

Senate Amendment. It states the authority by which Congress adopts the various budgetary enforcement rules and procedures for the consideration of certain legislation set out in the budget resolution. An identical provision was included in section 234 of last year's budget resolution.

The Conference Agreement does not include the language from either section 210 or 211 of the Senate Amendment because all assumptions regarding revenues are taken into account within the actual revenue aggregates set out in the Conference Agreement. In addition, the issue of the level of funding for programs authorized in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act is taken into account within the levels for Function 500.

SENSE OF CONGRESS, HOUSE AND SENATE
PROVISIONS

House Resolution

The House budget resolution contains the following Senses of the House or Congress that have no legal force but reflect the Congress' views on a variety of budget-related issues. The section numbers and section headings of these reserve funds are as follows:

Section 14 states a Sense of the House concerning Federal pay.

Section 15 states a Sense of Congress relating to Individual Development Accounts and the working poor.

Section 16 provides a Sense of Congress relating to Federal fire prevention assistance.

Section 17 states a Sense of the House regarding the deduction of state sales tax from Federal income taxes.

Section 18 states a Sense of Congress regarding funding for Graduate Medical Education.

Senate Amendment

The Senate amendment contains the following Sense of the Senate provisions:

Section 301 Sense of the Senate on Debt Reduction.

Section 302 Sense of the Senate on AIDS and Other Infectious Diseases.

Section 303 Sense of the Senate on Consolidated Health Centers.

Section 304 Sense of the Senate on Funding for Department of Justice Programs for State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance.

Section 305 Sense of the Senate on United States Coast Guard Fiscal Year 2002 Funding.

Section 306 Sense of the Senate on Strengthening our National Food Safety Infrastructure.

Section 307 Sense of the Senate with Respect to Increasing Funds for Renewable Energy Research and Development.

Conference agreement

The Conference Agreement contains the following Sense of the Senate and Sense of Congress provisions:

Subtitle A—Sense of the Senate provision.
Section 301 Sense of the Senate on conservation.

Section 302 Sense of the Senate on AIDS and other infectious diseases.

Section 303 Sense of the Senate on Consolidated Health Centers.

Section 304 Sense of the Senate on Funding for Department of Justice Programs for State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance.

Section 305 Sense of the Senate on United States Coast Guard Fiscal Year 2002 Funding.

Section 306 Sense of the Senate on Strengthening our National Food Safety Infrastructure.

Section 307 Sense of the Senate with Respect to Increasing Funds for Renewable Energy Research and Development.

Section 308 Sense of the Senate with respect to increased education funding.

Subtitle B—Sense of the Congress provisions.

Section 311 Asset building for the working poor.

Section 312 Federal Fire prevention assistance.

Section 313 Funding for graduate medical education at children's teaching hospitals.

Section 314 Concurrent retirement and disability benefits to retired members of the armed forces.

Section 315 Federal Employee Pay.

Section 316 Sales tax deduction.

JIM NUSSLE,
JOHN E. SUNUNU,

Managers on the Part of the House.

PETE DOMENICI,
CHUCK GRASSLEY,
DON NICKLES,
PHIL GRAMM,
KIT BOND,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FLAKE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. HINOJOSA addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

CONGRESSIONAL HEARINGS ON
VTOL TECHNOLOGY WILL EXAMINE
FAILED OSPREY PROJECT
AND NEW TECHNOLOGY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to discuss an issue that relates directly to the safety of the men and women whose task it is to defend our country. It also goes to the heart of the American lead in the aviation technology upon which we depend so much.

For over a decade, I backed a project that I believed would permit America to take the lead in the next major step in aviation technology, that is, Vertical Takeoff and Vertical Landing aircraft. Unfortunately, it is clear now that the project, the Osprey project, has been a costly and a dangerous failure.

Of the 11 aircraft built, four have crashed, and three of the crashes resulted in 30 fatalities. That is 30 dead heroes whom we cannot bring back.

The flight crews that were lost were the most experienced on this craft and some of the best and the brightest of the Marine Corps.

On page 32 of the most recent copy of the Marine Corps Gazette, there is an article by a pilot who is also a weapons and tactics instructor that underscores the skepticism about the viability of the Osprey program. Then there is the alarming allegations of a cover-up, a cover-up and records falsification by Marine officers directly involved in the Osprey's operational testing. Recently, the Defense Department's Blue Ribbon panel echoed the finding of the Marine Corps' Accident Mishap Board in recommending extensive redesign of the craft. All of this calls into question the Osprey's future use by the military and, of equal significance, its commercial viability. No commercial aviation company in this country is ever going to get insurance on a craft with this kind of safety record.

The Blue Ribbon panel mandates that we go back to the drawing board. That is not a condemnation of vertical landing, vertical takeoff; it is a condemnation of the Osprey program. Vertical Takeoff and Vertical Landing technologies are the way to alleviate our overcrowded airports, to ease our overburdened air traffic control systems, and to ensure our military's ability to respond when our runways have been destroyed by a wartime adversary. To pull us into the 21st century, we need a simple Vertical Takeoff, Vertical Landing aircraft with longer range, higher speed, and greater payload capacity. Perhaps like a transport version of the Harrier jet.

Tomorrow, the Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics, a subcommittee that I chair, will be holding a hearing on one such aircraft that holds promise for the future, and it will fly for the first time this summer. Let me note that my father was a Marine pilot.

Mr. Speaker, these 30 casualties during the testing of the Osprey program are unconscionable, 30 dead Marines. We do not need any more dead Marines. The Osprey program is a failure, but the Vertical Takeoff, Vertical Landing concept is not. We should not abandon that technology, and we should try to keep America first in aviation technology by ensuring that new concepts of Vertical Landing, Vertical Takeoff will be available to the American military and also available to commercial aviation so that the United States of America will be able to fly its up-to-date, cutting-edge aircraft throughout the world and remain the leader in aviation technology, creating jobs for our people and creating a capability, both militarily and commercially, that will keep America ahead of the competition and ahead of our adversaries.

So I would ask my colleagues tomorrow to pay attention to our hearing, and I would ask the public to pay attention to the hearing of the Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics