving telemedicine and even better access for health care for all Americans would be slowed down. Cutting space station funding would adversely affect Joe Valentine's Alliance for Technology access in San Rafael, California, which is in the district of the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY), and she is going to speak in a few minutes. The alliance which has 40 resource centers around the country provides assistance to the disabled through a variety of high-tech resources, many of which have been developed through manned space exploration and all of which stand to benefit greatly from current telemedicine-telemedical research.

Mr. Chairman, capping or eliminating space station funding also could stymie progress at the University of Notre Dame's bioscience core facility. At this laboratory in the district of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER)

scientists and researchers are dedicated to providing technical and instrumental support for biological and biochemical research. I do not believe either of these Congress persons wish to do something that would harm the hopes and dreams of what these people are trying to accomplish in their districts, and our Nation's drive to improve the lives of humans and the health of our planet would be waylaid if Congress votes to terminate funding for the International Space Station. It would be a shame to throw away one of the best financial investments our Nation can make, and I have said it several times. For every Federal dollar we spend in space we get a $9 return here on Earth. Nine dollars has created tens of thousands of good jobs for Americans.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I urge all of my colleagues to think about their children and their grandchildren when casting their vote on any of these three dangerous amendments. Do we really want to deprive our children and grandchildren the benefits of future improvements and discoveries in medicine, meteorology, microbiology by voting against continued funding of the International Space Station?

Well, I do not want the 106th Congress to go down in history as one of the most myopic in history by endorsing these amendments. Therefore, I urge all of my colleagues to vote no on the amendments to NASA's budget authorization bill.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in respectful but still opposition to at least two of the amendments offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROEMER). Perhaps we will talk about the third, but let me just say that now is not the time for us to undermine the space station program.

The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) has made his position very clear. He believes the space station is wasteful, and he believes that it takes away from other priorities. He has made his arguments, and some of his arguments have certainly a flavor of legitimacy to them, not to say that we can agree with him at this time. Perhaps 10 years ago when we were facing this same situation, perhaps when I first came to Congress, would have been a better idea just to go along with Mr. Roemer at that time, but we have gone forward now, and we have reached a point that it would be a tremendously destructive factor to America's space program to try to end the space station project at this time.

If we end the space station project, we follow the lead of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER), it will be a death knell to space cooperation throughout the world. We have made agreements with our allies. We also made an agreement and a covenant with the American people. We spent so many billions of their dollars already on this project, it is incumbent now upon us here at the last moments, in the last 2 years of this project, to get the project done.

And I agree with Mr. Goldin. Mr. Goldin, I think, has been a breath of fresh air to the space program, that his number one priority is to get this project done, get on with it, so then we can go on to other things. If we instead decide to cancel this project to go on to other things, as the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) would like us to do, it will lead to just the opposite. We will not be cancelling to go into other things, we will be undermining public confidence and any other major space programs and commitments in the future.

So, while I sympathize with his responsible efforts to prioritize and to talk about, as my colleagues know, drawbacks in this budget, I simply cannot support, and I do not think it is responsible for us now to pull back at this last moment.

Now let me just say a few words about space station and what it will be and why it is worth moving forward at this time.

The space station, once complete, will be one of the great and historic engineering feats of all times. We are demonstrating that our engineers, and with a combined and cooperative effort with other countries of the world, can build a great edifice in space, a structure that can be used for, yes, scientific research, but also a structure that can be expanded and used for other things in the future that we perhaps cannot foresee now. Just the engineering experience that we get from building space station and the experience we have working with this cooperative relationship with others will educate us and permit us to accomplish other great things in space, perhaps a moon base, perhaps something that I envisioned, a space grid, an electric grid in space that will help us once our oil resources dwindle to provide clean electricity from space to be beamed down from solar collectors onto the Earth.

These are great dreams, but these are dreams that have to start with engineering capabilities that the space station now will enable us to do because it will teach us those techniques and enhance those capabilities.

So, I would respectfully request my colleagues to reject Mr. ROEMER's amendments, at least two of them dealing with the space station, and to support the space station, not to quit and call it off right here at the last moment.

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

Mr. Speaker, I will not take my full 5 minutes. In fact, I will condense it to Mr. ROEMER's pending three amendments. I will rise in opposition to all three, but I will only speak once.

□ 1330

I want to speak to the cutting of the funding, to the striking of the funding, or even to the reducing of the international effort in the International Space Station. The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) is a fine Member. I would say to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) that I hope I do not give the same speech every year because his amendments obviously I oppose.

The International Space Station represents the future of space exploration in our country, and it represents a high tech lab whose innovations have countless applications in the daily lives of all Americans. It represents an era of international cooperation that everyone can benefit from.

To date, the International Space Station has been a model of international cooperation and responsible management. If Congress does undermine the funding for the Space Station with an unexpected reduction, it would represent a major reversal and a commitment made to the program's stability over the past few years and it would be a betrayal to our international partners.

Critics have said that the cost for the life cycle of the Space Station has drastically risen. It is just not true, Mr. Chairman. In fact, the cost for the life cycle of the station has only gone up 2 percent in the last 3 years. So that is pretty good compared to even our low inflation rate.

We have also said that funding the Space Station would push out any smaller space exploration endeavors like the Mars Pathfinder Mission, the Hubble Space Telescope, that have enormous success. Again, this is not true. NASA, with the development of the Space Station, will have a platform from which future space exploration and research can be continued.

We are standing on the brink of the 21st century and I hope that we will not look back to the last century by cutting the funding for the Space Station, the NASA scientists, researchers and astronauts. We do not want to lose the foothold our country has into the future. So I ask a ''no'' vote on all three of the Roemer amendments.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to support the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) to put caps on the Space Station spending, and I want to urge my colleagues to support his amendment and my amendment to cut our losses on the Space Station and to cancel that project.

In fact, on this issue, to cut our losses and cancel the Space Station, I am very proud to be recognized, since the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) is no longer in attendance at the Committee on Science meetings, I am proud to be recognized as ROEMER in a skirt.

First, though, it is important to point out the valuable work of NASA, the work that NASA does to push the envelope of technology in reaching out

to space. But one project in particular, the Space Station, has cost us far too much, casting too large a shadow over our budget.

Speaking of throwing money at a problem, when the Space Station was proposed in 1984 the estimated price tag was about $8 billion. That is a lot of money. Now that price has risen more than a dozen times to almost $100 billion over the life of the project. This is truly unacceptable.

Let us see what we can do with that much money, Mr. Chairman. We could provide low income heating assistance for thousands of families. We could fund child immunization programs, clean up our Superfund sites, fund drug prevention programs, and pay our debt to the United Nations.

To sway some of my colleagues, I would say that for the same amount they could buy three nuclear aircraft carriers, five Seawolf submarines and 30 B–2 bombers, although I would not recommend it nor would I vote for it.

Mr. Chairman, with the immediate savings from this amendment, $2.4 billion in the year 2000, we could offer college education, including tuition fees and books, to over 500,000 students who could not otherwise afford college, right here on Earth.

With $2.4 billion, we could provide prenatal care to pregnant women who do not have access to routine health care, right here on Earth.

With $2.4 billion, we could expand the WIC program so that all eligible pregnant and nursing mothers can get food supplements, and still we would have money left over.

Supporters of the Space Station claim that research in space will advance health research. Well, with $2.4 billion, we could fully fund the National Heart, Lung and Blood Institute, right here on Earth. And with $2.4 billion, we could make Medicare more affordable to nearly 3 million elderly women living in poverty.

I do not question the ability of our outstanding engineers, Mr. Chairman, and our scientists who would bring this project to reality. However, I believe this is a case of misplaced priorities. With the many needs here on Earth, the Space Station is just too expensive.

With limited funds available for programs right here on Earth, we must focus our resources on our Nation's most urgent needs in order to ensure a bright future for our children. Let us not send our tax dollars out in space when we have unmet needs right here. Let us cancel the Space Station program. I urge my colleagues to support the Roemer amendments.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) and just add one other category of where $100 billion might come in handy for a useful down payment, and that is the $5.5 trillion national debt that still hangs over this Nation, that affects us and is definitely going to be affecting the future of our children.

I do rise in strong support of the three amendments the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) is offering to kill, cut or control this fiscal irresponsibility known as the International Space Station, although I do so with a great deal of sadness, Mr. Chairman. I commend the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) for the courage that he has displayed year in and year out to bring these amendments to the floor to highlight this issue, to force the Congress to have to make some tough fiscal decisions and just to remind the American people of what is going on with this program.

But I do so sadly, Mr. Chairman. As a representative of western Wisconsin, the home of such outstanding astronauts such as one of the original Mercury astronauts, Deke Slayton, who hails from a small town called Leon in the Sparta area of Wisconsin, and current Shuttle astronaut Mark Lee, I have always been and will always remain a strong proponent of space exploration and our national space program.

I, like many Americans, am very supportive of NASA's efforts to explore the universe and expand human knowledge, but I am not willing to support this cause at the expense of fiscal sanity. The Space Station program, initiated back in 1984 at an estimated cost of roughly $8 billion, has become a budgetary black hole. The GAO estimates, even with its scope and size reduced, it will now cost nearly $100 billion over its life span.

At a time when Congress is trying to abide by the 1997 balanced budget agreement and live within the spending caps that exist, how can we support a Federal program that now is estimated over 1,000 percent over budget?

With this authorization, the space program will consume one-sixth of NASA's entire budget over the next 3 years, a large amount considering the agency will essentially be level funded during that. As the Station's cost has grown, it has crowded out other scientific priorities. Any further slips in construction and schedule will only add to the pressure on other space priorities.

We must know, as an institution, when to say enough. Since its inception, our national space program has represented what is best about our Nation, Mr. Chairman: our ingenuity, our technological skill, our desire for knowledge about our universe and about ourselves. When confronted with seemingly insurmountable odds, the fine men and women in our space program have risen to the occasion time and time again.

Who will forget that memorable moment back in 1961 when Yuri Gagarin was the first Russian and first person to be launched in space and the shock waves that reverberated across our country from that event. And then a mere 23 days later Alan Shepard, sitting courageously on top of the Mercury Redstone rocket, not knowing whether or not when it ignited it was going to blow up from underneath him, was the first American to finally reach outer space. And then 20 days after that a young President by the name of John F. Kennedy challenged our Nation to send a man to the moon and safely return him to Earth by the end of the decade.

For almost 40 years the achievements of our space program have raised the hopes and dreams of people of all ages. Alan Shepard and Deke Slayton were childhood heroes of mine. I had a model of Freedom 7 on my dresser growing up as a child during the 1960s. All who have been involved in our Nation's space program are American heroes, no question about it.

I want to do what I can to extend this fine legacy but I will not do so at any price. The space program is a wonderful program, Mr. Chairman, that there is no question about.

What has to be questioned is the tremendous cost that the American taxpayers are facing today to perpetuate a Space Station that many in the scientific community, outside of the NASA community, believe has limited or no value.

I would encourage my colleagues to seriously consider supporting these amendments which will hopefully restore some fiscal discipline and some fiscal sanity around a program that is sucking up more and more tax dollars every year as we continue to slide down this slope. I commend my friend from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) for bringing these amendments again this year.

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

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

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to all three of the Roemer amendments dealing with funding for NASA's International Space Station. As well intentioned as they might be, I think they are very misguided, and I think that is apparent by the actions taken by previous Houses on this issue.

Some of these amendments are the same old items in new packages. All of them would be destructive and detrimental to the program.

Some of our colleagues have argued that it would be fiscally prudent to eliminate the Space Station in this year's budget, as the previous speaker just mentioned. In my opinion, nothing could be further from the truth. In fact, it would be terribly imprudent to kill the program.

We have already invested more than $20 billion in the Space Station. Our 12 international partners have spent more than $5 billion; 250 tons of hardware has been built and two elements are currently in orbit. To eliminate the program now, after so much has been

invested and so much work has been done, would be the height of irresponsibility by allowing our investment to be completely wasted.

The International Space Station is a worthwhile investment in exploration and science, an investment in jobs and economic growth and, most of all, an investment in improving life for all of us here on Earth. The space program and experiments conducted on the Space Shuttle have made remarkable contributions to medical research and the study of life on Earth. The Space Station is the next logical step, a permanent orbiting laboratory.

Let me highlight some of the Station's potential for contributing to medical advancements. For example, Space Station researchers will use the low gravity environment of the Space Station to expand our understanding of cell culture, which could revolutionize the treatment for joint diseases and injuries. The Space Station will provide a unique environment for research on the growth of protein crystal, which aids in determining the structure and function of proteins. Crystals grown in space are far superior to those grown here on Earth.

Such information will greatly enhance drug design and research into cancer, diabetes, emphysema, parasitic infections and immune systems disorders.

The almost complete absence of gravity on the Space Station will allow new insights into human health and disease prevention and treatment, including heart, lung and kidney function, cardiovascular disease, bone, calcium loss and immune system function.

I also share the concern of my good friend, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER), that the continued Russian participation in this project needs to be carefully examined. The economic difficulties that Russia is currently experiencing have caused several unfortunate delays in their delivery of certain Space Station components and this needs to be scrutinized. This partnership deserves every chance to succeed because of the experience and expertise the Russians bring to the table and the potential foreign policy benefits of continuing this partnership.

Mr. Chairman, the International Space Station is vital to continued human man presence in space and I would urge a defeat of all three of the Roemer amendments.

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

Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) for his tenacity on this issue and I once again join him in his efforts to cap, curtail or eliminate the International Space Station program.

I have heard all of the arguments over the years, just as many of my colleagues have, and I have to say that while I recognize the sincerity with which many of these arguments are advanced, I do not accept the validity of many of them.

For example, I do not believe that this debate should be about jobs. I do not believe that this debate should be about good money after bad. I do not think that it should be entirely about cost, though I would point out that the Roemer-Sanford amendment is supported by the National Taxpayers Union, Citizens Against Government Waste, the Concord Coalition and Citizens for a Sound Economy.

I do not believe those issues should be central to our discussion today. Our debate today should be about science.

□ 1345

It should be about whether or not the International Space Station represents good science.

Dr. Robert Park of the American Physical Society observed that no scientists not funded by NASA support this station. My experience suggests that is, in fact, true. Dr. Donald Brown, a leading biological scientist and staff member of the Carnegie Institution, says NASA plans for space-based life sciences research is costly and ineffective; ground-based research in other areas are more important.

NASA once boasted that the space station would have eight major scientific objectives. Today, after numerous redesigns and cost overruns, the station retains only two of the original eight. Many experts in space science believe the station no longer represents a worthwhile endeavor, and the science experiments now slated for the station could be conducted aboard unmanned satellites or the space shuttle at a much lower cost.

The station's costs are threatening to crowd out promising projects within NASA. Last year, NASA shifted $200 million from space shuttle safety and space education grants to pay for station overruns. NASA also asked for the authority to shift another $375 million in 1998.

Smaller, cheaper, faster missions will never share the success of other small programs like the Hubble Space Telescope and Mars Pathfinder if we do not cancel the station now. At $1 trillion in life cycle costs, the space station has sucked the air out of space-based research and space-based science that should be allowed to exist on its own.

These proposals are thoughtfully presented, they are fiscally responsible, and most importantly, they are science-based. I would urge my colleagues to support these proposals.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman, first of all, for her ongoing support for this effort that we have put forward, not just this year, not just last year, not just the year before, but the gentlewoman from Michigan comes to the floor to articulate her strongly felt views every single year on this project, and I am grateful to her for her strong support and her words of wisdom.

I do want to say that in reading one of the Congressional Research briefings on the space station, they say on page 2 of 13 that there are no caps in this House bill. There are overall caps in the Senate bill inserted by Senator MCCAIN on the overall costs of the launch and the assembly. Mr. Chairman, $21 billion for one, $17.8 billion for the other. That is all we are asking in this first amendment. An overall $38 billion cap or a fence for disinfectant, for sunshine, for policing, for accountability, for good government so that we can control the costs of this space station.

I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

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

I would like to state my opposition to this amendment, and I would encourage my colleagues to vote against it.

I extend my full support for the sensible NASA Authorization Act before us today and I would like to commend the hard work and leadership of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

With their guidance and support, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER), as well as the gentleman from California (Mr. BROWN), the ranking member of the Committee on Science, and my good friend the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON), a member of the Subcommittee on Space, I believe we have a sound bill that will advance scientific research, promote commercial and privatized space efforts, and ensure the United States' role as a preeminent player in the international space community.

I would like to especially commend the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) for maintaining strict oversight throughout the International Space Station program and rightly criticizing the participation by the Russian Space Agency for some of the inefficiencies that certainly they have been involved in.

I am satisfied that this bill has been stripped of pet projects that would take away resources for critical scientific research and development. By increasing the total level of funding above the President's request, while at the same time ensuring that NASA continues to streamline and modernize their operations, I am confident that this bill will allow NASA to focus funding on advanced space research and activities.

I believe this bill addresses NASA's critical priorities, such as space science, life and microgravity sciences, advanced space transportation technology, space shuttle safety and performance upgrades and numerous education programs. By opposing this

amendment we are continuing the scientific integrity of this important legislation.

I urge all of my colleagues to support the NASA Authorization Act and to oppose efforts which would burden NASA by adding unnecessary and wasteful projects to this bill.

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

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

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise today, of course, in strong support of H.R. 1654, and I want to talk a little about the amendments. This is an annual matter, and I have such high regard for the author, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER). I have said so many times that this is another of those situations where one likes the author, but one cannot stand his amendment. But I am getting used to it, because we have voted on this day in and day out, year in and year out.

I really think some of these amendments are not all that bad. I would say that to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER). It is kind of like in gun control. I do not mind the waiting period, I do not mind registering them, but I know that the full intent is to take them away from us. Here, these amendments are steps in the direction of losing the space station. We do not want to do that. We cannot afford to do that.

I am pleased that the International Space Station and the space shuttle operations are fully authorized at the level as requested by NASA and this legislation. I think they are entitled to the respect of this committee because some time ago the chairman of the Committee on Science and I, working together, minority and majority, talked to the Administrator and told him of our desire to cut down the NASA expenditure and try to cut it by say 25 or 30 percent. It seemed like the words were used that if you do not cut the budget here, you know how to cut it because you know all of the ramifications of the budget. We know about as much as we can know, but we will either cut it with a baseball bat or you cut it with a razor and do it in the right manner so that NASA could still operate.

I am happy to say that Mr. Goldin did that and he cut that budget almost 34 percent, more than I think any other budget percent-wise has been cut on Capitol Hill.

So I would just say that NASA's space research has been cut, but they are still operating, and it results in products that improve our quality of life, such as instruments that measure bone density without penetrating the skin, cardiac pacemakers, computer readers for the vision impaired, smoke detectors, voice-controlled wheelchairs, and the list goes on and on of the accomplishments. And yes, the inspiration to the young school children all over this country. If we cancel out this space station, I would say we would have than uprising from the schools, from the intermediate schools on up to the strongest higher education levels that this Congress has never envisioned before. I say to my colleagues, they would come alive.

We need to continue the research that the space station could lead to, the medical breakthroughs of combating cancer, arthritis, diabetes, balance disorders, Alzheimer's, cardiopulmonary diseases and other afflictions that threaten our citizens.

We need this space station. We need the hope that this space station holds out. For those wasting away in cancer wards as we speak, they have one thing in their heart, and that one thing is hope. I hope that this Congress will not let them down and cut off the one operation that could deliver to them the deliverance from the wards they languish in. They are entitled to that hope.

Mr. Chairman, throughout America's rich history, there has always been among the American people and its leaders a deep and abiding belief in that hope, and in that future, a belief that we can and will continue to accomplish great feats and make great discoveries. Space is our last frontier, and NASA is the organization that provides the knowledge, the resources, the heroes and the vehicles necessary for space exploration.

This is important legislation, and just as in the gun control thrust, they will take several steps toward it that look innocuous, but would take the guns away and violate the amendment to the Constitution that these people rely on. This is the same situation. A few amendments can cripple the space station. We do not want to get to that point. I think this legislation deserves our support today.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1654, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Act of 1999, and for the important work that NASA has consistently accomplished as the world's leader in space endeavors. As a longtime member of the Science Committee, it has been gratifying to see the progress that NASA continues to make in streamlining its programs, controlling its spending, while continuing to deliver good results.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased that the International Space Station and Space Shuttle operations are fully authorized at the level requested by NASA in this legislation. The space station represents an investment in our future and represents the combined hopes of many nations that microgravity research in space will have far-reaching benefits for our people. Specifically, this legislation designates slightly more than $1 billion over the next three years for life and microgravity sciences and applications.

As you know, Mr. Chairman, NASA's space research has already resulted in products that improve our quality of life, such as instruments that measure bone density without penetrating the skin, cardiac pacemakers, computer-readers for the vision-imparied, smoke detectors, and voice-controlled wheelchairs. We continue to hope that research on the Space Station could lead to medical breakthroughs in combatting cancer, arthritis, diabetes, balance disorders, Alzheimer's, cardio-pulmonary diseases and other afflictions that threaten our citizens.

This legislation provides $6.9 billion for the international space station and $9.6 billion for space shuttle operations. The space station began as a dream and still has its share of critics. But through hard work, careful planning and the financial commitment of many nations, the space station dream is still very much alive. This legislation will help keep it so.

Throughout America's rich history, there has always been among the American people and its leaders a deep and abiding belief in our future—a belief that we can and will continue to accomplish great feats and make great discoveries. Space is our last frontier, and NASA is the organization that provides the knowledge, the resources, the heroes, and the vehicles necessary for space exploration. This is important legislation, Mr. Chairman, that deserves our support today.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Roemer amendments, and I would like to thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) again for being tenacious with this particular issue.

We have heard an awful lot of debate about the pros and cons of whether we should move forward with the space station. The reality is, if we had ideal budget numbers, if we had all the money available to us that we wanted for seniors and veterans and for education and environment, and a whole host of other issues that we deal with, then very possibly if we had all of that money, then we could put money towards this. But we do not. We have limited resources, and if we look at the reality and the facts of the space station, of the numerous missed deadlines; if we look at what the original cost estimates were: $8 billion, a lot of money when that was first brought up, and when we look at where it is now, $100 billion, that should speak volumes to us. If we look at the space station as what scientists are saying about it, and we have many scientists who are saying that this is not a good idea and we should not move forward. If we look at what NASA may have to be doing to other very successful programs like Voyager and the Mars mission and space shuttles, and many of my colleagues are talking about the benefits that we derive right here on Earth from many of NASA's projects, and I agree with that, and I am as proud as anyone in this House with the accomplishments that we have had with our space programs.

Those same accomplishments can be made without the space station. Those dollars, those billions of dollars, $80 more billion that will have to be spent on this is money that should be redirected. If we look carefully and we understand what we are committing ourselves to in the long run, we will understand that the Roemer amendments

make sense. The Roemer amendments made sense last year and the year before, and I supported them very proudly. I think they make even more sense this year.

So once again, I will ask my colleagues to say that enough is enough, to look at where we are and where we need to go and to understand that the right thing to do is to support the Roemer amendments.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I support efforts to explore space and believe the benefits to high technology research and to the private sector are vast. But I have grave concerns about our space station program.

Mr. Speaker, we are facing a time of tight budget caps, which I support. But these caps force us to make some tough spending choices. By making a decision now to cancel the space station, we can fund other priority areas within our discretionary budget.

In 1993, the Space Station was projected to cost about $17.7 billion. The estimate has risen to exceed more than $26 billion. The price of this program continues to rise, while the target completion date gets pushed later and later.

The fact is, the space station is stripping scarce funds from other valuable NASA programs.

I am excited about our recent successes in exploring Mars through the Pathfinder and its rover, Sojourner. It seems to me, we get much more value for our dollar through ventures such as this one, than we do from the space station, given its excessive price tag.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Roemer/Sanford amendment. I do not believe that we should be sending billions of dollars into space when we have so many more urgent problems here on Earth. On top of that, our Country is over $5.6 trillion in debt.

When NASA proposed the space station back in 1984, the project was to cost a total of $8 billion. Since 1984, the space station has been redesigned many times and the cost estimates have skyrocketed.

Mr. Chairman, what does this mean for the taxpayers? Well, it means they will be sinking billions and billions more of their hard earned money into this space station rat hole. We have all heard many times that space is the final frontier. I believe the space station is a frivolous frontier. It is yet another example of how the federal government cannot do anything in an economical or efficient manner. Instead, many fat-cat government contractorsare getting rich at the expense of the taxpayers.

I recently spoke on this floor about another failed space venture, the Air Force's Titan IV program. There have been three failures in a row for this program at a cost of over $3 billion. If we took all of this wasted money and put it towards some of our ailing programs such as Social Security, I believe our Country would be much better off.

Additionally, Mr. Chairman, this Country has paid Russia, our partner, hundreds of millions of dollars to participate. What have we gotten from Russia in return? Well, we've got increased costs because of Russian schedule delays. Mr. Chairman, the United States has enough of its own delays. We don't need Russia's help with that.

When this project was being debated in the early 1990's, a coalition of 14 leading scientific groups came out against the space station saying that they were especially disturbed that the escalating costs in subsequent years would drain money from other important scientific projects.

According to the Congressional Research Service, in 1993, NASA said the International Space Station would cost $17.4 billion in research and development through the end of construction and it would spend no more than $2.1 billion a year on the program. Today, NASA's estimate for research and development is between $23 and $26 billion, depending on whether construction is completed in 2004 or October 2005.

Mr. Chairman, this is pitiful. I know of no business that could stay in operation with these types of overruns.

We have far too many more important programs here on Earth to justify sending all of these billions into space. I would urge a yes vote on the Roemer/Sanford amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER).

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

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 174, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) will be postponed.

Are there further amendments to the bill?

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. ROEMER

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 5 offered by Mr. ROEMER:

At the end of the bill, insert the following new section:

SEC. 221. CANCELLATION OF RUSSIAN PARTNERSHIP.

Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall terminate all contracts and other agreements with the Russian Government necessary to remove the Russian Government as a partner in the International Space Station program. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall not enter into a new partnership with the Russian Government relating to the International Space Station. Nothing in this section shall prevent the National Aeronautics and Space Administration from accepting participation by the Russian Government or Russian entities on a commercial basis. Nothing in this section shall prevent the National Aeronautics and Space Administration from purchasing elements of the International Space Station directly from Russian contractors.

In the table of contents, after the item relating to section 220, insert the following:

Sec. 221. Cancellation of Russian partnership.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I want to start with a quote from Winston Churchill. He said, and I quote, ''I cannot forecast to you the action of Russia. It is a riddle wrapped in a mystery inside an enigma, but perhaps there is a key.''

The key, Mr. Chairman, is to engage the Russians, to exchange with the Russians, to treat the Russians as an equal partner and a friend, but not to relegate our science programs to foreign policy welfare.

What we need to make sure we do, Mr. Chairman, is work carefully with the Russians, make sure we do educational exchanges and scientific exchanges, and make sure we continue to work carefully and diplomatically with the Russians on trying to craft the right kind of peace agreement in Kosovo for our troops, for NATO, for the world, for the refugees. However, we should not devise international science programs that continually, year after year, program after program, fail, and result in increased costs, increased burdens, increased problems for NASA in trying to build this International Space Station; increased problems for the American taxpayer when they have to foot the bill of the cost overruns and the delays coming from Russia.

□ 1400

This is not a partnership. It is a foreign policy pork barrel project.

One of my colleagues said, the partnership between the United States and the Russians deserves every chance to succeed. But after 6 years, after we were told by the administrator at NASA that their partnership would save the taxpayer $2 billion, we now find ourselves 6 years later with a $4 billion price tag that the American taxpayer has to foot.

It did not save us money, it is costing us money, and it is delaying when we wanted to launch the International Space Station. Instead of launching it in 2002 or 2003, it is now looking at 2004, 2005, 2006.

Each time we see a delay from one of our partners, in this case, the Russians, that adds to the costs for the United States. That adds to the burden of the NASA engineers, the NASA personnel, trying to do their job on the Space Station which they were contracted to do, and now they are doing the Russian jobs. It is not fair. It is not right.

Now, this amendment is not an anti-Russian amendment, it is not a severing of ties with Russia amendment. We have given this partnership in science 6 years and several billions of dollars to succeed.

I strongly advocate continued partnership with Russia in a host of areas. Russia and China continue to be the United States' two key bilateral relationships in foreign policy.

This is not an amendment to bash the Russians. This is an amendment on an international science program to make sure that when we do a memorandum of understanding with another country, that they can continue to contribute science, they continue to contribute their expertise, they continue to contribute money and pay for their fair share, and not allow the United States to take up the full burden.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment also is reasonable. It reads, and I encourage

my colleagues to read the amendment, it does terminate all contracts and other agreements with the Russian government necessary to remove the Russian government as a partner in the International Space Station, but it goes on to say, ''Nothing in this section shall prevent NASA from accepting participation by the Russian government or Russian entities on a commercial basis. Nothing in this section shall prevent NASA from purchasing elements of the International Space Station directly from Russian contractors.''

So my reading of that would be that if the service module is ready to go, that the United States could directly purchase that from contractors, but the relationship needs to be redefined. I would hope that my distinguished chairman in the majority would agree with this amendment and we could move on to the next amendment.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased, for once, to support, in the spirit of bipartisanship, a Roemer amendment on the Space Station. What this amendment does is that it kicks the Russian government out of the partnership, but it allows NASA to make contracts with Russian aerospace contractors or the Russian space agency, which is a government entity, and thus makes Russia and its aerospace firms a subcontractor rather than a partner.

Mr. Chairman, I supported bringing Russia into the partnership when it occurred 6 years ago because I thought it would save money, it would bring the Space Station on line earlier, and allow the United States and the other partners to take advantage of Russia's tremendous expertise in constructing spacecraft as well as in long-term human space flight.

Unfortunately, this arrangement has not worked out as everyone had hoped. The time has come for a redefinition of the arrangement. Six years ago the administration promised that Russia would not be in the critical path. It said that Russia would be in an enhancing and not an enabling role.

Unfortunately, Russia is in the critical path. Whose fault it is, I do not know, and it is not relevant at this time. But every funding and every construction deadline that Russia has set for itself and agreed to its other partners with since 1996 has been missed by the Russians. They are 100 percent in not living up to their agreements, and that has cost the American taxpayers a lot of money.

The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) has said it costs the American taxpayers $4 billion. I would say it cost $5 billion. The time to prevent further hemorrhaging because of Russia's repeated defaults is at hand, and the Roemer amendment proposes to do so.

The last promise that Russia broke was at the end of last month. It broke its promise to decide by April to deorbit the Mir Space Station if it did not come up with outside funding to support Mir by April 30. Russia did not come up with the funding, and it has not decided to deorbit Mir.

It is obvious that Russia cannot afford two space stations. If Mir stays up, it will not have the money to fulfill its further agreements for the International Space Station. The Russians made that decision, and it is time for the American Congress to respond in kind. By removing Russia as a partner but not as a contractor, we can still get the benefits of the international cooperation that the administration seeks.

Russia has played the role of contractor successfully. It has been a miserable failure in being a partner with the United States, Canada, Japan, and the European space agency.

Two years ago when the NASA authorization bill was on the floor of the House, the House approved a bill that contained the Sensenbrenner-Brown amendment, which required NASA to develop a plan to remove Russia from the critical path. The CAV task force appointed by the NASA administrator recommended eliminating long-term dependence on Russia in its April, 1998, report by developing an independent U.S. propulsion capability. NASA echoed those recommendations in a July, 1998, briefing to the White House.

At that time, the White House rejected the task force and NASA recommendations, but later reversed itself. NASA has initiated long-lead procurements for an independent propulsion capability in fiscal 1999. Their fiscal 2000 request does include funding for an independent U.S. propulsion capability, but NASA has not signed a contract to develop this capability, which is still in its study phase.

I would just like to point out that the American people are also fed up with Russia's defaults. Florida Today took an online poll. Only 22 percent of those surveyed wanted to keep Russia as a partner. Thirty-two percent wanted to end Russia's partnership, and 46 percent wanted to reduce Russia's role but not kick it out of the program completely.

The Roemer amendment does what the 32 percent and the 46 percent of the people in the Space Coast and Florida want to see done, and I would urge its adoption.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose this amendment, this amendment that has had no hearings within our committee. This amendment would force NASA to kick the Russians out of the Space Station program with no consideration of the potential cost or schedule consequences for the United States that will result from such action, and with no consultation or negotiation with our 16 international partners in this multilateral cooperative program, each of whom have their own financial stake in the Space Station program.

Instead, this amendment would have the United States take unilateral action that could damage our relations with our existing international partners and do real damage to the Space Station program itself.

Once again, let me remind this body that two segments, the first two segments of the Space Station have been launched and are now in orbit. I think this amendment has a real risk of both wasting that particular investment and doing away with the potential benefits in the future. So for those reasons, I oppose this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I suspect that alarms are going off all over down at Foggy Bottom right now, but I rise in support of this amendment. My colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON) who just spoke said that this amendment has had no hearings in the Committee on Science. That is technically correct, but the whole issue of the number of times that the Russians have let us down has been debated, discussed, and talked about in the Committee on Science again and again and again.

There is an old German expression that says, fool me once, shame on you; fool me twice, shame on me. The expression does not even go on beyond that, but the truth of the matter is we have been fooled again and again and again by the Russians. It is time for this Congress to send a clear statement that we are tired of this gamesmanship that is being played by the Russians and by NASA.

I think this is a good amendment. I hope that colleagues on both sides of the aisle will join us in support of this, because this is the only way we are once and for all going to say to our Russian partners that either they play by the agreement that they made, or they do not play at all. And the Roemer amendment is even better than that because it allows us to continue to contract with those contractors who are willing to live up to their end of the bargain.

This is a good amendment, it is a timely amendment. It may not have been formally discussed in our committee, but the whole issue of Russian participation has been debated, discussed, ad nauseum in the Committee on Science. It is a good amendment. I am happy to support it.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) as well, when I was on the Committee on Science for almost 8 years we struggled through NASA's issues and other Committee on Science issues together. I have enjoyed the give and take and opportunities to work with the Members, but I have to say with this Roemer

amendment, I have to oppose the chairman of the committee and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) as well.

The spring is here. The Space Station issue is here. We have the Roemer amendments. Make no mistake about it, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) wants to kill the Space Station program. He wants to cap it, he wants to wound it, he wants to damage it any way he can.

We have been through this process year after year after year in the committee, on the floor of the House. We have had a fair fight. The issues have been presented. Why do we not say, enough is enough? Why do we not get off the NASA employees' backs?

Mr. Chairman, I urge especially the freshmen who have not been through this process before to listen to the debate today and look at the history of this House's involvement in this debate, and to recognize that the responsible thing to do is to get on with the enormous investment that we have made.

Speaking to the Russian issue, and that issue is a troublesome issue, and I know many Members here have struggled with that issue, but the International Space Station is a multinational project. It was intended when it was first proposed in 1984 by President Reagan to involve the International community.

We have legal agreements that we have to be concerned about that the Russians were involved in. If we today say that the House is going to decide that we do not want the Russians involved, then we are interfering with those legal agreements, as well.

Again, make no mistake about it, if this amendment passes or is accepted this will damage or kill the Space Station program. So I feel like I have to rise today in strong opposition to this, one of three Roemer amendments, and especially to remind my colleagues that what we are talking about today is a responsible investment in NASA, a responsible investment in the International Space Station program. There is a way to end the Russian involvement and end it responsibly, but this is not the way to do it today. Do not fall for this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER). I just would advise those people reading the official CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of this procedure to note that I have used the words, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER), which is just another miracle, as has happened here today.

The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) has been very persistent over the years, but on this particular amendment we should not ignore the fact that we may disagree with him on some things, but that he in this amendment is offering us a position that the Committee on Science and certainly the Subcommittee on Space has approved of for a long time.

This message by the Roemer amendment is not aimed at the Russians. We are not sending the Russians a message here. The Russians were sent that message by us a long time ago. This is a message to our own State Department and this administration to start paying attention to what this Congress is doing and what we are saying about how this project and other projects should be approached.

□ 1415

This administration has ignored us time and time again on the issue of how to deal with the Russians in connection with the Space Station program. The Committee on Science, although not having specific hearings on this issue, has addressed this issue on numerous occasions, and we have expressed our strong desire that the Russians, as the gentleman from Wisconsin (Chairman SENSENBRENNER) stated, be treated, not as partners, but instead as subcontractors.

The concept of the Russians as partners in Space Station, which made sense in the beginning, before we knew what chaos that the Russians were going to have to go through in the aftermath of the Cold War, makes no sense now that we know the limitations, the severe economic limitations of the current Russian government.

The Russians cannot afford to be partners in the Space Station program. I remember saying that probably 3 or 4 years ago. Yet, the administration proceeded without any regard to what Congress was saying and what we were trying to insist upon and continued with this idea with the Russians as partners. If we would have proceeded instead with Russians as subcontractors, we could, as the Roemer amendment is suggesting now, simply pay those subcontractors for what they have produced and get on with the program.

So, that is number one. This mistake was made, and it has turned out to be a costly mistake by the administration but it is based on the idea, on foreign policy considerations, not on NASA and Space Station considerations.

Secondly, let me suggest this. We have said over and over again that the Russians should not be in the critical path. I can remember many statements by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Chairman SENSENBRENNER) admonishing the administration, whatever you do, do not put us in the path where the Russians can prevent the success of the Space Station.

It is time we get them out of the critical path. It is time we make sure that we are defining this in a very responsible way. But NASA has ignored this committee. Again, it is not NASA that is ignoring the committee, it goes straight up to the very top of the administration, which has been making irresponsible decisions in terms of our relationship with Russia. This is probably paramount in that decision-making process, which is a flawed decision-making process.

With that said, let me admit that this Congressman in the very beginning supported the idea of having a cooperative relationship with Russia. I certainly do not fault the administration with, number one, good intentions and a defensible strategy in the beginning. But in order to protect the taxpayers when a strategy has gone wrong and when it seems that there are intervening circumstances that prevent that strategy from being successful, the administration, like everybody else, especially in the private sector but also people in government, have to admit the strategy can no longer succeed, and change the strategy.

Unfortunately, those of us again who supported the idea of cooperation in the beginning have found that, while we recognize the strategy had to change or it was going to cost the taxpayer tens of billions of dollars, the administration refused to change. We refused to change because of perhaps some face-saving concept, if we are going to save face for our Russian friends, and certainly the Russian government needs that type of moral support, but we should not be trying to give the Russian government moral support at the cost of tens of billions of dollars. That is what has happened here.

So while I believe the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) probably is motivated on his other two amendments to just try to kill the Space Station, I think that his amendment at this point is justified. I support it.

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

Mr. Chairman, Deputy Secretary of State Talbott, not the NASA administrator, signed a multinational agreement for the United States, establishing a framework, the legal framework for the national Space Station in 1998. This multilateral agreement involves major commitments by 15 countries and represents more than a space facility, but a political commitment by these countries to work together on a major civilian project.

To terminate Russia's participation in the International Space Station would jeopardize the United States' ability in the future to work toward a common end with the same set of countries, friends and allies on large scale projects.

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

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

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentleman from Texas, what is the penalty of that multilateral agreement if any of the partners does not fulfill its agreed-upon obligations?

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I would assume that we would be out of the Space Station. I think that we would probably be made to take our tools and go home, and we would lose the billions of dollars that we have spent.

This does not make sense to me as an amendment for what we are trying to do in building a relationship with other nations and at the same time accomplish science that we believe in.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

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

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, how many defaults of the Russians is the gentleman from Texas willing to accept? They have already cost us $5 billion. How many more and how much money is the gentleman willing to agree for cost overruns caused by the Russians not fulfilling their obligations?

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I fully understand that we have difficulties. We expected to have a challenge when we started building this Space Station. It is unfortunate that we have problems with the Russian government. But if we take action that jeopardizes our own ability to participate in this project, not only do we do harm to our other friends while we are trying to do harm to the Russians, we take ourselves out of it and we lose a significant commitment, a significant investment that we have made.

I want to point out another thing in the bill. In the very first few sentences of the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER), it says that the administrator shall terminate all contracts. Then a little bit further down the page, it says ''Nothing in this section shall prevent the National Aeronautics and Space Administration accepting participation by the Russian government or Russian entities on a commercial basis.'' That conflicts within itself.

This is not a good amendment. It is not one we should be considering here today because it has the potential of defeating the International Space Station, dissolving our partnership, costing us the billions of dollars that we have invested and that we have a hope that will give us something in our future.

Termination of the International Space Station multinational agreement will impose termination costs on all our partners. Termination would be programmatically expensive to the United States. It would result in major objections from our international partners, given their independent agreements with the government of Russia.

The Russian Space Station has an inextricable involvement in the Space Station program as a representative of the Russian government. It would be difficult to exclude their space agency from negotiations, should NASA be required to contract with Russian industry. I do not know how the commercial wording within the language of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) would work.

The participation of the Russian government in the Space Station has never been more important, not only to contribute money to the project, but also to ensure the political stability in a troubled country. As long as the United States can keep some kind of good working relationship with the Russian government, we can rest a little easier during this political turmoil that is going on there.

Our Russian partners have difficulty feeding its people. I admire their commitment to try to complete this long-term space project. From what my Russian friends and colleagues tell me, contributing capital and human resources to the Space Station is a tremendous source of pride among the Russian people. It is one reason why the government continues its commitment.

So as a representative of the United States Government and industry, I believe we have to do all that we can to encourage the Russians to maintain their involvement with the Space Station, and I would ask that my colleagues not support this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. I, too, like the chairmen of the full committee and the subcommittee, have expressed some very, very serious concerns regarding the management on the part of the Clinton administration and the NASA administrator regarding these continuing ongoing delays with the Russians. Nonetheless, I do not feel that this amendment, as it is currently crafted, is the proper way for us to address this problem.

I have several concerns. As I understand my reading of this amendment, should this be enacted into law, there would be nothing that would prevent the Russians from essentially charging us $200 million, for example, to deliver the service module on orbit, or substantially more sums of money. As I understand it, that is the cost of the service module. If we add on the cost of launching it, I think the way this thing is crafted, it could not only put the Space Station program but, as well, the American taxpayers in a very, very precarious position.

Additionally, I would like to also comment on the fact that as I understand the legal language of the international agreement, that we as the United States do not have the authority to discharge one particular partner from the international agreement. Essentially the only options that are available to us under the existing law would be for us to remove ourselves from the International Space Station, and therefore we would thus no longer be in partnership with some of our more reliable partners, such as the Japanese, the Canadians, and the Europeans.

So in summary, though I think the intent of this amendment is a good one and that I share the concerns of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER), and as well I share the concerns of my very esteemed colleagues, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), the committee chairman, and the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER), the subcommittee chairman, I feel that this amendment, the way that it is crafted, it is a bad amendment. It is impossible to implement and as well could ultimately, the end result, lead to significantly increased costs to the American taxpayers.

Then for that reason I would highly encourage all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, not only those who support our manned space flight program and the Space Station program but as well those who support fiscal responsibility, to reject this amendment.

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

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

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise against this amendment. For many years we have been cooperating with Russia. There is perhaps nothing more important in our space program than the symbol that it has for all of man and womankind, the chance to show two former adversaries working together.

Now, as we have a conflict in the Balkans, would be the worst possible time to slap the Russians. More importantly, this would be the worst possible time to have thousands of Russian scientists capable of building ballistic missiles suddenly unemployed as a result of a deliberately political and deliberately hostile action of this House against Russia, motivated, some would say, by a hostility toward the Vice President who played such a creative and important role in negotiating with Russia.

Clearly, the most cost effective way for us to explore space is to do it together, not in a race against Russia but in a race against the hostilities that can build up between countries, in a race to achieve peace and a race to achieve a working together with the only other nation to send men and women into space.

So I speak not only for an efficient space program but also for a lessening of international tensions when I rise against this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to rise to suggest that the level of debate was just brought down, and I resent it. I just want to put

this on the record. We need not to discuss these issues and every time we have a disagreement, relate political motives to each other. I for one am a little bit disgusted that every time I have a disagreement, not every time but often enough on this floor, that we end up saying, if we disagree with somebody over there, all of a sudden we are being political because we are opposing something the administration wants to do.

I would inform my colleague that this amendment was presented by a Democrat. This is a Democrat amendment. This is by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER), who has strong support, I imagine strong close ties to the Vice President. In fact, before the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) brought up the issue, I do not recall the Vice President's name being brought into this debate. In fact, I remember specifically stating that I personally supported this tactic and this strategy of working with the Russians in the beginning, but that the administration had not then shifted with the times and adjusted its strategy according to the current situation in Russia.

□ 1430

So I would suggest to my good friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN), that instead of trying to belittle other people or call into question our motives that he quit saying that we are being political and stick to the issues. And I just personally resent the fact there were implications in his words that we were over here trying to make political hay out of this.

I was interested in this Russian issue long before this administration became this administration.

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

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

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I believe that in my remarks I simply stated that it would be unfortunate if that were to be the motivation of anyone in this House. I believe that my colleague is referring to only a single phrase in a speech that was not as brief as I wish it was. And I think that my colleague can join with me in believing that all of us should cast a vote for what is in the best interests of the space program and what is in the best interests of our relations with Moscow without being colored by any concerns about any political matter.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER).

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

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 174, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. ROEMER

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Mr. ROEMER:

Amend section 101 to read as follows:

SEC. 101. INTERNATIONAL SPACE STATION.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the International Space Station, for expenses necessary to terminate the program, for fiscal year 2000, $500,000,000.

In section 106(1), strike ''$13,625,600,000'' and insert in lieu thereof ''$11,642,900,000''.

In section 106(2), strike ''$13,747,100,000'' and insert in lieu thereof ''$11,919,100,000''.

In section 106(3), strike ''$13,839,400,000'' and insert in lieu thereof ''$12,248,490,100''.

In section 121(a), strike ''sections 101,'' and insert in lieu thereof ''sections''.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I will be brief since we have been talking about the Space Station now for several hours.

This amendment is cosponsored by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD), the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GANSKE) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY). It is a bipartisan amendment.

It is also supported by the National Taxpayers Union, the Citizens Against Waste, the Taxpayers for Common Sense, the Citizens for a Sound Economy, and the Concord Coalition.

Mr. Chairman, there have been times when I brought this amendment to the floor in the past couple of years when we have had four or five cosponsors on the bill and, quite frankly, I was not sure we would get more votes than those four or five cosponsors, having come within one vote of defeating the Space Station back in 1993 on a 215–214 vote.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that the facts and the overruns and the inefficiencies continue to build up in our favor, yet the votes continue to go in the other direction for canceling the Space Station.

I want to remind my colleagues that this Space Station was first designed back in 1984 and the projected cost, Mr. Chairman, was $8 billion. And my colleagues might say, for $8 billion and eight scientific missions, including platforms to help us understand the environment of the Earth that would be put on the Space Station, a repair weigh station on the Space Station to help us with satellites, the Space Station would be used as a stepping stone to help us go and explore other planets.

We had eight scientific missions for this grandiose Space Station. That was 1984. Today is 1999. We are down to one mission. We do not have any of those platforms left. We do not have any of those scientific missions left except, basically, studying the effects of gravitation on men and women in space.

Now, maybe the symbol of some international cooperation and science, maybe the symbol of a Space Station up in orbit above the Earth is something important for $8 billion. But that cost, Mr. Chairman, has gone from $8 billion to now the General Accounting Office estimates in their reports $98 billion to launch it, to assemble it, to control it once it is up in space. $98 billion.

Now, I guess, Mr. Chairman, that if this were a welfare program, this would have been canceled a long time ago, or if this was a food stamp program that had gone up $90 billion over what it cost, it would have been canceled. But it is a jobs program and it has been put together with Machiavellian type political science in a lot of districts, although three States get about 80 percent of the contracts.

So I do not think, Mr. Chairman, this is a good deal for science. This is not fair to the rest of the great things that NASA does in its budget. This does not live up to the hopes and the dreams and the glory of the wonderful things that NASA has accomplished in the past, whether it was putting a man on the Moon, whether it was putting together the Hubble telescope, whether it was designing Pathfinder and putting it on Mars for $263 million on budget, on time, on schedule. And the American people got excited about it. They could not wait to ask, ''What did we find today on Mars?'' Budget efficient, fair to the rest of the budget. And NASA still allowed us to invest in aeronautics.

So I think, hopefully, we will vote for the Roemer amendment to fence the money, to be accountable for $38 billion of Space Station. If my colleagues cannot vote for that, the second amendment is to remove the Russians from the critical path and still allow commercial enterprise and exchange between the two countries.

And thirdly, my preference would be to cancel the Space Station, to move on, to not let our dreams be suspended 100 miles above Earth in technology that was designed 15 years ago. Let us dream about Mars. Let us dream about going back to the Moon. Let us dream big dreams like we are capable of, NASA.

I hope to get support on my amendments.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my opposition to this bold attempt to ground the International Space Station. Now, this program, in my opinion, is vital to developing new technology and new medicines for the next century.

This great land was discovered because of the courage of explorers who refused to let obstacles get in the way of their vision. Today, 500 years later, we talk of cutting exploration to the last frontier at a critical time when our budgets and our vision are already shrinking. Such a miscalculation not only cuts away at the future, it is a direct attack on the American spirit.

At its very core, the American spirit is based on adventure and fighting adversity despite the odds. We should thank God that Christopher Columbus was not tied to the short-sighted constraints of a U.S. Congress afraid of risks and shy of discovery.

Discovery of new cures for disease is only one field of many fields where space exploration has paid off. Medical innovation and further experimentation in space cannot be allowed to wither away. Instead of allowing our imagination to fade, we should raise our sights to the expectation of new strides in science and new leaps in technology.

We have come so far, there is absolutely no excuse to turn around now. With over $20 billion already invested, there is simply no justification for wasting funds that have been spent developing this Space Station to this date.

Despite what the adversaries of this program contend, this Space Station is actually on schedule and within its budget.

Now, not so long ago, a president of the United States challenged Americans to test their dreams and wagered that America could reach the Moon by the end of the decade. Well, Mr. Chairman, almost 40 years later the same country is trying to cut its losses in space because it is afraid of failure. Well, we cannot be afraid to fail. We cannot be afraid to experiment, and we must be determined to stick with this program.

So I just urge my colleagues to continue to support the International Space Station and vote against cutting and killing the Space Station.

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

I also rise to shock the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) because I rise to echo the comments of the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. TOM DELAY).

Mr. Chairman, when Columbus set sail, about two-thirds of the way into his journey a group of the sailors rose and urged that the project be defunded and that they return to Spain. We would not be standing here today if that amendment had not been defeated, just as we must defeat the amendment before us now.

The Space Station gives us a chance to build bridges to other countries, one in particular of which was our former adversary. It helps us build our own aerospace industry, which is the leading source of American exports.

In my own district, we are developing batteries for the Space Station in a way that may well lead to breakthroughs for an electric automobile so critical to the air quality of the most air-quality challenged city in America. Just as important is the research that can be done only in space on so many diseases, such as cancer, diabetes, AIDS, and influenza.

This Space Station, of course, is a cooperative project, including some 16 nations. Those other nations have contributed already $5 billion to this effort. Today, 250 miles above the Earth, already circle the first elements of the Space Station, *Zarya* and *Unity*, one from Russia, one from the United States.

Mr. Chairman, America belongs in space. Humankind belongs in space. And I can think of nothing worse that we can do at the beginning of a new millennium than defund the Space Station. That is why I urge all of our colleagues to vote against this amendment.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, let me associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from California, with one exception. I doubt that those sailors on Columbus' boats would have advocated defunding that mission because that meant they would not have been paid when they got back to Spain.

But other than that, I think the argument of the gentleman had a lot of merit, and I would hope that the committee and the House would not be fooled by the opponent's scare tactics.

The ground-based flight hardware is 82 percent complete. If we adopt this amendment of the gentleman from Indiana, that hardware will not go to orbit but will end up in museums around the country as an exhibit of Congress' foolishness in defunding the program when it was close to completion.

The flight hardware for the next six flights is already at the Kennedy Space Center being ready for launch. We American taxpayers have invested $20 billion so far in this project. If the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana were adopted, that money would go right down the drain. And that is a pretty tough sell to tell our taxpayers that we made a $20 billion mistake.

□ 1445

I would hope that this amendment would be rejected and rejected by the same overwhelming margins that have occurred in the last several votes on this topic.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the comments of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY). I believe the Space Station offers numerous benefits, spin-off technologies in medicine, in engineering, in transportation, in energy, in environment. Every year this Congress goes through this debate, it gives us an opportunity to affirm the benefits that station has.

The station also has another benefit. That is the intangible but real benefit of international cooperation. It has given us an opportunity to create a platform for participation and cooperation with the Russians. At this very moment, while the entire world teeters at the edge of a larger war in the Balkans, we are reaching out to the Russians to ask them for help. Let it not be forgotten that this very moment, when the Russian leadership has changed, at this very moment Russia is looking for the hand of cooperation to bring about peace.

This is not the time to kill this project which serves as a basis for cooperation with the Russians and other countries. This is a time to say that we need more projects which enable international cooperation and we need more projects that can put us in a peaceful, productive, cooperative relationship with Russia. We need Russia's help in building peace in this world. We do not need to slap Russia's hand on the Space Station. We need Russia to work with us in making this project work. We also need to work with them in making this project work and in building a framework for peace around the world.

Mr. Chairman, I want to indicate my strong support for the Space Station and my strong support for the benefits of the Space Station, and my strong support for continuing the relationship with Russia on this project and continuing this project as a basis for pursuing peace throughout the world.

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

Today I hope that as we are discussing the Space Station and we get into this last area of debate, that we take note that there is one person who is usually with us, who has been with us over the years and been an integral part of this debate, who is not with us today, whom we miss and we hope he is watching over C-SPAN. If he is not, we hope he is reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but we would all like to send our very best wishes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BROWN), the former chairman.

The gentleman from California has been a great boon to all of us in the Committee on Science. He has provided us an institutional memory over his many long years of service. During those many years, the gentleman from California has been a strong supporter of the International Space Station. In debates like this, he quite often has gotten up and reminded us of the long-term perspective and where we have been and where we are going, and has certainly done a great service to his country in that he has provided us the type of wisdom that is necessary for us to not only start projects like this but to complete projects like this.

We hope that the gentleman from California is watching after he has gone through, I understand, a heart operation. All of us send our very, very warm regards to him. I think that as we vote now on the Space Station, on these amendments, and I hope the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) will not take this badly, but I hope that we keep the gentleman from California in mind because he has been such a strong supporter.

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

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

Mr. ROEMER. I appreciate my friend from California yielding. I just want to join him in his heartfelt remarks to my good friend and my colleague and my former chairman and my ranking member, the gentleman from California. I understand he is doing well. He had a new valve put in his heart. He is recovering quickly and fully, I understand.

We not only miss his great expertise in these areas, we miss his wonderful and glowing sense of humor. We wish him Godspeed to get back here quickly and help us through some of these difficult dilemmas, even though he and I disagree on this issue.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Reclaiming my time, the gentleman from California was the head of the committee for many years as I was a member of the minority at that time. If there is anything that has inspired me to try my very best not to be partisan, but to try to reach out and find areas of compromise and try to be nice and kind and fair to Members who are now no longer in the majority, it is the way he treated us during that entire time.

There was no one who treated people more fairly and honestly in any committee than the gentleman from California did. We remember that now. It gives us a standard by which to judge our own behavior, a man who kept a very good spirit, even when there were spirited debates. We had honest disagreements under his leadership. Certainly we have a lot of honest disagreements because we come from minor political differences. By the way, our differences, even in the most adversarial parts of the discussion of any issue in this Congress, our differences are so minuscule compared to those things that separate other people in other countries who are killing themselves and such.

Here we have certain programs like the space program that binds us together as Democrats and Republicans and helps ensure that we all understand that there is a big picture, that this is not the administration's space program or a Republican or a Democrat space program, this is America's space program, and that we have honestly tried, and I know that there has been some friction here, to ensure that all sides feel that they are part of the decision-making process even when there is a disagreement. Let us keep that in mind, especially, and keep the gentleman from California in mind, because when he was chairman we certainly operated in that spirit.

As we go to this vote on the Space Station, I would hope that we do so, and there are some votes, I am siding with the gentleman from Indiana on one and opposing him on several, that we do so in this bipartisan spirit. I apologize if I got a little testy earlier when I thought the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) was suggesting that we had other motives.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to wholeheartedly concur with the gentleman from Indiana and the gentleman from California's kind remarks concerning the gentleman from California (Mr. BROWN). He will always be known for his humor and his expertise and his fairness. But let me again point out, he is doing very well. He is up and about, active, and will be back here soon to bring all those same skills to us.

If I could shift gears just a moment and go back to the amendment at hand, which is to kill the Space Station, I think we are all aware of the expression, ''same song, second verse.'' This is the same second, 22nd verse, or more.

Let me just quickly again remind the Members that two sections of this Space Station have already been put in orbit. Most all the hardware is on the ground ready to go into orbit. If this amendment passes, those billions of dollars of investment will be wasted, as well as wasting the potential of the good work of the Space Station.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment, because it seems to me that what this amendment is about is the very simple theme of putting good money after bad. The reason I say that is that if you were $2,000 into a hypothetical $10,000 investment and then all of a sudden that $10,000 investment began to look very iffy, would you invest the other $8,000 if it was your own money? I think most of us would not.

That is exactly where we are with this Space Station. We are $20 billion in, but we still have another $80 billion to go. Would you really go that distance if it begins to look iffy, which is what basically the scientific community has said? Put another way, if you were $200 toward fixing your car in a, quote, $1,000 repair job but then it turned out the $1,000 repair job would not get you there, would you put in the other $800? I do not think most of us would.

That fundamentally is what this amendment is all about. There is a big hole down in south Texas where there was going to be a supercolliding super conductor, yet in the end that project was found wanting and people said, ''Let's not continue to fund it.'' This is something that is done all day long in people's homes. It is something that is done all day long in businesses. Businesses have start-ups, they venture out, check it out, see if it is going to work and then if it does not look good, they retreat. We can do that in government, too. So, one, fundamentally, this is what that amendment is about.

Two, why is it putting good money after bad? It is putting good money after bad because first of all there is a tremendous amount of uncertainty in this project. As has already been mentioned, this is not the American Space Station, this is the International Space Station.

As we all know, there is a lot of uncertainty in Russia right now. Yeltsin seems to be running through prime ministers on a fairly regular basis. There are a whole host of other problems within this country. Is this the kind of subcontractor you want in a business deal? I know of no contractor, whether in Charleston, whether in Houston, whether in Los Angeles, who would go out and depend on a subcontractor that was iffy. That is exactly what we have in this project.

Therefore, would you risk $100 billion—or $100—of your own money if it was that kind of setup? In fact, it was the independent Chabrow report that last year said it is costing us between $100 and $250 million for each month that the assembly is delayed. That is what this subcontractor is costing us. I think it points to the uncertainty of this overall project.

Two, the reason I think it is putting good money after bad is that the scientific value so far has proved to be very, very limited. Because it is limited, we have to set priorities. Nobody wants to set priorities, but that is fundamentally what our role is about here in government. Indeed, we have got a lot of priorities in government. You could buy 40 B–2s, you could buy a bay full of aircraft carriers, you could buy a whole lot of books or computers for education. You could do a lot of other things with this money.

That is why the National Taxpayers Union supports this amendment. That is why Citizens Against Government Waste supports this amendment. In fact, I have here a stack of different articles that point to again the questionable nature of, quote, the scientific value of what is being talked about with Space Station, which is the reason it would be up there in the first place.

Indeed, the American Society for Cell Biology declared that crystallography experiments in microgravity have made no serious contribution to analysis of protein structures or the development of new pharmaceuticals.

I have here another article that points to scientific publication is the hallmark of a good laboratory, and yet there is not scientific finding or publication out of Space Station. In fact, it points to the Howard Hughes Medical Institute, which is by all models a model for scientific organizations. It has a budget of about $500 million and has numerous findings in all sorts of different scientific journals. Therefore, we could fund several fold, in other words, a multiple of Howard Hughes type organizations with this money as opposed to sending it off into space.

I have another article here that talks about how the Space Station is vulnerable to debris and how NASA is leaving off shields to fast track the project. In fact, according to the ISS partners, there is a 24 percent chance, a 1 in 4

chance that it could be hit by debris. Is that the kind of project you want to put $100 billion into?

I have another article here from the Sunday Times of London talking about how NASA jeopardizes Space Station research to help the Russians.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise again in strong opposition to this amendment by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER). This is the third Space Station either wounding or killing amendment that the gentleman from Indiana will offer. My colleagues should oppose every one of those.

This is the annual cancellation amendment that the gentleman from Indiana has offered. We came into Congress together, so he has offered it, I know, since 1991, both in the committee and on the floor at least once a year and sometimes twice a year as well. So to say the least, we have had a fair fight over this issue.

But let us talk about how far we have come. My colleagues have said we are throwing good money after bad. Not so. We have invested $20 billion in this program. We have evaluated this program, we have redesigned this program, we have micromanaged the program almost to death, but we have come too far to turn our back on this very important program.

Let us talk about the science that it will produce, the microgravity, scientific opportunities that are available there. There has been hearing after hearing in the Committee on Science over the opportunities that our scientists have for breakthroughs with diet research, with cancer research as well. So to say that the science is strictly testing the effects of gravity on human beings is to certainly oversimplify what we know many of those scientists and medical practitioners around the world are looking forward to pulling off on this experiment called Space Station.

□ 1500

If we do not fund the space station, we might as well disassemble NASA, because the space station program is the heart of NASA's research and development program and the heart of NASA's science program. This is not a project that is supposed to be flown in space for a few weeks. Space station will reside continuously in space for more than a decade. So for years our scientists will have opportunities to carry out these important scientific experiments there in microgravity under circumstances that we do not have here on Earth.

Five hundred thousand pounds of station components, half a million pounds of station components will have been built at factories around the world by the end of this year. Over 82 percent of the prime contractor's development work has been completed. And U.S. flight hardware sits at the launch site for the next six flights.

So this amendment would waste all the hard work that the NASA employees have put in, this amendment would waste the billion dollars of investment that we have made, and also this amendment and other amendments offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) would cause us to turn our back on the resources and commitment of the 16 nations that are participating in this International Space Station, 11 of those nations and the European Space Agency community as well. So we have got international legal agreements that depend on the continuation of this funding, and I say let us do it, let us do it decisively, let us oppose this amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) and all other Roemer amendments that attempt to mortally wound or kill this important space station program.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to rise in strong opposition to the amendment by Mr. ROEMER and Mr. SANFORD to cancel the International Space Station.

This is a debate that we have had every year, and every year the House has reaffirmed its support for the Space Station program. While much has already been said in our previous annual debates, let me touch on a few brief points for our Freshman Members who may be hearing this debate for the first time.

First, let's look at where we've been. Services and products ranging from satellite communications to internal pacemakers and cardiac defibrillators were either developed or significantly improved because of our past investments in space.

Even until today, Microgravity research has been limited by scarce flight opportunities and sporadic access to space. Unlike the Shuttle experiments which are limited to about 2 weeks in space, the Space Station will reside continuously in space for more than a decade. The Space Station will give scientists, engineers, and businessmen an unprecedented opportunity to perform complex, long-duration experiments that will benefit the world for years to come.

Next, let's look at how far we've come. At the end of last year, we took a significant step towards our ultimate destiny of establishing a permanent presence in space with the launch of the first International Space Station elements Zarya and Unity, which are now operating 250 miles above the Earth.

Led by the United States, the Space Station draws upon the expertise and resources of 16 nations, including Canada, Japan, Russia, Brazil, and 11 nations of the European Space Agency. In addition to the $20 billion that we have invested in the Space Station, our international partners have contributed $5 billion to date. By the end of this year, 500,000 pounds of station components will have been built at factories around the world. Over 82 percent of the Prime Contractor's development work has been completed, with U.S. flight hardware for the next six flights at the launch site.

This amendment would waste all the hard work and all the taxpayer dollars that have been spent to date on the program. We've come too far for Congress to turn its back on the American people now.

Now, let's look at where we're going. Microgravity capabilities will be available in the spring of 2000, with the outfitting of the U.S. laboratory, Destiny.

The Space Station will be good for science and good for America. Space Station research will complement ground-based research to generate tangible returns, improving the quality of life here on Earth as well as in space.

Space is the ideal environment in which to study processes in fields such as combustion science, fluid physics, and materials science, which are normally masked by gravity-driven forces here on Earth. This research could help us decrease pollution, save billions of dollars in energy costs, construct buildings that are better prepared for earthquakes, and improve the structure and performance of materials used in everything from contact lenses to car engines.

Space Station will enable the medical community to understand bone and muscle loss, and possibly lead to the design of countermeasures. NASA-developed telemedicine systems will be used to provide high-quality medical advice, instruction, and education to underserved parts of our Nation and our World. Growing and analyzing protein crystals in space will play a pivotal role in structure-based drug design.

Mr. Chairman, we are discussing this bad amendment at a time when we should be thinking about the best ways to utilize this opportunity to enter into a new era in life and microgravity sciences research which will revolutionize the quality of life on Earth. R&D onboard Space Station will improve our knowledge of industrial processes, help us take substantial strides towards remarkable medical advances, and enable that pioneering spirit in all of us to take the next steps in the human exploration of the solar system.

Our continued funding should be looked at as an investment in America's future, bringing us new and exciting discoveries that we haven't even yet imagined. Mr. Chairman, this is a bad amendment, and I urge the Members to defeat it.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER).

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

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 174, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) will be postponed.

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

Mr. Chairman, I have heard a lot of discussion here today about international cooperation, and I would just ask my colleagues to consider that we make as much effort to have some across the aisle bipartisan cooperation here in the House and in the Senate as we talk about between countries.

One issue that I would ask my colleague to consider as this bill goes into conference with the Senate is the issue of the Triana project. Now I know that there are those that want to push the Triana project because they perceive it as a Democrat issue, and there are those that want to oppose it because they perceive it as a Democrat issue. But I think that there is some issues

here that need to be discussed, and I would just ask the conferees as this bill moves forward to give at least the strong science part of Triana a benefit of the doubt. We have the capability with this project, if it is executed appropriately and the partisan politics is kept out of it as much as possible, to finally settle the issue of global warming and finally be able to say is the billions of dollars that we are considering spending on global warming, is it appropriate and is it needed?

So I would stand here today and ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, let us not use Triana for political advantage, let us not try to formulate a presidential campaign around a scientific research study, and I say sincerely I think both sides bear a degree of responsibility here. There are parts of Triana that I would ask the chairman and the conference committee to take a look at that is based on strong science coming from Scripps Institution of Oceanography and see if that portion of Triana can be preserved and enhanced so that those of us in the policymaking decision can get good, unfiltered information that is not tainted by political agendas to be able to make an informed decision about global warming.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SWEENEY

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SWEENEY:

In section 127(a)—

(1) insert ''(1)'' after ''LIMITATION.—''; and

(2) add at the end the following new paragraphs:

(2) The Administrator shall certify to the Congress at least 15 days in advance of any cooperative agreement with the People's Republic of China, or any company incorporated under the laws of the People's Republic of China, involving spacecraft, spacecraft systems, launch systems, or scientific or technical information that—

(A) the agreement is not detrimental to the United States space launch industry; and

(B) the agreement, including any indirect technical benefit that could be derived from the agreement, will not measurably improve the missile or space launch capabilities of the People's Republic of China.

(3) The Inspector General of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, in consultation with the Director of Central Intelligence and the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, shall conduct an annual audit of the policies and procedures of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration with respect to the export of technologies and the transfer of scientific and technical information, to assess the extent to which the National Aeronautics and Space Administration is carrying out its activities in compliance with Federal export control laws and with paragraph (2).

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, let me first congratulate my colleagues, specifically the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) from the subcommittee and the ranking member, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON) for their fine work on the NASA reauthorization bill.

There have been two major occurrences within the past 10 years that have proven to be a striking blow to the national security interests of our great Nation.

First, China used information it obtained as a result of our cooperation on satellite technology to upgrade its ballistic missile force, improving range and accuracy of its booster systems.

Secondly, the Chinese are also using information they obtained as a result of deliberate and, mind you, successful espionage efforts at our nuclear laboratories at the Department of Energy in order to improve their nuclear warhead arsenal. Mr. Chairman, the combination of these two events means that the Communist Chinese government, which currently has at least 40 ICBMs, will soon have the capability to launch multiple warheads, MIRV missiles, in just 3 to 5 years instead of the 20 years it would have taken without these two pieces of American technology.

Mr. Chairman, we should be outraged as Americans that these two events were allowed to occur, seemingly without a hint that the national security breaches were occurring at all. With these grave events as a backdrop, I offer my amendment today as an attempt to reestablish that it is the policy of the United States to ensure that our good faith efforts to share our technological advances with world partners are not turned against us in the form of military threat.

The amendment addresses two areas of concern to NASA. First, the Chinese espionage experience at the Department of Energy labs is not repeated within our space program. The amendment requires the Inspector General of NASA to assess on an annual basis in consultation with our intelligence community NASA's compliance with export control laws and the exchange of technology and information that can be used to enhance the military capabilities of foreign entities.

Secondly, my amendment requires that NASA, before it enters into an agreement to exchange technology and information with the People's Republic of China to certify with Congress that the exchange of technology and information cannot be used to enhance China's ballistic missile capacities. This policy is consistent with our export controls regarding trade and satellite technology and actually mirrors language in the 1999 defense authorization which requires the President to certify approved satellite technology exports to China. It is entirely appropriate that we hold that same standard to the potential technological exchanges between our space program and the PRC.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that the serious transfers of military technology have occurred at NASA, and I stress this, that has not happened at NASA yet, yet we need to recognize that there is a potential danger that must be addressed. A few years ago we were pretty certain that top secret scientific information at our nuclear labs was secure. We now know that that was not the case. This amendment insures that the appropriate steps are taken to prevent the repeat of the breach of our Department of Energy labs and strengthens existing controls on the flow of military critical technology being diverted to China.

This amendment also responds to another provision in the 1999 defense authorization and approved by a vote of 417 to 4 by this House which states that the United States should not enter into agreements with China involving space. This amendment does not go as far as to prohibit space cooperation with China, but it does raise the bar with respect to the types of sensitive technological information that we can exchange through NASA.

Mr. Chairman, NASA is one of the most respected government institutions in the world, and its contributions to technology development in the United States are enormous. This amendment insures that that reputation so painstakingly earned is never tarnished.

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

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

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to accept the amendment of the gentleman from New York. It requires a certification in advance that the cooperative agreement with the People's Republic of China does not harm the U.S. space launch industry or improve the missile launch capabilities of China and also directs the NASA Inspector General to conduct an annual audit to make sure that these certifications are being complied with.

It is a constructive amendment, and I hope it is adopted.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY).

The amendment was agreed to.

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 174, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed in the following order:

The amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER), amendment No. 4 offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER), amendment No. 5 offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER), and amendment No. 3 offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER).

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WEINER

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The Clerk designated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 225, noes 203, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 134]

AYES—225

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Armey
Baird
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Bentsen
Berkley
Berman
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Forbes
Ford
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (TX)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hastings (FL)
Hefley
Hill (IN)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hyde
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson, E.B.
Jones (OH)
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Klink
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Luther
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McGovern
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Moore
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Ney
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Quinn
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schakowsky
Scott
Shays
Sherman
Shows
Sisisky
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Talent
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thurman
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Vento
Walsh
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOES—203

Aderholt
Archer
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blunt
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brady (TX)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Crane
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Deal
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Everett
Ewing
Fletcher
Foley
Fossella
Fowler
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (WI)
Gutknecht
Hansen
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Herger
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Houghton
Hunter
Hutchinson
Isakson
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Kasich
King (NY)
Kingston
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lucas (OK)
Maloney (CT)
Manzullo
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Morella
Myrick
Nethercutt
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Ose
Oxley
Packard
Paul
Pease
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Reynolds
Riley
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Toomey
Traficant
Upton
Visclosky
Walden
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Whitfield
Wicker
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—5

Brown (CA)
Cox
McDermott
Napolitano
Serrano

□ 1534

Mrs. MYRICK and Mr. WATKINS changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. BOEHLERT, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mrs. KELLY, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Ms. CARSON changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, during rollcall vote No. 134, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes.''

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Pursuant to House Resolution 174, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device will be taken on each amendment on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. ROEMER

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 114, noes 315, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 135]

AYES—114

Abercrombie
Barrett (WI)
Bass
Bereuter
Berry
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Camp
Chabot
Chenoweth
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Crowley
Cubin
Danner
Deal
DeFazio
Delahunt
DeMint
Dingell
Doyle
Duncan
Evans
Fattah
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Ganske
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gutierrez
Hefley
Herger
Hilleary
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kildee
Kind (WI)
Kingston
LaFalce
Largent
Latham
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
LoBiondo
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Mascara
McCarthy (MO)
McHugh
McInnis
Meehan
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Myrick
Nadler
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Owens
Pallone
Paul
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Portman
Ramstad
Rivers
Roemer
Roukema
Ryan (WI)
Sanders
Sanford
Schaffer
Shays
Sherwood
Shuster
Smith (MI)
Stark
Stearns
Strickland
Stupak
Sununu
Tancredo
Tierney
Toomey
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Woolsey

NOES—315

Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner

Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chambliss
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Combest
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
DeGette
DeLauro
DeLay
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Dreier
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kennedy
Kilpatrick
King (NY)
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Maloney (CT)
Martinez
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McGovern
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Oxley
Packard
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rodriguez
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Sherman
Shimkus
Shows
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stenholm
Stump
Sweeney
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Walden
Walsh
Waters
Watt (NC)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—4

Brown (CA)
McDermott
Napolitano
Serrano

□ 1544

Ms. SLAUGHTER changed her vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

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

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, during rollcall vote No. 135, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''no.''

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. ROEMER

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 117, noes 313, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 136]

AYES—117

Armey
Baker
Ballenger
Barr
Bass
Bereuter
Biggert
Bilbray
Blagojevich
Bliley
Boehlert
Bonilla
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Camp
Canady
Cannon
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Coble
Coburn
Combest
Condit
Cook
Costello
Cunningham
Danner
Deal
Delahunt
DeMint
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dingell
Doolittle
Doyle
Duncan
Ehlers
Fattah
Fossella
Ganske
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Green (WI)
Gutknecht
Hayes
Hefley
Herger
Hilleary
Hoekstra
Holden
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Isakson
Jones (NC)
Kaptur
Kelly
Kind (WI)
Kingston
LaHood
Largent
Latham
Lazio
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas (OK)
Maloney (NY)
McInnis
McIntosh
Meehan
Mica
Mink
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Myrick
Paul
Petri
Pickering
Pombo
Portman
Ramstad
Roemer
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salmon
Sanford
Schaffer
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shays
Shuster
Smith (TX)
Spence
Stearns
Strickland
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Tancredo
Thomas
Tiahrt
Tierney
Upton
Visclosky
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Whitfield

NOES—313

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Bachus
Baird
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Campbell
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Collins
Conyers
Cooksey
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DeLay
Deutsch
Dicks
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Dreier
Dunn
Edwards
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Inslee
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
King (NY)
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Phelps
Pickett
Pitts
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Rogan
Rogers
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schakowsky
Scott
Sessions
Shaw
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stenholm
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Vento
Walden
Walsh
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—3

Brown (CA) Napolitano Serrano

□ 1554

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

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. ROEMER

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 92, noes 337, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 137]

AYES—92

Barrett (WI)
Bass
Bereuter
Berry
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Camp
Chabot
Chenoweth
Coble
Coburn
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cubin
Danner
DeFazio
Delahunt
DeMint
Dingell
Duncan
Evans
Fattah
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Ganske
Goode
Goodlatte
Gutierrez
Hefley
Herger
Hilleary
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Kaptur
Kelly
Kildee
Kind (WI)
Kingston
Largent
Latham
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
LoBiondo
Lowey
Luther
Manzullo
McHugh
McInnis
Meehan
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Myrick
Nadler
Nussle
Oberstar
Pallone
Paul
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Ramstad
Rivers
Roemer
Roukema
Ryan (WI)
Sanders
Sanford
Shays
Shuster
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Stark
Strickland
Tancredo
Tierney
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Wamp
Woolsey

NOES—337

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chambliss
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Cramer
Crane
Crowley
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeGette
DeLauro
DeLay
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kennedy
Kilpatrick
King (NY)
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pease
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rodriguez
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Walden
Walsh
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—4

Brown (CA) Napolitano
Cox Serrano

□ 1602

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio changed her vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

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

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BATEMAN

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BATEMAN:

In section 101(1), strike ''$2,482,700,000'' and insert ''$2,382,700,000''.

In section 101(2), strike ''$2,328,000,000'' and insert ''$2,228,000,000''.

In section 101(3), strike ''$2,091,000,000'' and insert ''$1,991,000,000''.

In section 103(4)—

(1) in subparagraph (A), strike ''$999,300,000'' and insert ''$1,099,300,000'';

(2) in subparagraph (A)(i), strike ''$532,800,000'' and insert ''$632,800,000'';

(3) in subparagraph (A)(i), strike ''$412,800,000 to be for the Research and Technology Base'' and insert ''$512,800,000 to be for the Research and Technology Base, including—

''(I) $20,000,000 for the Innovative Aviation Technologies Research program;

''(II) $30,000,000 for the Aging Aircraft Sustainment program;

''(III) $10,000,000 for the Aircraft Development Support program;

''(IV) $20,000,000 for the Unmanned Air Vehicles program; and

''(V) $20,000,000 for the Long-Range Hypersonic Research program'';

(4) in subparagraph (B), strike ''$908,400,000'' and insert ''$1,008,400,000'';

(5) in subparagraph (B)(i), strike ''$524,000,000'' and insert ''$624,000,000'';

(6) in subparagraph (B)(i), strike ''$399,800,000 to be for the Research and Technology Base, and with $54,200,000 to be for Aviation System Capacity'' and insert ''$54,200,000 to be for Aviation System Capacity, and with $499,800,000 to be for the Research and Technology Base, including—

''(I) $20,000,000 for the Innovative Aviation Technologies Research program;

''(II) $30,000,000 for the Aging Aircraft Sustainment program;

''(III) $10,000,000 for the Aircraft Development Support program;

''(IV) $20,000,000 for the Unmanned Air Vehicles program; and

''(V) $20,000,000 for the Long-Range Hypersonic Research program'';

(7) in subparagraph (C), strike ''$994,800,000'' and insert ''$1,094,800,000'';

(8) in subparagraph (C)(i), strike ''$519,200,000'' and insert ''$619,200,000''; and

(9) in subparagraph (C)(i), strike ''$381,600,000 to be for the Research and Technology Base, and with $67,600,000 to be for Aviation System Capacity'' and insert ''$67,600,000 to be for Aviation System Capacity, and with $481,600,000 to be for the Research and Technology Base, including—

''(I) $20,000,000 for the Innovative Aviation Technologies Research program;

''(II) $30,000,000 for the Aging Aircraft Sustainment program;

''(III) $10,000,000 for the Aircraft Development Support program;

''(IV) $20,000,000 for the Unmanned Air Vehicles program; and

''(V) $20,000,000 for the Long-Range Hypersonic Research program''.

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BATEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer my amendment and to express my displeasure with the drastic reductions in the NASA budget over the past several years. I am particularly concerned about the reduction in funding for aeronautics research. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) shares my concerns and joins in this amendment.

NASA is not simply a space exploration agency; it has also played a vital role in the creation of important technology used in civilian and military air transport. These contributions are among the brightest jewels in NASA's crown, but the last several years have seen the aeronautics budget dwindle precipitously.

The Clinton administration is rarely so zealous in its attempt to reduce nondefense discretionary spending. It is, therefore, ironic and unfortunate that it is so determined to scale back aeronautics research.

Today I have presented or am presenting an amendment to transfer $100 million from the International Space Station account to the Aeronautical Research and Technology account for each of the 3 fiscal years covered by the authorization bill before us. I have long been a supporter of the Space Station and remain so, but I feel that it has received more than generous funding while aeronautics research has suffered disproportionately.

I expect that it may be said that this $100 million reduction in the funding for the Space Station is a killer amendment. This is not the case, in my view, unless those who direct the Space Station program choose to make it so, and to me it is inconceivable that they would to this. No one, on the other hand, can do the vital aeronautics research identified in my amendment unless it is adopted.

Nearly $5 billion has been spent on the Space Station in the last 2 fiscal years, and another $2.4 billion is included in the President's budget for fiscal year 2000. Meanwhile, aeronautics research will have been reduced by $400 million over the same period.

The reduction in budget authority for aeronautics would bring the reduction in that program to 50 percent of what it was 10 years ago. Clearly aeronautics research has suffered disproportionately.

The Bateman-Scott amendment will transfer $100 million from the Space Station account to the aeronautics account for each of the 3 fiscal years covered by this bill. Failure to increase our commitment to aeronautics research will have grievous economic and national security consequences to the United States. The Bateman-Scott amendment will help guarantee that American aviation will preserve its traditional dominance.

My colleagues' support and vote for the Bateman-Scott amendment is solicited and will be appreciated.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Bateman-Scott amendment. The amendment will transfer $100 million from the International Space Station for each of the next 3 fiscal years to the Aeronautics Research and Technology account.

This amendment is necessary to restore deep cuts in aeronautics research and development programs as proposed by the bill. It is especially important when we know that several aeronautics R&D programs were cut, in large part in order to fund continued cost overruns for the Space Station.

We know that the Nation's aeronautics research program are in serious decline. The proposed FY 2000 NASA budget decreases an already underfunded aeronautics research effort by an additional 33 percent.

Mr. Chairman, we know that dollar-for-dollar investments in aeronautics research pay off. This is because aeronautics is the second largest industry in terms of positive balance of trade, second only to agriculture, and that goes back and forth every year. That is directly attributable to our past investments in aeronautics research.

Every aircraft worldwide uses NASA technology. For example, engineering principles developed from this research have contributed to overall aircraft safety and efficiency, including things like wing design, noise abatement, structural integrity and fuel efficiency. Such improvements are part of every aircraft in use today and are a direct result of our investment in aeronautics research.

Contrary to being corporate welfare, Federal investment in aeronautics research and development is vital because private companies are reluctant to fund this type of research when future applications of that research are unknown or will not pay dividends for 20 years. So our past and current funding of aeronautics research represents an appropriate and responsible Federal role.

The steady decline in aeronautics has already had an impact on United States competitiveness. Less than 10 years ago, United States firms held more than 70 percent of the world market share of civilian aircraft sales. But today, Europe's AirBus has more than 50 percent of that market share.

So while the U.S. has continued to severely cut research in this area, other countries have aggressively increased their investment. Japan, for example, will put $20 million more towards high speed transport research, while this budget ends our investment in high speed transport research.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and support our continued investment in aeronautics research and development.

Mr. Chairman, I submit for the RECORD a letter from Virginia Governor Jim Gilmore expressing his opposition to the bill and a January 18, 1999 article entitled the ''Cost of Station Cuts Into Funds For Supersonic Airplane Effort'' in ''Space News'', as follows:

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
May 18, 1999.

Hon. ROBERT C. SCOTT,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SCOTT; I write to you on behalf of the National Aeronautics and Space Agency Langley Research Center (NASA–LARC) and request your assistance during this year's appropriations process in the 106th Congress. Specifically, I request you cast your vote against H.R. 1654. President Clinton's budget proposal, submitted to Congress earlier this year, drastically reduces, for the second straight year, funding for the NASA–LARC to a level that threatens its critical research initiatives. NASA Langley is a national resource that is based in Virginia. I believe, therefore, that it is incumbent on all of us in elective office to represent its national mission. I respectfully request you halt this proposed budget cut and increase funding for this facility that is vital to the economy of the Tidewater region, the Commonwealth of Virginia, and our national competitiveness.

Over the last 2 years the NASA–LARC has been cut 24% comprehensively and the aeronautics portion has been reduced by 33%. This year, the President's budget proposes a cut of over $110 million and the reduction or abolition of numerous programs, including the elimination of two major programs—High Speed Commercial Transport (HSCT) and Advanced Subsonic Technology (AST). If this proposal is not overturned, Virginia will experience a direct loss of over 500 aeronautical engineering jobs through the end of 2000. Collateral effects include a total loss of approximately $275 million to the Virginia economy and 1,900 jobs lost. Moreover, these effects will not be contained strictly to the Tidewater region, but will also be realized in Blacksburg, Charlottesville and Northern Virginia as well.

The United States has drastically reduced federal aeronautics funding from $1.3 billion per year to $640 million per year—a 51% reduction—over the last ten years. In 1997, ''aeronautics products'' was the second largest U.S. export category ($69 billion) in our balance of trade, second only to agricultural products. While the United States continues to reduce its ability to compete in this market, other nations, such as Great Britain, South Korea, France, Taiwan and China, are increasing the amount of their investment in aeronautical R&D and are strong partners with their private sector companies. For example, Boeing has seen its share of the global commercial aircraft market go from 90% to less than 50% over the last 15 years. Airbus, based in France, has seen its share increase from 0% to approximately 50%. This comes as no surprise since the best aeronautic R&D facilities are now located in Europe.

In conclusion, I would like to point out that in a dangerous world in which this administration has deployed our military personnel to a multitude of locations around the globe, the most important thing necessary to insure their safety is complete domination of the skies over their heads. The current situation in the Balkans is a clear-cut example of why it is important to maintain a position for the United States at the forefront of aeronautics research and development.

Once again, I ask you to join me and fight to preserve NASA–LARC and see that it continues to play the integral role it has play in the economy of Virginia, in defense of this

notion and the promotion our commercial interests in global economy.

Very truly yours,

JAMES S. GILMORE, III,
Governor of Virginia.

[From the Space News, Jan. 18, 1999]

COST OF STATION CUTS INTO FUNDS FOR SUPERSONIC AIRPLANE EFFORT

(By Brian Berger)

WASHINGTON.—Funding for NASA's effort to develop technology for the next generation of supersonic passenger airplanes will be slashed and possibly eliminated to help NASA pay for cost overruns on the international space station program, according to government sources.

When U.S. President Bill Clinton presents his 2000 budget request to Congress in early February, sources said funding for NASA's High-Speed Research program—a nine-year-old effort to develop a concept for an environmentally friendly supersonic passenger jet—will be significantly reduced or cut from the space agency's budget altogether.

Last year, Congress appropriated $190 million for High-Speed Research in 1999, according to the NASA Comptroller's Office.

Although some sources say NASA could be in line for a small budget increase for 2000, congressional sources said its unlikely the White House will add enough money to pay for space station overruns without making cuts elsewhere.

A congressional source said some combination of new funds and program budget cuts are to be expected in a year when the White House is under political pressure to find as much as $1 billion extra for the international space station.

''This is the first year there hasn't been tremendous support for High-Speed Research,'' a senior NASA official said.

The NASA official declined to offer details of the cut pending the president's release of his spending plan. But a congressional source said the president's budget will reflect a deliberate decision to phase out the High-Speed Research program.

''I think it's dead,'' the source said, ''and I wouldn't be surprised if it goes away for a while.''

The NASA program began in 1990 to help U.S. aerospace companies develop the technologies needed to build a supersonic passenger plane capable of meeting the more stringent environmental regulations predicted for 2010.

But when industry-partner Boeing Co., Seattle, announced last fall that it would delay for 15 years its plans to build a supersonic passenger plane—also known as a high-speed civilian transport—until 2025, both the environmental and economic goals of the NASA program changed to reflect the new time frame.

Boeing spokeswoman Mary Jean Olsen said the company will not invest tens of billions of dollars in building a supersonic passenger jet until the technology and market demand for the product presents itself.

Alan Wilhite, deputy director of the Office of High-Speed Research at NASA Langley Research Center, Hampton, Va., said the program was on track to meet all the economic and environmental goals Boeing set for the program in 1990.

He said the program is now undergoing a year-long feasibility study to determine what must be done to meet more stringent environmental and economic goals forecasted for 2020–2025. Word of the budget cut comes as program officials at Langley are preparing to begin the next phase of the program, an eight-year, $700 million effort that includes the test and assembly of a full-scale supersonic engine.

But a Boeing program official said it is too soon to build an engine for an airplane that is still 20–25 years from reality.

''We really should not proceed with manufacturing technology,'' said Boeing's Robert Cuthbertson, program manager for the High-Speed Civilian Transport program.

During a NASA hearing before the House Science Committee in February 1998, Rep. Dana Rohrabacher (R–Calif.) questioned NASA Administrator Daniel Goldin about the advisability of building a full-scale engine for an airplane that may not be built.

''The whole program is being looked at very closely in terms of what level of investment the government should put in this area,'' the senior NASA official said.

Cuthbertson said Boeing is cutting back its investment in high-speed research substantially, estimating a 75–80 percent reduction over the next seven years.

John Logsdon, director of the Space Policy Institute at the George Washington University here, said aeronautics research is the subject of a long-standing debate between the White House and NASA.

''The argument is that aeronautics is a mature industry and ought to be paying for its own [research and development]'' Logsdon said. ''Some say it's inappropriate for the government to be paying for [a research and development] program that is essentially for Boeing.''

Boeing is the only U.S. company currently building large commercial airframes.

Robert Walker, former chairman of the House Science Committee, said the debate goes back decades, but that the High-Speed Research program was usually seen as the kind of pure technology development effort NASA should be supporting.

Driving the budget cut, a NASA and congressional source said, is a White House in search of money to pay for cost overruns in the international space station program without raiding NASA science accounts.

''One way or another, you have to fix the space station overrun problem,'' a senior NASA official said.

With NASA program officials calling for more than $700 million for High-Speed Research through 2007, the program presents a tempting target for the White House budget ax.

''There aren't a lot of cookie jars for NASA to go after,'' the congressional source said.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I am in support of the bill and the piece of legislation and opposed to the amendment. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is in direct contradiction to the President's and Administrator Goldin's priorities for the space program for NASA.

I understand the concern of the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BATEMAN) about the continuing reductions over time that we have seen in NASA's aeronautics budget. But cutting the Space Station to fund aeronautics is not the appropriate answer.

However, at this point, let me point out that the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER), again, the truth of his arguments is that we have to prioritize. If we are going to be spending huge chunks of money on the Space Station, that is exactly right. It is a very painful process. This is what part of that painful process is. Once again we are faced with something that comes from our decision, the decision of the whole body, to move forward with the Space Station.

Administrator Goldin in this environment says his top three priorities are, number one, safety; number two, finishing the Space Station and getting it over with; and advanced space transportation technology. Everything else comes after that as far as the administration and Mr. Goldin and his priorities go.

That means that the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BATEMAN) is proposing cutting the administrator's number two priority, which will in fact increase total Space Station costs because it will cause delays just to fund the station at a different level of priority.

So let us not think that this is just an easy answer that takes somebody through Space Station. When we are here in the very last few moments of getting the Space Station up, any delay in this system will be very expensive, and there will be delays if we start cutting precipitously like this.

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BATEMAN) may or may not know that this bill does not cut research at NASA's Aeronautics Center one bit. In fact, this bill directs NASA to bring the resources and talents of the excellent scientists and engineers at the Aeronautic Center to bear on a higher priority. It is a priority, as I just mentioned, of Mr. Goldin's; it is one of his top three priorities. It is a much more difficult challenge than just trying to improve aeronautics, and that is to improve and to meet the challenge of advanced space transportation technology.

□ 1615

Simply keeping the aeronautics centers working on aeronautics only is a very bad strategy. Now, yes, we realize that that is valuable work. But there are many challenges that we face and contributions that they could make outside the area of aeronautics. And limiting these centers to aeronautics, basically it is a very bad strategy and it is based on a going-out-of-business strategy.

I, therefore, respectfully oppose the well-intentioned but I say counterproductive amendment of the gentleman. Because in the end, by delaying the Space Station and by taking money precipitously from it, it will cause disruptions in the Space Station program and the plan that we are moving forward on and we will not be getting done with the project and it will end up costing us more money and putting even more pressure on aeronautics and other aspects of NASA's budget.

So while I understand the pressures we are under, I can sympathize with the idea that certain areas are not being funded like we would like to see them be if we had unlimited funding, but just cutting the Space Station precipitously is not the answer. Perhaps the answer should be, as I say, looking

at the aeronautic centers and trying to broaden their area of research rather than keeping them just on aeronautics.

So I reluctantly and respectfully oppose this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in reluctant opposition to the Bateman-Scott amendment. They have both been good friends of NASA and tireless champions of aeronautic research. I believe this amendment is well-intentioned.

Nevertheless, I think taking money from NASA's Space Station will simply destabilize that program and that will result in more station cost growth, more pressure on the NASA budget that will not benefit anyone in the long-run.

So although I think we need to take a long hard look at what needs to be done to keep NASA's aeronautics program world class, I oppose taking money from the Space Station. And I urge Members to vote against this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BATEMAN).

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BATEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 140, noes 286, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 138]

AYES—140

Baldwin
Barrett (WI)
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Berry
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Boucher
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Camp
Capps
Capuano
Carson
Chabot
Chenoweth
Clay
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Crowley
Danner
Davis (VA)
DeFazio
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dickey
Dingell
Doggett
Duncan
Evans
Ford
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Graham
Hefley
Herger
Hilleary
Hinchey
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hostettler
Hunter
Hutchinson
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kaptur
Kelly
Kildee
Kind (WI)
Kingston
Kucinich
LaFalce
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
LoBiondo
Lowey
Luther
Manzullo
Markey
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
Meehan
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moore
Myrick
Nadler
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Paul
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rivers
Roemer
Ryan (WI)
Sanders
Sanford
Sawyer
Schakowsky
Scott
Shays
Sherwood
Shuster
Sisisky
Skelton
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Tancredo
Taylor (NC)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Traficant
Udall (NM)
Upton
Vento
Visclosky
Wamp
Wilson
Wolf
Woolsey

NOES—286

Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Becerra
Bentsen
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Cardin
Castle
Chambliss
Clayton
Clement
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Cramer
Crane
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Deal
DeGette
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dixon
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Goss
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilliard
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hooley
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kennedy
Kilpatrick
King (NY)
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuykendall
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lofgren
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Ortiz
Ose
Packard
Pastor
Payne
Peterson (PA)
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rodriguez
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sandlin
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Sherman
Shimkus
Shows
Simpson
Skeen
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Stabenow
Stearns
Stenholm
Sweeney
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Toomey
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Velazquez
Walden
Walsh
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wise
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—7

Abercrombie
Brown (CA)
Cox
Ganske
Lipinski
Napolitano
Serrano

□ 1636

Messrs. TAYLOR of Mississippi, SMITH of Michigan and FROST changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. SPRATT, Mr. OLVER and Ms. DELAURO changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Are there any other amendments?

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

Let me quickly thank the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) and their staff for their efforts to try to bring about a good bill here, but I have to say I am disappointed that we were not able to get that done.

Let me point out very quickly that Dan Goldin, the NASA administrator, has strongly suggested that Members oppose this bill; that the OMB has recommended this bill be opposed, for a variety of reasons:

Quickly, because it would delete all funding for NASA's information technology initiatives, it would hold NASA's earth science research program hostage to an unworkable data buy earmark, it would cancel the peer reviewed Triana scientific and educational mission and waste the $35 million already appropriated, and it would prohibit any research on innovative inflatable technologies that have great potential to lower the costs of future human space operations.

You can be pro NASA and against this bill. I recommend, as the ranking member on this committee, a ''no'' vote.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. 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 pro tempore. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD) having assumed the chair, Mr. SHIMKUS, Chairman pro tempore 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. 1654) to authorize appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal years 2000, 2001, and 2002, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 174, 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 any 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 amendment.

The 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.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 259, noes 168, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 139]

AYES—259

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bentsen
Bereuter
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Cunningham
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeGette
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Etheridge
Everett
Ewing
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Fowler
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Isakson
Istook
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kasich
Kelly
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaHood
Lampson
Largent
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Maloney (CT)
Manzullo
Markey
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moore
Moran (KS)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Ortiz
Ose
Oxley
Packard
Pease
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rodriguez
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salmon
Sandlin
Saxton
Scarborough
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shows
Simpson
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Toomey
Traficant
Turner
Upton
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Wu
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—168

Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baird
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
Delahunt
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Duncan
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Ganske
Gephardt
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Holden
Holt
Hoyer
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
John
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
LaFalce
Lantos
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (NY)
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McInnis
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (VA)
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Phelps
Pomeroy
Rahall
Rangel
Rivers
Roemer
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sanford
Sawyer
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Shuster
Sisisky
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Stabenow
Stark
Stupak
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thurman
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn

NOT VOTING—7

Brown (CA)
Hooley
Napolitano
Pastor
Serrano
Shimkus
Terry

□ 1658

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas changed her vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

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. PASTOR. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 139, had I been present, I would have voted ''aye.''

□ 1700

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 1654, NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1999

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to make technical corrections in the engrossment of the bill (H.R. 1654) to reflect the actions of the House, and that the Clerk be directed to make the following specific changes:

In the instruction to strike in the amendment by Mr. TRAFICANT to section 103(4)(A)(i) the phrase ''focused program, and'', and to apply the same instruction to strike to section 103(4)(B)(i) and section 103(4)(C)(i) with respect to fiscal years 2001 and 2002.

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

There was no objection.

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 and to place extraneous material in the RECORD on H.R. 1654, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I have discussed with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COSTELLO), and unless there is an amendment that we do not know about, we will probably not have votes on the next bill that is coming up. I cannot give a complete assurance that there will be no rollcall votes, but my guess is that all of the amendments and the bill will be disposed of by voice vote and the Members can take that into account when making their plans.

NATIONAL WEATHER SERVICE AND RELATED AGENCIES AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1999

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 175 and rule