HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Thursday, May 6, 1993*

The House met at 12 noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

On this National Day of Prayer we remember the blessings that have come to us as individuals and as a nation. We are grateful, O God, that we have enjoyed the freedom to worship in our own manner and with those who share our beliefs. We are thankful that the blessings of liberty and freedom have been our heritage and have given to our country a rich inheritance that is more than we could ask or deserve. On this special day, we earnestly pray that we will remember these blessings and not lose our way with all the days crowded with necessary tasks to be done and decisions to be made. May we, in our own day and time, and with the responsibilities that are before us, be faithful to the spiritual tradition that we seek to preserve and sustain. In Your name, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. The Chair will ask the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] if he would kindly come forward and lead the membership in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MILITARY ENGAGEMENT IN BOSNIA

(Mr. RICHARDSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, let us face it, there is little support in our country for getting militarily engaged in Bosnia, even limited airstrikes.

Given the fact that Bosnia could become a Vietnam quagmire if we are not careful, it is critically important that the Congress fully debate and authorize such an action. The President needs to bring in the American people on his decision.

Most Americans at this point do not know the issues in Bosnia, much less where it is.

Mr. Speaker, even though our allies and the United Nations might be supportive, it is critically important that the American people also understand and support our action. There are good foreign policy reasons to intervene. There are good moral reasons to intervene, and perhaps in our best national interest to proceed. But without the American people giving the view that they understand and are ready to support the matter, we should not proceed.

The President is to be commended for his caution so far.

Mr. Speaker, in Sarajevo and Sebrenica people are dying. And last night's decision by the Bosnian Serbs to put off acceptance of the Vance-Owen peace plan is yet another sign of intransigence and brutal disregard for the will of the civilized world.

I agree with President Clinton that we cannot act hastily, committing our men and women to a mission without clear goals, without a high level of comfort by the military, and without an exit strategy. Nonetheless, we cannot sit idly by.

Having just returned from Yugoslavia, I believe that we must respond to the beastly action of the Serbs in terms that they will understand. We must act for reasons of human decency and for reasons of hard, rational foreign policy. I fear, however, that we lack a national consensus for involvement. Therefore, I urge President Clinton to come to Congress for authorization to act. While I don't believe he legally needs authorization to participate in a peacekeeping operation, I think it will be good for the country and good for the President to consult and ask for authority from this body before moving forward. We must act but we must act together.

Mr. Speaker, the stakes in the former Yugoslavia are real and we, as the leader of the free world, cannot sit still.

OLD AND NEW DEMOCRATS

(Mr. BALLENGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, what is the difference between a new Democrat and an old Democrat?

An old Democrat says he is going to rob from the rich and give to the poor, while a new Democrat says he is going to rob from the rich to give to the middle class.

Unfortunately, as Bill Clinton has proven in his first 100 days, both the old and new Democrats share one trait.

They take from the rich, the middle class, and the poor and they give to the Government.

Clintonomics means raising taxes on almost every conceivable consumer product, from energy to beer, to spend money on the pork projects preferred by the President's political cronies.

Obviously, Clintonomics will hurt everybody. It is not what the President promised in his campaign, and it is not what the American people want as an economic policy.

Old and new Democrats share another trait. A bankrupt economic philosophy that will bankrupt this country.

ONLY A BUMP IN THE ROAD

(Mr. PRICE of North Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, for those who say the President's jobs bill is history, I have got news for them: The detrimental impact of not passing that plan is being felt every day by our constituents.

I have heard from 20 of the 100 employees of the Webb Technical Group in Raleigh who have just lost their jobs because the USDA's food safety and inspection service has cut back the number of meat product samples processed by Webb from 3,500 per month to 600. The President's package included $4 million in extra funds for FSIS to assure consumers of a safe and unadulterated food supply. That money would also have ensured those workers their jobs. Try telling their families that the President's package was not a jobs bill.

A lender in my district told me he has been forced to turn down 23 applications from low-income families who had scrapped together $400 for nonrefundable appraisal and loan application fees. Those families have lost that money and their dream of owning a home because the Farmers Home Administration has run out of money for the Guaranteed Loan Program. President Clinton's proposal would have provided $234.8 million in new guaranteed loan authority to stimulate the housing market.

Try telling our small businessmen and women that the President's program was wasteful pork—they have just been informed that the Small Business Administration has also run out of money for its Guaranteed Loan Program. The President had proposed an additional $2.6 billion in business loan guarantees to support that vital sector of our economy which economists say creates the most jobs.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

These three examples are but a few clear indications that the President's proposal was indeed a jobs bill and an economic stimulus bill, an insurance policy against the sputtering out of this jobless recovery. Our constituents know that, even if the other body does not get the picture. But we will have other opportunities to address this agenda and to make the investments essential to our own economic future. We must ensure that the Republican filibuster is only a temporary return to gridlock, no more than a bump in the road to recovery.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RICHARDSON). The Chair would caution Members that they should not refer to proceedings in the other body.

THE RICH AND FAMOUS

(Mr. DOOLITTLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, 2 nights ago, President Clinton, while schmoozing with his rich and famous celebrity friends at a Democrat fundraising dinner, accused Republicans of not coming up with any specific spending cuts.

The whole country knows that Republicans offered billions of dollars in specific spending cuts in their budget alternative.

But it is easy for the President to lose touch with reality when he parties with the Hollywood elite.

The Hollywood elite will not be hit hard by the President's taxes. They can afford the extra $500 that most American families will have to pay due to the President's middle-class energy tax. They do not have to worry about the President's Social Security taxes.

Mr. Speaker, the President needs to get back in touch with reality. He needs to admit that Republicans have a better plan of deficit reduction, and that his taxes will hurt working families the hardest.

Let us get down to earth. Leave the fantasy to Hollywood.

AMERICA'S CALL FOR CHANGE

(Mr. VISCLOSKY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, the American people want jobs. They want change. They want gridlock to end.

Unfortunately, Gary, IN, economy is dying while Republicans killed the President's jobs bill and a ray of hope that was left for my hometown.

The President's jobs bill would have meant 2,300 precious jobs to the people of Gary where unemployment is the only rising economic indicator.

These 2,300 jobs may never be created because Republicans would rather play politics than use money saved from this year's foreign aid and defense budgets to put Americans back to work.

Mr. Speaker, the American people have called for change, not more of the same. Surely, the Nation supports using money saved from a warmed-over, cold war budget to create 500,000 jobs here at home.

□ 1210

TO HAVE EMPLOYEES, YOU HAVE TO HAVE EMPLOYERS

(Mr. HUNTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, contrary to the comments of the last several speakers on the Democrat side, the President did get his big measure passed, and his big measure was a massive tax bill that increased taxes, it was manifest in his budget to increase taxes on those employers who would be hiring people if they were not seeing hundreds of billions of dollars of new taxes assessed on them, on their customers, and on their employees.

A jobs bill is a situation where there is a few bucks left in a small businessman's pocket so he can go out, hire that extra employee, expand his plant, buy that new piece of equipment. And the present downturn that we are seeing right now is the voting of American people by their pocketbooks based on their judgment of the President's giant new bill of taxes.

That is what is depressing the economy. You know, one lesson my Democrat friends never seem to learn is this: To have employees, you have to have employers. Putting massive taxes on the backs of employers is not going to increase jobs.

DEMOCRATIC MESSAGE ON ECONOMY

(Ms. SCHENK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SCHENK. Mr. Speaker, my office in San Diego got a call recently from a man who has been out of work for almost 18 months. Laid off from his job in the electronics division of a defense contractor, this man has been forced to sell valuables to make the payment on his monthly mortgage. While he has had several interviews, as of his last conversation with my office, he had found no work.

Mr. Speaker, this man is not alone. Every day most of the Members of this body receive similar calls from similar people with similar stories. The unemployment rate in San Diego stands at a dismal 7.6 percent. Nationally, economic growth was a sluggish 1.8 percent in the first 3 months of this year. And we remain 3.4 million new jobs away from a typical recovery.

Mr. Speaker, there are faces behind these statistics. There are families that are hurting in my district in San Diego and across America. Let no Member of this or the other body kid themself—this Nation is still in desperate need of an economic package that will create jobs.

The President is willing to work with us to pass such a package. I urge Members of this body, on both sides of the aisle, to work with him to put Americans back to work.

THE PRESIDENT IS NOT READING HIS MAIL

(Mr. GOSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, it was with astonishment yesterday that I heard President Clinton is still accusing Republicans of calling for spending cuts but not offering any specifics.

As one Member who forwarded the President a copy of specific spending cuts, I would like to set the record straight. I would like to read from my letter to the President dated March 3, 1993:

> DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In response to your many calls to be specific regarding spending cuts, I respectfully submit my list of 50 specific proposals to cut Federal spending. If implemented, these cuts could save about $191 billion over five years.

Two weeks later I got a letter back from the White House:

> DEAR MR. GOSS: Thank you for your letter regarding Federal spending cuts. The President has been advised of your proposed spending cuts, and a copy of your letter has been sent to O.M.B.

Perhaps the staff shakeup at the White House should include the President's mail handlers. He evidently is not seeing his mail.

THE AMERICAN HEALTH SECURITY ACT OF 1993

(Mr. HAMBURG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HAMBURG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1200, the American Health Security Act of 1993.

Mr. Speaker, one-quarter of the population of the United States resides in rural areas. Since rural residents are more likely to be self-employed, seasonally employed, or employed by a small business, they often do not have employer-provided health benefits. Be-

cause of this, rural residents are frequently forced to purchase health insurance coverage through the expensive individual and small group markets.

True health care reform must address the health care needs of rural areas. The American Health Security Act addresses those needs. Under the act, no one would have to depend on their employer to provide health insurance benefits. And since there is no employer mandate in the act, it would relieve small businesses in rural and other areas of the burden of providing health care coverage to their employees.

Under the act, all Americans would be entitled to a comprehensive package of benefits including inpatient and outpatient hospital services; professional services; preventive services; long-term care and hospice care; prescription drugs; vision care; pediatric dental services; mental health services; and other services.

The bill also would double grants to community health centers and migrant health centers and expand programs to increase the number of primary care physicians and send them into rural, underserved areas.

Mr. Speaker, this body will be debating over the next several months the merits of different approaches to health care reform. I urge my colleagues to consider the single-payer approach of the American Health Security Act. It is the most comprehensive reform and it bestows its benefits equally on urban and rural citizens.

WORKING FOR UNCLE SAM

(Mr. SMITH of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Monday, May 3, was Tax Freedom Day, the day Americans quit working for Government and began working for themselves.

Next year Tax Freedom Day will be today, May 6, 3 days later. One hundred days of President Clinton, 3 more days of working for Uncle Sam.

Among President Clinton's new taxes is the tax on energy, or Btu tax. It will hit every American directly or indirectly. It will cost 600,000 jobs and $475 per family, according to the National Association of Manufacturers.

Last year when Mr. Clinton sought the Presidency he spoke of "fairness" in tax policy. Now in full control of the political apparatus, we find out what he really wants from tax policy: revenue, revenue, revenue to pay for spending, spending, spending.

This administration is not about fairness; it is about bigger Government, more spending, and more taxes.

INTRODUCTION OF THE COMMISSION ON FILIPINO VETERANS ENTITLEMENT ACT

(Mr. BLACKWELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BLACKWELL. Mr. Speaker, 2 hours after the bombing of Pearl Harbor in 1941, locations in the Philippines were also bombed.

Forces made up of United States and Filipino soldiers fought and died, side by side, in defense of the Philippines. Of the 155,000 men and women from the allied forces, 110,000 were Filipinos.

The heart of the battle raged for 6 months; 20,000 Philippine Army troops were killed in action and 24,000 more were wounded.

Despite recognition of their valiant and loyal service by President Roosevelt and others following the war, Congress passed a bill expressly excluding Filipino World War II veterans from receiving benefits under the GI bill.

Today, I am introducing the Commission on Filipino Veterans Entitlement Act. This bill will create a Commission to study, research, investigate, and conduct public hearings on the claim of Filipino veterans to equal entitlements.

I invite my colleagues to join me in support of this bill. The merits of the cause of the Filipino World War II veteran are obvious and compelling.

We cannot rewrite history, but we can correct our mistakes from the past.

HIGH ALTITUDE BOMBING DANGEROUS AND MINIMALLY EFFECTIVE

(Mr. CUNNINGHAM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BLACKWELL] that I would like to be the first to sign his bill.

Mr. Speaker, on May 10, 1972, I was shot down over North Vietnam while on a bombing mission. A year later I found myself flying a Mirage over the Golan Heights.

Twenty-one years later, American pilots may face the same fate if the President chooses to strike Bosnian Serbs' antiaircraft sites.

President Clinton's efforts thus far to end this war are commendable. I think all Americans should thank him.

If airstrikes, however, are used, bad weather in winter, camouflaged sites, mobile AAA sites, and mountainous terrain will force the release of ordnance at high altitude, and those strikes will not be effective and our aircraft will be shot down.

If I were the Serbs, the tactics would be to kill all the U.N. forces and move all the Serb AAA forces into the suburbs, forcing United States and allied pilots to bomb civilians.

First of all, the President should ask Milosevic to resign, a land bridge controlled by Russian and Chinese troops should be created, equal pressure should be placed on Serbs, Croatians, and Moslems, and we should offer to contain the fight in Bosnia. How we do that, I do not have enough time during this speech, Mr. Speaker.

HIGH-TECHNOLOGY JOBS? NOT

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Department of Labor has listed some more high-technology jobs in their dictionary of new job titles: Bosom presser; sanitary napkin machine operator; zipper trimmer; beaver trapper; nut roaster; bone picker; brassiere cup molder-cutter; crotch closer; loin trimmer; vibrator assembler; hardness inspector; and an impregnating helper. Boy, we are just overrun with all these jobs. We have so many jobs out there, and they are all high-technology, are they not? This sounds like a promo for a porno flick to me.

I say it is time to incentivize the Tax Code to create some real jobs in America in the private sector and put America back on track.

VIOLENCE FREE COMMUNITIES

(Mrs. SCHROEDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, Colorado, like many parts of America, has been blighted recently by a savage string of youth violence. It is very difficult to say which act is the most sickening. I can tell you about one of the most recent. That was an 11-year-old doing an armed robbery with his mother's 25-caliber pistol.

This is absolutely outrageous. Coloradans, as Americans, want their State back. They want the right to live in peace, and communities all over are starting to grapple with this.

It is time the Federal Government grappled with it, too, because, if the Federal Government and the communities work together, maybe we can finally make progress, rather than cower even more.

I am very pleased that we are having a conference this week in Denver on how we can have more cooperation and how we can finally get our communities back and violence free.

CONGRATULATIONS TO HARRY JACKSON OF COLUMBUS, GA

(Mr. COLLINS of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the

House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remind the Members of this Chamber that it is the small businesses of America that contribute the most significant number of jobs, investment capital, and economic growth to our Nation's economy.

I also rise today to recognize Mr. Harry Jackson, from Columbus, GA, who has been named "Georgia's Small Business Person of the Year for 1993." In addition, he is now here in Washington where he will be named the "Small Business Council of America's Nationwide Small Business Person of the Year."

Harry Jackson has achieved successes in many areas, contributing to the economic, political, and social strength of his community and beyond. He has served as a successful businessman, an elected official, a banker, and in many other capacities too numerous to list here. His life represents a much needed balance that includes both the drive for personal success, along with the need to help those around him find success and prosperity as well.

Today, I salute Harry Jackson of Columbus for his many achievements, and I thank him for his tireless service and commitment to his community and to the State of Georgia.

NAFTA

(Mr. BISHOP asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, We currently have a trade agreement looming over our head that will cripple many facets of our American Economy. The North American Free-Trade Agreement must not pass.

NAFTA will destroy the economy of Southern Agriculture. NAFTA will send our manufacturing jobs south of the border. NAFTA will be an environmental disaster. And, yes, Mr. Speaker, NAFTA will hurt our economy.

Opponents of NAFTA must stand up and be heard. We must not import Mexican goods at the expense of exporting American jobs. That is not free trade. We cannot compete with $5-a-day wages with no health care benefits. We cannot compete with the weak environmental regulations that are placed on Mexican farmers.

I, and a number of my colleagues, have sent suggested side agreements to the administration. However, I continue to hear that side agreements will have no enforcement authority. This will not stand. The future of American jobs depends upon our resistance to job giveaway trade agreements.

DISABILITY THREATENS JOB OF CONGRESSIONAL WORKER

(Mr. RAVENEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RAVENEL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I had a few words to say about the terrible mistake this House was about to make in terminating Fifine Glaws, our mentally challenged elevator operator. Just minutes ago, I talked with the Architect of the Capitol who told me that he can work the situation out subject to the approval of our Speaker. As the Protection and Advocacy Service of Washington has told me that Fifine's forced retirement appears to be a clear violation of the Americans With Disabilities Act, I hope that all things will work together for good, and this House will have done the right thing.

I will keep you posted again next week.

IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 820, NATIONAL COMPETITIVENESS ACT OF 1993

(Mr. SWETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SWETT. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon the House will continue consideration of H.R. 820, the National Competitiveness Act of 1993. I would like to urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this crucial legislation.

I have watched for many years our Nation's economic floundering. I have watched other countries pass us by as their governments have promoted technological advancement. And sadly, I have watched more and more Americans put out of work year after year, simply because we have not invested in our Nation's economic future.

The National Competitiveness Act will create jobs—high-skill, high-wage jobs.

Too often, government simply reacts to a problem. As the turn of the century approaches, let us show the American people that we have a vision and a plan for creating the America we want for tomorrow.

In New Hampshire we have companies like Resonetics, MPB Corp., and Hitchiner Manufacturing—companies that are creating new technologies, new jobs, and new trade opportunities. But American companies need help in order to compete successfully against their competitors overseas who are getting help from their governments.

Mr. Speaker, the people in my State want action. They want a strong American economy that will create good jobs. We are in an economic war for survival. Other countries have already invested in their economic future, they have a battle plan, and they intend to win.

Mr. Speaker, we need to give America a fighting chance. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the National Competitiveness Act of 1993.

WHITE HOUSE STAFF CUTS

(Mr. WALKER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, over the last several weeks we have had the President of the United States telling us he wanted to cut the White House staff and the White House budget by 25 percent. It turns out it must be one of those bad jokes that the President is so fond of telling, because, as we meet later on this afternoon, the House Appropriations Committee is going to be asked to mark up a new supplemental from the White House asking for $7½ million more than the Bush administration wanted to spend for White House activities, and adding 50 new full-time employees.

What is this money going to be used for? It is going to be used for more expense money. They want $1.2 million for transition moneys. That is a doubling of what was spent just 4 years ago.

They want more people, 50 new people, $3 million for 50 new people in the administration.

They want $800,000 for more telephones and they want $2 million so that they can do more political mailings out of the White House.

This is outrageous, to have the President go around the country telling people that he is making cuts when in fact, in the reality of the closed doors of the Appropriations Committee, they are asking for $7½ million more than the Bush administration was going to spend on White House activities.

THE EXAMPLE OF SHEILA GARRIGUE, FORMER BRITISH CITIZEN

(Mrs. LOWEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I was honored by a visit from Sheila Garrigue from Westchester County.

Sheila Garrigue immigrated to this country from Great Britain over 25 years ago. Although she married an American and raised her children as Americans, her ties to her homeland remained strong, and she never gave up her British citizenship.

Never, that is, until last summer when, moved by the vision of hope articulated by then-candidate Bill Clinton, Sheila Garrigue decided that she wanted to become an American citizen in time to vote for change in November's election. Sheila Garrigue was so motivated by Bill Clinton's call for action, so energized by his vision for a better tomorrow, that she was willing to trade in her British citizenship to take part in Bill Clinton's new America.

Yesterday she came to my office and told me that she had no regrets about

her decision, but she was disappointed that our friends in the Senate had not been as willing to embrace dramatic change as she had been.

Mr. Speaker, Sheila Garrigue could not understand how, with millions of Americans out of work, the other party would hide behind gridlock.

Sheila Garrigue wants jobs. The Senate should move the jobs bill. We want jobs. Let us do it now.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. VISCLOSKY). The Chair would admonish Members not to advocate action in the other body.

□ 1230

THE MEDICAL AND PROSTHETIC RESEARCH PROGRAM OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

(Mr. SMITH of New Jersey asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to restore some modest, but very critical, funds to the veterans affairs medical and prosthetic research program.

It is my understanding that the Subcommittee on VA, HUD, and independent agencies is in the process of receiving testimony from the Department of Veterans Affairs on the President's fiscal year 1994 budget request. I am introducing this concurrent resolution because immediate action is needed to reverse the drastic cuts to VA's research program as proposed.

The medical and prosthetic research account has suffered from chronic underfunding. In 1983, funding levels were sufficient enough to permit VA to support approximately 80 percent of all peer reviewed, meritorious research proposals. In the 3 most recent years, VA has been able to fund just over 30 percent of approved research proposals. The Clinton budget requests $206 million for research, a decrease of $26 million below 1993 levels. With this funding level, VA research will suffer a loss of over 576 FTEE in fiscal year 1994. The number of approved projects will decline by 31 percent below 1992 levels.

VA research serves as an essential element of quality health care delivery. Its application to patient care serves to ensure that veterans receive state of the art medical treatment which meets their unique needs. VA research programs help recruit and retain talented physicians who might not otherwise choose VA employment. Funding at the requested level could well be the death knell for this vital veterans program.

The Committee on Veterans Affairs has advocated for modest increases to VA's research budget for many years. Bipartisan support for this important program is based on the knowledge that research is an essential and integral component of the over-all quality of care delivered at VA medical centers. VA research allows VA medical centers to affiliate with major universities who are on the cutting edge of health sciences and medical practice. VA research provides incentives for VA to recruit and retain top clinician researchers whose contributions to the health of veterans are crucial.

Cuts to the VA research program cannot stand. Such reductions will have a direct effect on the quality of care delivered to our Nation's veterans. This concurrent resolution calls for the restoration of funding to this program to levels that at the very least should be no less than the amount appropriated in fiscal year 1993 plus inflation.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

PROMISES IGNORED BECAUSE OF WARS ABROAD

(Mr. TORRICELLI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, it was the frustration of his life that the New Deal social program that Roosevelt promised was interrupted by war. A decade later, Mr. Speaker, Harry Truman became frustrated again when his calls for national health insurance and civil rights were interrupted by Korea. And in our own time the first victim of Vietnam became the Great Society.

Now a new President, committed to health care reform, and education, and for social justice in America, faces the same painful choice that has dominated America in the 20th century, her conscience for the needs of our own people and the callings from abroad. As Bill Clinton considers the victims of Bosnia and the horror of that war, I ask him to consider the homeless in our streets, our children who are not learning in their schools and the families outside of the net of our health care system.

I do not know whether American military presence in Bosnia can help. I fear we will worsen the situation. But I know that we can help those in America who have been neglected for so long.

Mr. Speaker, this is our mission, this is our purpose, for a new administration, and they cannot be ignored again because of those who would call us from abroad.

PREVENTIVE HEALTH CARE

(Mr. GILMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, prevention is the key to fixing our Nation's health care system. With over 35 million Americans lacking adequate health insurance, we need to find cost-effective ways to provide health care for those who need it.

I have introduced H.R. 36, the Comprehensive Preventive Health and Promotion Act of 1993, providing for periodic health exams, health screening, counseling, immunizations, and health promotion in any health care plan.

H.R. 36 has been endorsed by the American Health Foundation, the American Nurses Association, the Association of Schools of Public Health, the American Academy of Otolaryngology, and the New York State Nurses Association.

Moreover, the American Health Foundation said: "on behalf of all of us concerned with research on effective disease prevention as the most efficient means of controlling health care costs, we wish to congratulate you on your taking the initiative of introducing H.R. 36." The Association of Schools of Public Health applauded our "championing health promotion and disease prevention issues in Congress."

Furthermore, I have been working with the President's task force on health, and most recently I received a note from Hillary Clinton, which said, "there is no question that preventive health care is an essential component of our reform effort."

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to cosponsor H.R. 36, and join in my effort to ensure that preventive services are included in any health care plan.

NATIONAL SERVICE

(Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, later today a bill will be introduced into this House to set forth the President's agenda on national service. What better time, Mr. Speaker, than a time when college tuition is being raised by many college campuses all across the country, a time when many parents find themselves caught in the middle. They find themselves caught in the middle because they make a little bit too much money to afford to apply for college assistance, Federal assistance, and make too little money to afford to take the money out of their own salaries to pay for their kids' education. It also comes at a very important time because there are many young people who are defaulting on student loans. They are defaulting on student loans simply because they do not have the money. They do not have the money because they are unem-

ployed. They are a part of the 10 million people who are out of work.

This program, Mr. Speaker, will do a couple of things. One, participants will be able to pay their college loans back through national service. This is a great initiative, an initiative that, I think, should have been made a long time ago.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the President, and I certainly urge my colleagues to support this legislation

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 737

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the name of the gentleman from New York [Mr. HINCHEY] as a cosponsor of H.R. 737.

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

There was no objection.

CLARIFYING THE FAMILY FIRST UNIFICATION POLICY

(Mr. REYNOLDS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I want to mention to the House that today I am going to be introducing a bill that will clarify the family first unification policy that we currently react to and look to the best interests of the child. This is based on a tragic incident in my city, in Chicago, where a 3-year-old child was put back in a home that he had been taken out of on three separate occasions, and the child was hanged the other day by his mentally disturbed mother. This policy was followed in my State for reunification of the family at all costs. My bill will clarify this miscarriage of understanding of Federal policy and have us think of the children first.

CONGRESS' RESPONSIBILITY IN THE URGENT SITUATION IN BOSNIA

(Mr. LEVIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remark.)

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, as in all international crises, under our Constitution the President bears the major responsibility to lead in Bosnia. But the Congress has responsibility to do more than just be prepared to follow. We also must help lead.

It is said the public is confused as to our national interests in Bosnia and that the President must spell them out. True. But Congress must participate in this process. We, too, must point out that, if Serbian aggression is rewarded in Bosnia, the conflict could spread to other areas, and it would be signal to all that hypernationalism and so-called ethnic cleansing can remain supreme with a thumb of the nose at the United States and the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, the war in Bosnia looms starkly as the first real crisis in the post-cold-war era. It is complex. It is also urgent, very urgent. All of us here have a responsibility to see that there is an effective response, not reckless, but effective.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

(Mr. GUTIERREZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, our President is about to announce some bold changes in the way we conduct congressional campaigns.

And there has been much speculation in this body as to what these changes will be.

And, unfortunately, much of that speculation has focused on how much these potential changes might hurt our chances for reelection.

Let me suggest that we are asking the wrong question.

We should be asking how much these changes will help the American people.

How much these changes will help to take the special interest out, and put the American interest in, our electoral process.

I call on my colleagues today to step forward and support President Clinton and his bold steps toward change—toward getting spending under control and toward putting a real limit on PAC influence.

Toward giving the American people an electoral process that will give us leaders who will deliver a better future, not a process that gives us politicians who deliver big vote totals.

That is what real campaign finance reform means for the American people, and that is what we should support.

NATIONAL COMPETITIVENESS ACT OF 1993

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. VISCLOSKY). Pursuant to House Resolution 164 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 820.

□ 1240

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 further consideration of the bill (H.R. 820) to amend the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980 to enhance manufacturing technology development and transfer, to authorize appropriations for the Technology Administration of the Department of Commerce, including the National Institute of Standards and Technology, and for other purposes, with Mr. LANCASTER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, May 5, 1993, all time for general debate had expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute now printed in the bill, as modified by the amendment printed in section 2 of House Resolution 164, shall be considered by titles as an original bill for the purpose of amendment and each title is considered as read.

The Clerk will designate title I.

The text of title I is as follows:

H.R. 820

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

TITLE I—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 101. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "National Competitiveness Act of 1993".

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—

TITLE I—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 101. Short title; table of contents.
Sec. 102. Findings.
Sec. 103. Purposes.
Sec. 104. Definitions.

TITLE II—MANUFACTURING

Subtitle A—Manufacturing Technology and Extension

Sec. 201. Short title.
Sec. 202. Findings, purpose, and statement of policy.
Sec. 203. Role of the Department of Commerce.
Sec. 204. National Technology Outreach Program.
Sec. 205. Advanced Manufacturing Technology Development Program.
Sec. 206. Miscellaneous and conforming amendments.
Sec. 207. Manufacturing Technology Centers.
Sec. 208. State Technology Extension Program.

Subtitle B—National Science Foundation Manufacturing Programs

Sec. 211. Role of the National Science Foundation in manufacturing.
Sec. 212. Engineering and Cooperative Research Centers.
Sec. 213. Manufacturing traineeships and fellowships.
Sec. 214. Total quality management.

TITLE III—CRITICAL TECHNOLOGIES

Subtitle A—Benchmarking Science and Technology

Sec. 301. Benchmarking United States science and technology against foreign capabilities.

Subtitle B—Advanced Technology Program

Sec. 321. Development of program plan.
Sec. 322. Large scale research and development consortia.
Sec. 323. Technical amendments.

Subtitle C—Civilian Technology Loan Program

Sec. 331. Loan and loan guarantee authority.
Sec. 332. Operating plan and effective date.
Sec. 333. Terms and conditions.
Sec. 334. Technical assistance for lenders and borrowers.
Sec. 335. Outreach to economically depressed areas.

Sec. 336. Socially and economically disadvantaged individuals.
Sec. 337. Definitions.
Subtitle D—Civilian Technology Development Program
Sec. 341. Short title.
Sec. 342. Definitions.
Sec. 343. Establishment and purpose.
Sec. 344. Advisory Committee.
Sec. 345. Organization and licensing.
Sec. 346. Capital and management requirements.
Sec. 347. Financing for licensees.
Sec. 348. Issuance and guarantee of trust certificates.
Sec. 349. Venture capital for qualified business concerns.
Sec. 350. Operation.
Sec. 351. Regulations; liability.
Sec. 352. Technical assistance for licensees and qualified business concerns.
Sec. 353. Performance measures; Annual report.
Sec. 354. Reports, investigations, and examinations.
Sec. 355. Revocation and suspension of licenses; cease and desist orders.
Sec. 356. Injunctive relief.
Sec. 357. Conflicts of interest.
Sec. 358. Removal or suspension of directors and officers.
Sec. 359. Violations.
Sec. 360. Civil penalties.
Sec. 361. Antitrust savings clause.
TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS
Sec. 401. Department of Commerce Technology Advisory Board.
Sec. 402. International standardization.
Sec. 403. Malcolm Baldrige Award amendments.
Sec. 404. Cooperative research and development agreements.
Sec. 405. Competitiveness assessments and evaluations.
Sec. 406. Study of semiconductor lithography technologies.
Sec. 407. American workforce quality partnerships.
Sec. 408. Severability.
Sec. 409. Sunset.
Sec. 410. Use of domestic products.
Sec. 411. National Quality Program.
TITLE V—AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS
Sec. 501. Technology Administration.
Sec. 502. National Institute of Standards and Technology.
Sec. 503. Additional activities of the Technology Administration.
Sec. 504. National Science Foundation.
Sec. 505. Availability of appropriations.
Sec. 506. Sense of the Congress.

SEC. 102. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds that—

(1) the creation, development, and adoption of advanced technologies are significant determinants of sustainable economic growth, productivity improvement, and competitive standing;

(2) over the last decade, the rate of advanced technology adoption in the United States has been about half that of some prominent foreign nations and has contributed to a relative decline in United States industrial competitiveness;

(3) maintaining a highly competitive manufacturing base in the United States is essential for economic prosperity and national welfare and requires continuous development and adoption of advanced manufacturing technologies that will enable United States manufacturers to develop innovative products rapidly and manufacture goods of the highest quality at competitive prices;

(4) there is general agreement on which fields of technology are critical for economic competitiveness through the first decade of the next century, but the United States Government must pursue a comprehensive strategy to ensure that the appropriate research, development, and applications activities and other reforms occur so these technologies are readily available to United States manufacturers for incorporation into products made in the United States;

(5) technology-based products of the twenty-first century must be developed incorporating the values of sustainable development, including low energy and material use, safety, recyclability, and minimal pollution;

(6) the cost of and difficulty in obtaining investment capital for small high technology companies are significant deterrents to their formation, development, and growth;

(7) standardization of weights and measures, including development and promotion of product and quality standards, has a significant role to play in competitiveness;

(8) strategic technology planning for sustainable economic growth, the support of critical civilian technology research, development, and application, and advancement of manufacturing technology research, development, and adoption are appropriate Government roles; and

(9) programs established under this Act, and the amendments made by this Act, shall be funded as a result of shifting the total Federal investment in research and development to achieve a balance between support for defense and civilian activities, and shall not be financed through additional deficit spending.

SEC. 103. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this Act are to—

(1) promote and facilitate the creation, development, and adoption of technologies by United States companies throughout the Nation that will contribute significantly to United States competitiveness, employment, and sustainable economic growth;

(2) improve the competitiveness of United States manufacturers, particularly small businesses, by developing a nationwide technology outreach program to improve access to information, expertise, technology, and management practices required to compete throughout the world;

(3) promote the development and rapid application of advanced manufacturing technologies and processes by United States manufacturers, with emphasis on environmentally sound practices and sustainable economic growth;

(4) stimulate long-term investment in United States companies engaged in development or utilization of critical or other advanced technologies;

(5) establish mechanisms to ensure synergistic linkages between Federal, State, and local initiatives aimed at enhancing the competitiveness of United States companies;

(6) enhance and expand the core programs of the National Institute of Standards and Technology, including the Advanced Technology Program; and

(7) monitor and assess foreign technology capabilities relative to those of the United States in order to assist United States companies and policymakers in identifying and responding to competitive opportunities and challenges.

SEC. 104. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this Act—

(1) the term "advanced manufacturing technology" has the meaning given such term in section 4 of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980, as amended by section 206(a) of this Act;

(2) the term "critical technologies" means technologies identified as critical technologies pursuant to section 603(d) of the National Science and Technology Policy, Organization, and Priorities Act of 1976 (42 U.S.C. 6683(d));

(3) the term "Director" means the Director of the Institute;

(4) the term "Institute" means the National Institute of Standards and Technology;

(5) the term "modern technology" has the meaning given such term in section 4 of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980, as amended by section 206(a) of this Act;

(6) the term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Commerce;

(7) the term "small business" means a United States company that is a small business within the meaning given such term in the Small Business Act;

(8) the term "sustainable economic growth" has the meaning given such term in section 4 of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980, as amended by section 206(a) of this Act;

(9) the term "United States company" has the meaning given such term in section (4) of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980, as amended by section 206(a) of this Act;

(10) the term "United States manufacturer" has the meaning given such term in section 4 of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980, as amended by section 206(a) of this Act; and

(11) the term "Under Secretary" means the Under Secretary of Commerce for Technology.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to title I?

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF CALIFORNIA, AS MODIFIED

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to offer amendments en bloc and to amend titles not yet read. The amendments will cut across several titles.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. BROWN of California: Page 6, line 3, strike "and".

Page 6, line 9, strike the period and insert in lieu thereof "; and".

Page 6, after line 9, insert the following new paragraph:

(10) facilitate cooperation among Federal agencies with the goal of achieving an integrated national effort to improve United States competitiveness, employment, and sustainable growth.".

Page 10, line 22, insert ", along with other Federal agencies," after "Technology Administration".

Page 13, line 4, strike "be the lead agency of" and insert in lieu thereof "have primary responsibility in".

Page 16, line 10, insert "and activities supported by Federal, State, or local agencies which could contribute to the goals of this title and" after "extension centers".

Page 24, line 19, insert "other appropriate Federal agencies," after "Advisory Board,".

Page 27, line 20, insert ", and which shall be complementary with advanced manufacturing technology development programs supported by other Federal agencies" after "electronic data exchange".

Page 32, line 17, insert "the Department of Energy, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration," after "Department of Defense,".

Page 68, line 10, insert ", the Secretary of Defense, and the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration," after "Secretary of Energy".

Page 68, line 13, strike "energy technologies" and insert in lieu thereof "technologies developed by those agencies".

Mr. BROWN of California (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be

considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California to consider the amendments en bloc?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] is recognized in support of his amendments.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, these amendments have been discussed with the minority, and we do not think there are any objections to them. They are an effort to clarify the need for coordination between several departments of the Government.

Let me just say in a preparatory way that as we indicated during general debate, this bill probably can be perfected in a number of ways. These amendments are one of the efforts to perfect it in accordance with views expressed to us by various departments of the Federal Government. The departments, in addition to Commerce, that are involved, are particularly Energy, and perhaps the Department of Defense, and others. We have accepted and solicited, as a matter of fact, their efforts to develop language which would meet all of their needs and provide for a proper recognition of the roles of the various departments.

I will explain that in more detail later, but I wanted to make an additional point which I hope all the Members will be aware of. We are assiduously seeking to consult with anyone who may have amendments to see if those amendments can be drafted in such a fashion that we can accept them without a great deal of controversy. We stand ready to do that today, as we were yesterday and as we will be tomorrow or whenever. It looks to us at this point that we will not be able to finish this bill today, and that it will be necessary to complete the amendment process next week. I specifically asked the Members, if they have amendments that they have not discussed with the committee staff, they continue to work on this over the weekend, and we will be as flexible as we possibly can. One of the virtues, or flaws, of an open rule is that Members who wish to do so can continue to provide places that need perfecting in this bill and bring up amendments, and while we welcome and relish this, we want to accommodate these Members as well as we can without dragging the bill on interminably. I am sure that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] understands this and will help us accomplish that objective.

Mr. Chairman, one of the realities of Washington—and one of the inevitable effects of a new administration—is the various turf wars that take place among agencies seeking to implement a new President's agenda. Even Congress has occasionally had some experience with this phenomenon.

Some agencies within the administration have expressed concern about some of the language in the bill which might imply that the Department of Commerce would have an exclusive role in helping to restore our Nation's competitiveness.

That, of course, was never the intent of the bill; indeed, throughout the bill, there are references directing the Secretary of Commerce to cooperate and coordinate with activities of the various agencies, many of whom have existing or planned programs relevant to competitiveness.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee recognizes that many agencies have expertise to bring to this problem. In particular, the Department of Energy and its national laboratories have a unique set of technological and human resources which we believe have much to offer U.S. industry in the development of new technologies. Indeed, the Committee is working on separate legislation that I have introduced, H.R. 1432, relating to the transformation of the role of the national labs from meeting our past military security needs to meeting our modern economic security needs.

The fact is that there is plenty of work to be done by both the Department of Commerce and the Department of Energy, as well as other agencies. In that regard, I am pleased that Secretary O'Leary and Secretary Brown have met and discussed ways to improve the cooperation and coordination of the two agencies on these issues.

This amendment, which I believe is noncontroversial, is intended to further this cooperative process, and goes further in recognizing the roles of other agencies and the need for coordination and cooperation. I urge my colleagues to vote for the amendment .

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

Mr. Chairman, it is my intention to support this amendment, but I think there are a couple of things that we need to clarify with regard to the amendment, and maybe we can work them out here, because we think there are a couple of potential problems here.

As the amendment now reads, it appears to me as though it was meant to be a part of the purposes section of the bill, rather than the finding section of the bill. I am talking about the very first part of the en bloc amendment. It appears to me that one of the purposes was to facilitate cooperation among Federal agencies. It is placed in the bill as a finding and makes no contextual sense as a finding.

I am wondering if we can get unanimous consent to correct that so we can put it in the right place in the bill and so that we can get this straightened out.

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

Mr. WALKER. I am happy to yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, the committee counsel has just called my attention to the fact that there are some technical amendments, mainly addressing page and line numbers which need to be done. I have just submitted a copy of these to the Clerk, and if the gentleman does not object, I will ask unanimous consent that these technical corrections may be made, which will remedy many of the points the gentleman has raised.

Mr. WALKER. Certainly. That would be my intention also.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California that the amendments be modified?

There was no objection.

The text of the amendments as modified, offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] is as follows:

Amendments, as modified, offered by Mr. BROWN of California:

Page 7, line 12, strike "and"

Page 7, line 17, strike the period and insert in lieu thereof "; and".

Page 7, after line 17, insert the following new paragraph:

(8) facilitate cooperation among Federal agencies with the goal of achieving an integrated national effort to improve United States competitiveness, employment, and sustainable growth."

Page 10, line 22, insert ", along with other Federal agencies," after "Technology Administration".

Page 13, line 4, strike "be the lead agency of" and insert in lieu thereof "have primary responsibility in".

Page 16, line 10, insert "and activities supported by Federal, State, or local agencies which could contribute to the goals of this title and" after "extension centers".

Page 24, line 19, insert "other appropriate Federal agencies," after "Advisory Board,".

Page 27, line 20, insert ", and which shall be complementary with advanced manufacturing technology development programs supported by other Federal agencies" after "electronic data exchange".

Page 32, line 17, insert "the Department of Energy, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration," after "Department of Defense,".

Page 68, line 10, insert ", the Secretary of Defense, and the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration," after "Secretary of Energy".

Page 68, line 13, strike "energy technologies" and insert in lieu thereof "technologies developed by those agencies".

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, and I think that helps us.

The other thing I have is a question, and I just want to clarify in my own mind what this language means. As I understand it, we are making the Commerce Department the department which will have the primary responsibility in these matters of technology work, as opposed to language in the bill which previously read "be the lead agency of." Is that correct?

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

Mr. WALKER. I am happy to yield to the committee chairman.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is precisely cor-

rect. The term, "lead agency," seems to raise a red flag in various administrative departments, and we want to make it clear that we are not trying to establish any new pecking order or anything of that sort. We are trying to encourage cooperation, so we have substituted for "the lead agency" the term the gentleman has mentioned, "have primary responsibility of."

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, let me raise a concern here and see whether or not I can figure out why some of these agencies might have run a red flag up. My guess is that because this is a part of the Clinton economic plan, as many on the gentleman's side have articulated over the last day or so, there are an awful lot of agencies that want to become involved in programs that sound like this, and my concern is that we will have a whole series of agencies coming up with detailed spending plans that sound remarkably like those that are in this particular piece of legislation.

When you make somebody a lead agency, what you have done is basically put the program in that agency, and then the rest of the people who want to participate in those programs basically have to work through that agency. Where you have primary responsibilities, it seems to me we may be opening a door to a whole host of agencies coming in here with remarkably similar programs, thereby running the costs up fairly substantially.

Can we get some assurance that that is not what is happening here?

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

Mr. WALKER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is very perceptive in noting the phenomenon that he has described here where a number of different departments who see a good thing coming down the road do like to get involved in it, and they do not want to feel they are preempted by the language here.

On the other hand, by changing the language to indicate a desire to include the activities of the other agency, we open the door to the possible kind of abuse the gentleman has mentioned. It is not our intention to do that.

The intention here is to recognize that other agencies have very good programs already ongoing, and the gentleman is well aware of many of these in the Department of Energy, in the retitled ARPA in Defense, in NASA, and other agencies. What we want to do in the bill is establish a language in which these already ongoing programs will be able to interact more effectively without feeling they are being preempted by the responsibilities assigned to Commerce.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, and with that legislative history I am a good deal more comfortable with the change in language taking place here.

□ 1250

I would hope that we will enforce that along the way in our committee; that if other agencies come to us with duplicative sounding programs. We will exercise some judgment in whether or not we continue with those. I think the idea of coordinating programs already in place in a way that makes all of them more effective is something which should be done, and I have no objection to that. I do not want to open the door to massive new spending requests.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], of course, is correct, and we will make every effort to carry through in that fashion.

As with any new program, and while these programs here are based upon existing programs, they are a major expansion of them, with any such case oversight is the only way to ensure that the intent of Congress is being fully carried out. I can assure the gentleman that it will be a primary charge on my part to the Investigations and Oversight Committee to keep close tabs on what is happening here.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there further debate? If not, the question is on the amendments, as modified offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN].

The amendments, as modified, were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there other amendments to title I?

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. VALENTINE

Mr. VALENTINE. Mr. Chairman, I offer amendments that do not appear on the list and I ask unanimous consent they be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. VALENTINE:

Page 8, after line 20, insert the following new paragraphs:

(9) the term "State" means each of the several States, 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 territory or possession of the United States.

(10) the term "United States" means the several States, 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 territory or possession of the United States;

Page 8, line 21, through page 9, line 5, redesignate paragraphs (9), (10), and (11) as paragraphs (11), (12), and (13), respectively.

Page 120, after line 25, insert the following new section:

SEC. 412 DEFINITIONS.

Title III of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980, as added by title II and section 407 of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 306. DEFINITIONS.

"For purposes of this title and title IV—

"(1) the term 'State' means each of the several States, 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 territory or possession of the United States; and

"(2) the term 'United States' means the several States, 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 territory or possession of the United States.".

Amend the table of contents accordingly.

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

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to consideration of the amendments en bloc?

There was no objection.

Mr. VALENTINE. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that these amendments, which I send forward for the gentleman from the Virgin Islands [Mr. DE LUGO], have the effect of putting the territories on a par with the 50 States in the Union for the purpose of the legislation which is before us.

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

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, is it also the understanding of the gentleman that the definition that we are putting in here is consistent with other public law in such definitions and that we are not in any way coming up with a new definition for the purposes of this bill?

Mr. VALENTINE. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I would say that that is our understanding. It is not my desire and it is not the desire of the gentleman from the Virgin Islands [Mr. DE LUGO] to enlarge on the normal definition of these territories.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. VALENTINE].

The amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title I? If not, the Clerk will designate title II.

The text of title II is as follows:

TITLE II—MANUFACTURING

Subtitle A—Manufacturing Technology and Extension

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the "Manufacturing Technology and Extension Act of 1993".

SEC. 202. FINDINGS, PURPOSE, AND STATEMENT OF POLICY.

The Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 3701 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new title:

"TITLE III—MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY

"SEC. 301. FINDINGS, PURPOSE, AND STATEMENT OF POLICY.

"(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds and declares the following:

"(1) United States manufacturers, especially small businesses, require the adoption and implementation of both modern and advanced manufacturing and process technologies to meet the challenge of foreign competition.

"(2) The development and application of modern and advanced manufacturing technologies are vital to the sustainable economic growth, standard of living, competitiveness in world markets, and national security and welfare of the United States.

"(3) New developments in flexible, computer-integrated manufacturing, electronic manufacturing communications networks, and other new technologies make possible dramatic improvements across all industrial sectors in productivity, quality, and the speed with which United States manufacturers can respond to changing market opportunities.

"(4) The application of advances in computer science and technology to manufacturing is also vital to the Nation's prosperity, national and economic security, industrial production, engineering, and scientific advancement.

"(5) The Department of Commerce's Technology Administration can continue to play an important role in assisting United States companies to develop, test, and adopt modern and advanced manufacturing technologies and in establishing high-performance computing technology testbeds to develop, refine, test, and transfer advanced manufacturing and networking technologies and associated applications.

"(b) PURPOSE.—It is the purpose of this title to contribute to the competitiveness of the United States by enhancing the Department of Commerce's technology programs to—

"(1) provide United States manufacturers, especially small businesses, with ready access to high quality advice and assistance in the development, adoption, and improvement of modern manufacturing processes and technology, and in solving their specific technology-based problems; and

"(2) encourage, facilitate, and support the development and adoption of advanced manufacturing principles and technologies by United States manufacturers.

"(c) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—Congress declares that it is the policy of the United States that—

"(1) Federal agencies, particularly the Department of Commerce, shall work with United States manufacturers, labor, and the States to ensure that the United States is second to no other nation in the development, adoption, and use of modern and advanced manufacturing technology;

"(2) the Department of Commerce shall work with all the major Federal research and development agencies to encourage the development and adoption, by United States manufacturers, of advanced manufacturing technologies, and shall work closely with United States manufacturers and labor, and with the Nation's universities, to develop and test those technologies; and

"(3) the Department of Commerce shall place a high priority on the establishment and growth of a National Technology Outreach Program to promote and facilitate the development and use by United States manufacturers of modern and advanced manufacturing systems and applications for manufacturing.

"(d) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this title shall be construed as modifying the duties and responsibilities of the Department of Energy with regard to its technology resources and expertise in matters under its jurisdiction.".

SEC. 203. ROLE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE.

Title III of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980, as added by section 202 of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 302. ROLE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE.

"(a) DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE.—Consistent with the purposes and policies of section 301, the Department of Commerce shall be the lead agency of the Federal Government in working with United States manufacturers and labor and the States to develop advanced manufacturing technologies and to promote and assist the adoption and use of modern and advanced manufacturing technologies, practices, and management techniques throughout the United States. In carrying out this title, the Secretary, acting, as appropriate, through the Under Secretary and the Director, shall—

"(1) consult and cooperate with other Federal agencies, including the Department of Defense, the Department of Energy, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to ensure consistent and, where possible, coordinated efforts to promote the development and adoption of modern and advanced manufacturing technologies;

"(2) assist the Office of Science and Technology Policy in its efforts to coordinate the manufacturing technology activities of the various Federal agencies; and

"(3) work with representatives of Federal, State, and local agencies, manufacturing extension programs, private industry, industry groups, worker organizations, and academia to encourage and facilitate the use of both advanced manufacturing technologies, including those developed by the Advanced Manufacturing Technology Development Program established under section 304 of this Act, and modern manufacturing technologies and practices to United States manufacturers.

The Secretary shall annually report to Congress on actions taken under this subsection.

"(b) OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES.—To the extent permitted by other law, other Federal agencies shall cooperate with the Secretary in carrying out this title.".

SEC. 204. NATIONAL TECHNOLOGY OUTREACH PROGRAM.

Title III of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980, as added by sections 202 and 203 of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 303. NATIONAL TECHNOLOGY OUTREACH PROGRAM.

"(a) ESTABLISHMENT AND PURPOSE.—There is hereby established a National Technology Outreach Program (in this section referred to as the 'Outreach Program'), the purpose of which shall be to—

"(1) interconnect, programatically and electronically, the Nation's technology and manufacturing extension centers, programs, and activities;

"(2) improve the competitiveness of United States manufacturers and create jobs located in the United States; and

"(3) assist United States manufacturers, especially small businesses, to expand and accelerate the use of cost-effective modern manufacturing technologies and practices and to develop and adopt advanced manufacturing technologies. The Secretary, acting through the Under Secretary and the Director, shall implement and coordinate the Outreach Program in accordance with an initial plan and a 5-year plan for the Outreach Program, to be submitted to the Congress under subsection (g).

"(b) PROGRAM COMPONENTS.—The Outreach Program shall constitute a partnership between the Department of Commerce, the States, the private sector, and, as appropriate, shall include other Federal agencies to provide a national system of manufacturing and technology extension centers and technical services to United States manufacturers, particularly small businesses. The Outreach Program shall include—

"(1) Manufacturing Outreach Centers established under subsection (c);

"(2) Regional Centers for the Transfer of Manufacturing Technology established under section 25 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278k);

"(3) the State Technology Extension Program established under section 26 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278l);

"(4) the Outreach Program Information Network and the Clearinghouse established under subsections (d) and (e) of this section, respectively; and

"(5) other technology and manufacturing extension centers that the Secretary considers appropriate for inclusion in the Outreach Program.

"(c) MANUFACTURING OUTREACH CENTERS.—(1) Eligible government and private sector organizations that are engaged in technology or manufacturing extension activities may apply to the Secretary for designation as Manufacturing Outreach Centers, in such form and manner as the Secretary may prescribe. Eligible organizations include Federal, State, and local government agencies, extension programs, universities, and laboratories; small business development centers; and professional societies, worker organizations, industrial organizations, nonprofit organizations, community development organizations, community colleges, and technical schools and colleges.

"(2) The Secretary shall establish standards, consistent with the requirements of subsection (f), for designation of existing technology or manufacturing extension programs and for qualification of start-up programs as Manufacturing Outreach Centers.

"(3) The Secretary may, through a competitive process, make grants, subject to the availability of appropriations, to Manufacturing Outreach Centers designated in accordance with the standards established under paragraph (2), to enable them to fulfill the purposes and perform the activities of the Outreach Program. If a State plan for technology extension exists in a State where an applicant for a grant under this paragraph is operating or plans to operate, the proposer shall demonstrate in its application that its proposal is compatible with such State plan. The purpose of such grants is to upgrade the overall quality of the Outreach Program and to contribute to the goal of ready availability of the services and information provided through the Outreach Program, including information on modern and advanced manufacturing technology, to all interested United States manufacturers. Such grants shall be awarded to increase the capabilities and capacity of Manufacturing Outreach Centers. Manufacturing Outreach Centers may not concurrently receive financial assistance under section 25 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act and grants under this paragraph. Grants may be awarded under this paragraph for an initial period not to exceed 3 years and may be renewed for one additional period, not to exceed 2 years. Such grants may not at any time exceed 50 percent of the operating costs and in-kind contributions of the grant recipient.

"(4) In selecting applicants to participate in the Outreach Program and in making grants under paragraph (3), the Secretary shall solicit and consider evaluations of the applicant's performance record and current capabilities, and

the potential usefulness of the applicant's proposal, from United States manufacturers that the Secretary considers qualified to make such evaluations.

"(d) OUTREACH PROGRAM INFORMATION NETWORK.—(1) The Department of Commerce shall provide for an instantaneous, interactive electronic communications network (in this section referred to as the 'outreach network') to serve the Outreach Program, to facilitate effective and efficient interaction within it, and to permit the collection and dissemination in electronic form, in a timely and accurate manner, of information described in subsection (e). The outreach network shall, wherever practicable, make use of existing public and private computer networks, data bases, and electronic bulletin boards. The design, configuration, acquisition plan, and operating policies, including user fees and appropriate electronic access for public and private information suppliers and users, of the outreach network shall be included in the 5-year plan prepared under subsection (g)(2) and shall address—

"(A) effective mechanisms for providing operating funds for the maintenance and use of the outreach network established under this paragraph, including user fees, industry support, and continued Federal investment;

"(B) the future operation and evolution of the outreach network, including its relationship with other public or private information services;

"(C) how to protect the copyrights of material distributed over the outreach network; and

"(D) appropriate policies—

"(i) to ensure the security of proprietary information that might be available on the outreach network and to protect the privacy of users of the outreach network; and

"(ii) to facilitate and limit access to the outreach network and its information to member organizations of the Outreach Program and to United States companies, State and local governments, United States universities and colleges, and United States nonprofit organizations that the Secretary deems appropriate.

"(2) Except as provided in this section, the outreach network established under paragraph (1) shall be designed and configured in a manner that will enable interoperability with networks and technologies developed under the National High-Performance Computing Program described in section 101 of the High-Performance Computing Act of 1991 (15 U.S.C. 5511).

"(e) CLEARINGHOUSE.—(1) The Secretary shall develop a clearinghouse system, using existing public and private sector information providers and carriers where appropriate, to—

"(A) identify expertise and acquire information, appropriate to the purpose of the Outreach Program stated in subsection (a), from all appropriate Federal sources, and where appropriate from other sources, providing assistance where necessary in making such information electronically available through and compatible with the outreach network;

"(B) ensure ready access, through the outreach network, by United States companies, Federal agencies, State and local governments, United States universities and colleges, United States nonprofit organizations that the Secretary deems appropriate, and member organizations of the Outreach Program, to the most recent relevant available information and expertise;

"(C) ensure that common standards of interconnection are utilized by the outreach network and the clearinghouse to allow maximum interoperability and usership; and

"(D) to the extent practicable, inform United States manufacturers of the availability of such information.

"(2) The clearinghouse shall include information available electronically on—

"(A) activities of Manufacturing Outreach Centers, Regional Centers for the Transfer of Manufacturing Technology, the State Technology Extension Program, and the users of the outreach network;

"(B) domestic and international standards and other export promotion information, including conformity assessment requirements and procedures;

"(C) the Malcolm Baldrige Quality program, and quality principles and standards;

"(D) manufacturing processes minimizing waste and negative environmental impact;

"(E) federally funded technology development and transfer programs;

"(F) how to access data bases and services; and

"(G) skills training, particularly the implementation and use of modern and advanced manufacturing techniques.

"(3) The Secretary, acting through the Under Secretary, may convene a national conference to develop recommendations for common standards for interconnection and for improved dissemination to users of the clearinghouse of information on domestic and international technical regulations and standards, and on conformity assessment procedures, including draft standards and regulations. Invited participants are to include a broad cross section of the standards, accreditation, and user communities.

"(f) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall satisfy the following requirements:

"(1) The Outreach Program and the outreach network shall be established and operated through cooperation and cofunding among Federal, State, and local governments, other public and private contributors, and end users that the Secretary determines are appropriate for providing maximum benefit to United States manufacturers.

"(2) The Outreach Program and the outreach network shall utilize and leverage, to the extent practicable, existing organizations, data bases, electronic networks, facilities, capabilities, and existing standards for interconnection, and shall be designed to complement rather than supplant State and local programs.

"(3) The Outreach Program and the outreach network shall be subject to all applicable provisions of law for the protection of trade secrets and business confidential information.

"(4) Access to the services available through the Outreach Program and information available through the outreach network servicing the Outreach Program shall be limited, as appropriate, to United States companies, State and local governments, United States universities and colleges, and United States nonprofit organizations that the Secretary deems appropriate.

"(5) Local or regional needs should determine the management structure and staffing of the Manufacturing Outreach Centers. The Outreach Program shall strive for geographical balance with the ultimate goal of access for all United States manufacturers.

"(6) Manufacturing Outreach Centers should have the capability to deliver outreach services directly to United States manufacturers, actively work with, rather than supplant, the private sector, and to the extent practicable, maximize the exposure of United States manufacturers to demonstrations of modern technologies in use, including flexible manufacturing practices.

"(7) The Department of Commerce shall develop mechanisms for—

"(A) soliciting the perspectives of United States manufacturers using the services of the Manufacturing Outreach Centers and Regional Centers for the Transfer of Manufacturing Technology; and

"(B) evaluating the effectiveness of the Manufacturing Outreach Centers and Regional Centers for the Transfer of Manufacturing Technology.

"(g) PLAN AND REPORTS.—(1) Within 6 months after the date of enactment of this title, the Secretary, after consultation with the Under Secretary, the Director, the Department of Commerce Technology Advisory Board, and a cross-section of potential participants in the Outreach Program, shall submit an initial plan for the implementation of this title to Congress—

"(A) describing how the Secretary will carry out the responsibility to create, operate, and support the Outreach Program and the outreach network, including the interactive electronic linkage of Manufacturing Outreach Centers to the programs of the Technology Administration and other appropriate Federal, State, and local agencies;

"(B) establishing criteria and procedures, consistent with the requirements of this title, for—

"(i) the selection of organizations to receive Department of Commerce services or financial assistance as part of the Outreach Program, including qualifications and training of technology extension agents;

"(ii) access to services provided by participants in the Outreach Program and to information available through the outreach network servicing the Outreach Program; and

"(iii) the annual evaluation of the Outreach Program in achieving the purposes of this title; and

"(C) evaluating the need for and the benefits of a National Conference of States on Technology Extension, similar in structure to the National Conference on Weights and Measures, and, if the Secretary determines that such a Conference is advisable, developing, in consultation with the States and other interested parties, a plan for the establishment, operation, funding, and evaluation of such a Conference.

"(2) Within 1 year after the date of enactment of this title, the Secretary, in consultation with the Under Secretary, the Director, and the Department of Commerce Technology Advisory Board, shall prepare and submit to the Congress a 5-year plan for implementing the Outreach Program and the outreach network and clearinghouse established under subsections (d) and (e), respectively. Such 5-year plan shall identify appropriate methods for expanding the Outreach Program in a geographically balanced manner. Such 5-year plan shall include a detailed implementation plan and cost estimates and shall take into consideration and build on the report submitted under paragraph (1).

"(3) Beginning with first year after submission of the 5-year plan under paragraph (2), the Secretary shall annually report to the Congress, at the time of the President's annual budget request to Congress, on—

"(A) progress made in achieving the purposes of the Outreach Program described in subsection (a) using criteria and procedures established under subsection (g)(1)(B)(iii);

"(B) changes proposed to the 5-year plan;

"(C) performance in adhering to schedules; and

"(D) any recommendations for legislative changes necessary to enhance the Outreach Program.

The report under this paragraph submitted at the end of the fourth year of operation of the Outreach Program shall include recommendations on whether to terminate the Outreach Program or extend it for an additional period not to exceed 5 years.".

SEC. 205. ADVANCED MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM.

Title III of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980, as added by sections 202, 203, and 204 of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 304. ADVANCED MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM.

"(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary, through the Under Secretary and the Director, shall establish an Advanced Manufacturing Technology Development Program which shall include projects to develop advanced manufacturing systems, networks, and electronic data exchange.

"(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the Advanced Manufacturing Technology Development Program is to create collaborative multiyear technology development programs involving United States companies and, as appropriate, cooperating with other Federal agencies and laboratories, the States, worker organizations, universities and colleges, independent research organizations, and other interested persons, in order to develop, refine, test, and transfer design and manufacturing technologies and associated applications, including advanced computer integration and electronic networks for manufacturing information exchange.

"(c) PROGRAM COMPONENTS.—The Advanced Manufacturing Technology Development Program shall include—

"(1) the advanced manufacturing research and development activities at the Institute; and

"(2) one or more technology development testbeds within the United States, selected in accordance with procedures, including cost sharing, established for the Advanced Technology Program established under section 28 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278n), whose purpose shall be to develop, refine, and test advanced manufacturing, data exchange, and networking technologies and associated applications and to facilitate the transfer of such technologies and applications to United States manufacturers.

"(d) FUNCTIONS AND ACTIVITIES.—The Advanced Manufacturing Technology Development Program, under the coordination of the Secretary, through the Director, shall—

"(1) test and, as appropriate, facilitate and support the development of the equipment, computer software, and systems integration necessary for the successful operation within the United States of advanced design and manufacturing systems and associated electronic networks;

"(2) establish at the Institute and the technology development testbed or testbeds—

"(A) prototype advanced computer-integrated manufacturing systems;

"(B) prototype electronic networks linking manufacturing systems; and

"(C) prototype clean manufacturing systems;

"(3) assist United States companies to develop voluntary consensus standards relevant to advanced computer-integrated manufacturing operations, including standards for networks, electronic data interchange, and digital product data specifications;

"(4) help to make high-performance computing and networking technologies an integral part of design and production processes where appropriate;

"(5) conduct research to identify and overcome technical barriers to the successful and cost-effective operation of advanced manufacturing systems and networks and to promote and facilitate electronic data exchange;

"(6) facilitate the efforts of United States companies to develop and test new applications for manufacturing systems, networks, and information exchange;

"(7) involve in the Advanced Manufacturing Technology Development Program, to the maximum extent practicable, both those United States manufacturers which make manufacturing technology and related computer equipment and software, and United States companies which buy such technology, equipment and software;

"(8) identify training needs, as appropriate, for managers, engineers, and employees of United States manufacturers in the operation and applications of advanced manufacturing technologies and networks, with particular emphasis on training for production workers in the effective use of advanced manufacturing technology;

"(9) work with United States companies, universities, independent research organizations, and other interested parties to develop standards, tools, and techniques for the use of advanced computer-based training systems, including multi-media and interactive learning technologies;

"(10) involve small businesses in its activities;

"(11) exchange information and personnel, as appropriate, between the technology development testbeds and the outreach network created under section 303(d); and

"(12) coordinate its activities with the National High-Performance Computing Program described in section 101 of the High-Performance Computing Act of 1991 (15 U.S.C. 5511) to ensure that both programs are complementary and compatible.

"(e) TESTBED AWARDS.—(1) In selecting applicants to receive awards under subsection (c)(2) of this section, the Secretary shall give preferential consideration to applicants that have existing computer expertise in manufacturing applications and the ability to diffuse such expertise to United States companies, and that, in the case of joint research and development ventures, include both suppliers and users of advanced manufacturing technology. In the case of systems described in subsection (d)(2)(C), the Secretary shall also give preferential consideration to applicants that have existing program expertise in clean manufacturing, including the areas of concurrent engineering, materials research, and environmental science, and which have a technology transfer mechanism in place to transfer testbed results of a clean manufacturing program to industry participants.

"(2) An industry-led joint research and development venture applying for an award under subsection (c)(2) of this section may include one or more State research organizations, universities, Federal laboratories, independent research organizations, or Regional Centers for the Transfer of Manufacturing Technology (as created under section 25 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act) and other organizations as the Secretary considers appropriate.

"(f) ADVICE AND ASSISTANCE.—(1) Within 6 months after the date of enactment of this title, and before any request for proposals is issued, the Secretary shall hold one or more workshops to solicit advice from United States companies and from other Federal agencies, particularly the Department of Defense, regarding the specific missions and activities of the testbeds.

"(2) The Secretary shall, to the greatest extent possible, coordinate activities under this section with activities of other Federal agencies and initiatives relating to computer-aided acquisition and logistics support, electronic data interchange, flexible computer-integrated manufacturing, and enterprise integration.

"(3) The Secretary may request and accept funds, facilities, equipment, or personnel from other Federal agencies in order to carry out this section.

"(g) ANTITRUST SAVINGS CLAUSE.—This section shall not be construed to modify, impair, or supersede the operation of the antitrust laws. For purposes of this subsection, the term 'antitrust laws' has the meaning given it in subsection (a) of the first section of the Clayton Act (15 U.S.C. 12(a)), except that such term includes the Act of June 19, 1936 (49 Stat. 1526; 15 U.S.C. 13 et seq.), commonly known as the Robinson Patman Act, and section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 45) to the extent that such section 5 applies to unfair methods of competition.".

SEC. 206. MISCELLANEOUS AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—Section 4 of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 3703) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

"(14) 'Director' means the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology.

"(15) 'Institute' means the National Institute of Standards and Technology.

"(16) 'Assistant Secretary' means the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Technology Policy.

"(17) 'Advanced manufacturing technology' means—

"(A) numerically-controlled machine tools, robots, automated process control equipment, computerized flexible manufacturing systems, associated computer software, and other technology for improving manufacturing and industrial production of goods, including biotechnology products, which advance the state-of-the-art; or

"(B) novel manufacturing techniques and processes not previously generally available that improve manufacturing quality, productivity, and practices, including engineering design, quality assurance, concurrent engineering, continuous process production technology, inventory management, upgraded worker skills, communications with customers and suppliers, and promotion of sustainable economic growth.

"(18) 'Modern technology' means the best available proven technology, techniques, and processes appropriate to enhancing the productivity of manufacturers or to promoting sustainable economic growth.

"(19) 'Sustainable economic growth' means economic growth that enhances the national quality of life and preserves environmental integrity.

"(20) 'United States company' means a company described in section 28(d)(9)(B) of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278n(d)(9)(B)).

"(21) 'United States manufacturer' means a company described in section 28(d)(9) of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278n(d)(9)) that is engaged in manufacturing activities. The Secretary, in applying subparagraph (A) of such section 28(d)(9) for purposes of this Act, may make a finding under that subparagraph based on certification by the company.

"(22) 'Benchmarking' means the assessment of foreign science and technology capabilities relative to comparable United States capabilities.

"(23) 'Independent research organizations' means nonprofit organizations organized primarily for the purpose of conducting or managing research activities.".

(b) REDESIGNATIONS.—The Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 3701 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by inserting immediately after section 4 the following new title heading:

"TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND RELATED PROGRAMS";

(2) by redesignating sections 5 through 10 as sections 101 through 106, respectively;

(3) by redesignating sections 16 through 22, as sections 107 through 113, respectively;

(4) by inserting immediately after section 113 (as redesignated by paragraph (3) of this subsection) the following new title heading:

"TITLE II—FEDERAL TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER";

(5) by redesignating sections 11 through 15 as sections 201 through 205, respectively;

(6) by redesignating section 23 as section 206;

(7) in section 4—

(A) by striking "section 5" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "section 101";

(B) in paragraphs (4) and (6), by striking "section 6" and "section 8" each place they appear and inserting in lieu thereof "section 102" and "section 104", respectively; and

(C) in paragraph (13), by striking "section 6" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 102";

(8) in section 105 (as redesignated by paragraph (2) of this subsection) by striking "section 6" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "section 102";

(9) in section 106(d) (as redesignated by paragraph (2) of this subsection) by striking "7, 9, 11, 15, 17, or 20" and inserting in lieu thereof "103, 105, 108, 111, 201, or 205";

(10) in section 201(i) (as redesignated by paragraph (5) of this subsection) by inserting "loan, lease, or" after "may"; and by inserting "Actions taken under this subsection shall not be subject to Federal requirements on the disposal of property." after "activities.";

(11) in section 202(b) (as redesignated by paragraph (5) of this subsection) by striking "section 14" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 204";

(12) in section 204(a)(1) (as redesignated by paragraph (5) of this subsection) by striking "section 12" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 202";

(13) in section 113 (as redesignated by paragraph (3) of this subsection) by striking "sections 11, 12, and 13" and inserting in lieu thereof "sections 201, 202, and 203";

(14) in section 206 (as redesignated by paragraph (6) of this subsection)—

(A) by striking "section 11(b)" in subsection (a)(2) and inserting in lieu thereof "section 201(b)"; and

(B) by striking "section 6(d)" in subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "section 102(d)"; and

(15) by adding at the end of section 201 (as redesignated by paragraph (5) of this subsection) the following new subsection:

"(j) ADDITIONAL TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER MECHANISMS.—In addition to the technology transfer mechanisms set forth in this section and section 202 of this Act, the heads of Federal departments and agencies also may transfer technologies through the technology transfer and extension programs of the Department of Commerce and the Department of Defense.".

SEC. 207. MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY CENTERS.

Section 25 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278k), is amended—

(1) by amending the section heading to read as follows: "MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY CENTERS";

(2) in subsection (c)(5), by striking "which are designed" and all that follows through "operation of a Center" and inserting in lieu thereof "to a maximum of one-third Federal funding. Each Center which receives financial assistance under this section shall be evaluated during its sixth year of operation, and at such subsequent times as the Secretary considers appropriate, by an evaluation panel appointed by the Secretary in the same manner as was the evaluation panel previously appointed. The Secretary shall not provide funding for additional years of the Center's operation unless the evaluation is positive and the Secretary finds that continuation of funding furthers the goals of the Department. Such additional Federal funding shall not exceed one-third of the cost of the Center's operations";

(3) by striking subsection (d); and

(4) by adding at the end the following new subsections:

"(d) If a Center receives a positive evaluation during its third year of operation, the Director may, any time after that evaluation, contract with the Center to provide additional technology extension or transfer services above and beyond the baseline activities of the Center. Such additional services may include, but are not limited to, the development and operation of the following:

"(1) Programs to assist United States companies that are engaged in manufacturing and their employees, including front-line production workers, in the Center's region to learn and apply the technologies, techniques, and processes associated with systems management technology, electronic data exchange, or improving manufacturing productivity.

"(2) Services focused on the testing, development, and application of manufacturing and process technologies within specific technical fields such as advanced materials or electronics fabrication for the purpose of assisting United States companies that are engaged in manufacturing, both within the Center's original service region and in other regions, to improve manufacturing quality, product design, workforce training, and production efficiency in those specific technical fields.

"(3) Industry-led demonstration programs that involve United States manufacturing technology consortia to provide ongoing research, technology transfer, and worker training assistance to their members. An award under this paragraph shall be for no more than $500,000 per year, and shall be subject to renewal after a 1-year demonstration period.

"(e) In addition to any assistance provided or contracts entered into with a Center under this section, the Director is authorized to make separate and smaller awards, through a competitive process, to nonprofit organizations which wish to work with a Center. Such awards shall be for the purpose of enabling those organizations to provide outreach services, in collaboration with the Center, to United States manufacturers located in parts of the region served by the Center which are not easily accessible to the Center and which are not served by any other manufacturing outreach center. Organizations which receive such awards shall be known as Local Manufacturing Offices. In reviewing applications, the Director shall consider the needs of rural as well as urban manufacturers. No single award for a Local Manufacturing Office shall be for more than three years, awards shall be renewable through the competitive awards process, and no award shall be made unless the applicant provides matching funds at least equal to the amount received under this section.

"(f) In carrying out this section, the Director shall coordinate his efforts with the plans for the National Technology Outreach Program established under section 303 of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980.".

SEC. 208. STATE TECHNOLOGY EXTENSION PROGRAM.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Section 26(a) of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278l(a)), is amended—

(1) by inserting immediately after "(a)" the following new sentence: "There is established within the Institute a State Technology Extension Program."; and

(2) by inserting "through that Program" immediately after "technical assistance".

(b) ADDITIONAL AUTHORITIES.—Section 26 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278l) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(c) In addition to the general authorities listed in subsection (b) of this section, the State Technology Extension Program also may, through merit-based competitive review processes—

"(1) make awards to States and conduct workshops, pursuant to section 5121(b) of the Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act of 1988, in order to help States improve their planning and coordination of technology extension activities;

"(2) support technology demonstration projects to help States provide technical assistance and services to United States manufacturers that will improve their productivity and competitiveness;

"(3) support State efforts to develop and test innovative ways to help United States manufacturers improve their technical capabilities;

"(4) support State efforts designed to help United States manufacturers in rural as well as urban areas adopt modern manufacturing technologies;

"(5) support State efforts to assist interested United States manufacturers in the defense industry to adapt to modern or advanced manufacturing technologies as they convert to nondefense or dual-use purposes;

"(6) support worker technology education programs in the States at institutions such as research universities, community colleges, labor education centers, labor-management committees, and worker organizations in production technologies critical to the Nation's future, with an emphasis on high-performance work systems, the skills necessary to use modern or advanced manufacturing systems well;

"(7) help States develop programs to train personnel who in turn can provide technical skills to managers and workers of United States manufacturers; and

"(8) support State efforts to assist United States manufacturers to develop on-the-job training in modern and advanced manufacturing technologies, techniques, and processes and to promote the development and adoption of modern and advanced manufacturing technologies.".

Subtitle B—National Science Foundation Manufacturing Programs

SEC. 211. ROLE OF THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION IN MANUFACTURING.

The Director of the National Science Foundation, after appropriate consultation with the Secretary, the Under Secretary, and the Director, shall—

(1) work with United States companies to identify areas of research in advanced manufacturing technologies and practices that offer the potential to improve United States productivity, competitiveness, employment, and sustainable economic growth;

(2) support research at United States universities to improve advanced manufacturing technologies and practices; and

(3) work with the Technology Administration and the Institute and, as appropriate, other Federal agencies to accelerate the transfer to United States companies of manufacturing research and innovations developed at universities.

SEC. 212. ENGINEERING AND COOPERATIVE RESEARCH CENTERS.

The Director of the National Science Foundation shall strengthen and expand the number of Engineering Research Centers and strengthen and expand the Industry/University Cooperative Research Centers Program with the goal of increasing the engineering talent base versed in critical technologies, with emphasis on advanced manufacturing technology and practices, and of advancing fundamental engineering knowledge in these technologies, including biotechnology. At least one Engineering Research Center shall have a research and education focus on the concerns of United States manufacturers, including small businesses that are trying to modernize their operations. Awards under this section shall be made on a competitive, merit review basis and on terms and conditions the Director may prescribe to ensure that the purposes for which the award is made

are satisfied. Such awards may include support for acquisition of instrumentation, equipment, and facilities related to the research and education activities of the Centers and support for undergraduate students to participate in the activities of the Centers.

SEC. 213. MANUFACTURING TRAINEESHIPS AND FELLOWSHIPS.

(a) GRADUATE TRAINEESHIPS.—The Director of the National Science Foundation, in consultation with the Secretary, may establish a program to provide traineeships to graduate students at institutions of higher education within the United States who are citizens of the United States and who choose to pursue masters or doctoral degrees in manufacturing engineering. The Director of the National Science Foundation shall make an effort to ensure the provision of traineeships under this subsection to socially and economically disadvantaged individuals (within the meaning of section 8(a) (5) and (6) of the Small Business Act, and including women).

(b) MANUFACTURING MANAGERS IN THE CLASSROOM PROGRAM.—The Director of the National Science Foundation, in consultation with the Secretary, may establish a program to provide fellowships, on a cost-shared basis, to employees of United States companies with experience in manufacturing to serve for 1 or 2 years as instructors in manufacturing at 2-year community and technical colleges in the United States.

SEC. 214. TOTAL QUALITY MANAGEMENT.

The Director of the National Science Foundation, in consultation with the Secretary, the Under Secretary, and the Director, may establish a program to develop innovative curricula, courses, and materials for use by institutions of higher education for instruction in total quality management and related management practices, in order to help improve the productivity of United States companies.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to title II?

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. VALENTINE

Mr. VALENTINE. Mr. Chairman, I offer two amendments, and I ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. VALENTINE:

Page 20, line 7, insert "The Secretary shall also, as appropriate, coordinate activities under this subsection with the relevant activities of other Federal agencies, particularly the agile manufacturing/enterprise integration activities of the Department of Defense." after "(15 U.S.C. 5511).".

Page 26, line 15, insert "In the preparation of such 5-year plan, the Secretary shall provide an opportunity for public comment, and the plan submitted to Congress shall include a summary of comments received. Such plan may not be implemented until 90 days after its submission to the Congress." after "under paragraph (1).".

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

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina that the amendments be considered en bloc?

There was no objection.

Mr. VALENTINE. Mr. Chairman, the first of these amendments is offered at the suggestion of our distinguished colleague from Texas, Mr. PICKLE. It asks the Secretary of Commerce, as appropriate, to coordinate activities of the Manufacturing Outreach Program Information Network with relevant activities of other Federal agencies and in particular the agile manufacturing/enterprise integration activities of the Department of Defense.

The Department of Defense, as part of its technology reinvestment and defense conversion efforts has provided significant support for the development of tools necessary to extend agile manufacturing capabilities to U.S. businesses and has worked closely with the Technology Administration of the Department of Commerce in this regard.

This amendment merely shows that it is the intent of the Congress that this spirit of cooperation be extended to the information network.

The second amendment is offered at the suggestion of Congresswoman COLLINS of Illinois. It is her concern that there be an adequate opportunity for public comment and for congressional consideration of the administration's plan for the manufacturing outreach network which is required on page 26 of the reported version of the bill.

Her amendment merely requires the Secretary to provide an opportunity for public comment in advance of the report's submission to Congress, to give Congress access to a summary of those comments, and to give Congress 90 days to consider the report in advance of its implementation.

I consider this amendment to be consistent with other steps that we have taken to make sure that this program is industry-led.

These amendments make small changes to H.R. 820 and I hope my colleagues will find them acceptable and noncontroversial.

I ask their adoption.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. VALENTINE].

The amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there other amendments to title II?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROHRABACHER

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROHRABACHER:

Page 39, lines 1 through 16, strike paragraph (2).

Page 39, lines 17 and 18, redesignate paragraphs (3) and (4) as paragraphs (2) and (3), respectively.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, in the general debate yesterday I mentioned that Chairman VALENTINE and Chairman BROWN have both done a terrific job. They have worked hard on this and have been very fair to us in the committee. Although we have our disagreements, I compliment them on the hard work they have put into this bill.

Also in general debate yesterday I pointed out, as other Members pointed out, that there is a basic philosophical difference in this bill, and that while well-intended, many of us believe this bill is taking the wrong approach to technology and development.

The operative philosophy seems to be never settle for a little Government intervention if there is a lot to be had. The prime example is the manufacturing and technology centers. The philosophy behind the current law which was adopted in 1988 is to provide Federal seed money to these centers, starting them with one-third Federal funding, which the successful centers would be able to phase out, becoming self-sustaining after a maximum of 6 years, while the unsuccessful centers, on the other hand, would not be allowed to remain on the Federal dole after 6 years. It makes sense, does it not?

However, section 207 throws out this concept. Under this section, success is no longer defined as becoming self-sustaining. Success becomes furthering the goals of the Commerce Department, whatever that may be.

Under this bill, manufacturing technology centers can get their Federal funds forever, as long as the bureaucrats want to keep them going.

My amendment would return to the original concept. If it is adopted, manufacturing technology centers would still be expanded from a pilot program into a nationwide network.

But I propose we return to the principle that Federal funding will not last forever. Either the centers become valuable enough so that private companies are willing to pay the full cost, or the technology center will not be able to continue. It will close and the taxpayers will be off the hook because it is an inefficient operation.

Under my amendment those who work for these centers will have the incentive to do a better job serving their customers and to find private support, either through donations or fees. Under the bill the incentives go in the opposite direction. After a few years the managers of the technology centers will start romancing the bureaucrats and politicians in order to enlist political support.

□ 1300

Ronald Reagan once said that a government program is the next best thing to eternal life on this planet. The authors of this bill obviously intend to prove him right. What will it be? Federal seed money or another permanent Federal program? Is not the deficit high enough? Are there not enough permanent Federal programs already?

A vote against my amendment is a vote for more perpetual Federal spending. I urge my colleagues to show some

respect for the taxpayers and to support this fiscally responsible amendment.

Let me note that we did present this in our committee hearings, and one of my colleagues noted that he himself had gone down to do an inspection of one of the technology centers that already exists. He had made my point. He was a politician going down to inspect a technology center. And what do politicians know about that?

Instead, we should be setting up these systems so that after a certain number of years we have businessmen, technology entrepreneurs going into these centers to do their inspections to see if they are worthwhile and not just politicians who are looking for votes and looking for favors for their constituents.

So I would urge at this time of high deficit that my colleagues support this fiscally responsible amendment and that we put a limit on how much money is going to be taken out of the taxpayers' pocket, that we give all the right incentives, instead of putting people on a permanent disincentive, to become self-sufficient.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

Mr. VALENTINE. Mr. Chairman, we, of course, oppose the gentleman's amendment.

I would like to say at the outset that we reciprocate in the feelings expressed by the gentleman from California. We do have differences of opinion, and we have differences in political philosophy.

However, I would say that in his case and mine, perhaps the differences are not as distinct as in some other situations that come to mind.

But I do, for the committee, Mr. Chairman, respectfully oppose the gentleman's amendment.

It seems to me that in dealing with a situation where we seek to find avenues to change educational patterns, where we have designed legislation which allows local governments and State governments to use their sources of revenue, to use local money, tax money, to enter into partnership with the Federal Government, that the Federal one-third match in many of those instances will prove to have been and will prove to be needed to keep the projects alive, that as State governments in the future change and their attitude towards these operations change and as administrations change and perhaps their attitude toward this initiative changes, that the last thing we need is for this program to have to experience the planned uncertainty of sunset provisions.

Normally, to put in legislation a mechanism whereby the procedure, the program will self-destruct sometime in the future, that has appealed to me and to others of my colleagues. But I do not think that we want to apply this self-destruct mechanism to these new educational initiatives.

It seems to me that will discourage participation from the beginning and help to thwart the very purpose for which they are created.

I will say in conclusion that these manufacturing centers are an important source of local information on a variety of topics of importance to manufacturers who wish to compete at home and abroad, and they ought to be here to stay. We ought not to put it out and say, well, we are going to put in here a mechanism whereby this initiative, this program, at a certain number of years, will self-destruct. In the event of a positive evaluation, that is the only way that the centers can be extended.

The Secretary of Commerce has responsibility to oversee the operation, and there will not be a question as to whether or not this initiative is extended unless there is a positive evaluation. So while I respect and admire my colleague from California, we believe that in this instance his well-meaning amendment should be rejected.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder how many Members of Congress ran in their districts last year saying that, "One of the things we ought to do to reform government is to have sunset provisions, to assure that programs don't go on and on and on forever without being reaffirmed, that we ought to have a way of getting rid of some of these programs somewhere along the line?"

There was a former President who said that the embodiment of eternal life on Earth is itself a Federal program. The ugly truth of the language that is in this bill is that we are going to perpetuate the idea that a Federal program, once created, is never-ending.

Let me tell my colleagues something, that was not the deal when this program was originally put in place. When this program was originally put in place, we very specifically wanted these manufacturing centers that were being created to go out on their own after a 6-year period.

Let me quote to you from the law that was passed at that time.

The law says that no funding be provided for a center, provided by the Department of Commerce, after the sixth year of operation of a center.

In other words, we gave them 6 years of funding.

After that period of time, they were supposed to have proved their worth to the community, and then they got their funding through private enterprise. In other words, we were taking public money and turning it over to private money. We were stopping spending money that increased the national debt, and we were putting the burden on industry, on all those rich people out there that we hear so often we ought to be grabbing for more of the resources of government.

What does this decide to do? It decides that those rich people ought not fund these centers but, instead, what we ought to do is continue to pile up public debt in order to fund these centers.

And so what the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER] has done is said that the language in this bill is really at odds with the law, that the sunset law that we put in place years ago ought to be upheld. We ought not to do what this bill does.

If we go to page 39 and we look at lines 1 through 16 on page 39 of the bill, we find this shocking retreat from reform. Here was an attempt in public law to do something real about sunset. For once, we had actually sunsetted a program. We had said, after 6 years the program gets no more public money.

Then we go to page 39 of the bill, and we find that we are retreating from that reform.

It is high time that we do something for real. Why are the American people disgusted with what goes on in the Congress? Because every time we do something phony, every time we tell them that we are doing something real about reform, they find out later on that it was just a phony.

Here we are, a few years later, and what we are saying is, that little job we did back a while ago, where we sunsetted a program, forget it. Buried down in page 39 of this bill we are just going to wipe out the sunset provision, and we are going to go right on spending money as though there was no tomorrow.

Guess what? It is money we are going to be piling on the backs of our kids, because this is all debt money that is being spent to fund these centers.

Now, if my colleagues want to continue to accumulate public debt, if they have no regard for the reforms of the past, if they want to continue to tell the American people that everything we do here in terms of reform is a phony, what they will do is support what the committee wants to do, because the committee bill wipes out the sunset provisions.

If they want to be a reformer, if they want to stick with the reforms of the past, if they want to do something about debt and deficit, if they want to stop spending the public money in places where the rich could actually pick up some of the tab, then what they will do is they will support the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER], because these manufacturing centers can, in fact, be sustained with private money. We do not need to go to the public till. We do not need to pile up more debt, and we do not need to abandon reform.

We can support the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER]. We can

retain the manufacturing centers, but we can retain them in the way that they were originally meant to be done.

□ 1310

So I would suggest that we do want to support what the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER] is suggesting here, and stand on the side of reform and good fiscal sense.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WALKER) there were—ayes 4, noes 7.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Evidently a quorum is not present. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 2 of rule XXIII, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the pending question following the quorum call. Members will record their presence by electronic device.

The call was taken by electronic device.

The following Members responded to their names:

[Roll No. 155]

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allard
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Armey
Bacchus (FL)
Bachus (AL)
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Beilenson
Bentley
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blackwell
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Byrne
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Castle
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooper
Coppersmith
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
de Lugo (VI)
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
Engel
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Faleomavaega (AS)
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Filner
Fingerhut
Fish
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Fowler
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Gallo
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Grams
Grandy
Green
Greenwood
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastings
Hayes
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hobson
Hochbrueckner
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Huffington
Hughes
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hutto
Hyde
Inglis
Inslee
Istook
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kopetski
Kreidler
Kyl
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lehman
Levin
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
Long
Lowey
Machtley
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Manzullo
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCloskey
McCollum
McCrery
McCurdy
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McKeon
McKinney
McMillan
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Meyers
Mfume
Mica
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Morella
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Norton (DC)
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pickle
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quillen
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Ravenel
Regula
Reynolds
Richardson
Ridge
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Romero-Barceló (PR)
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Santorum
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Schenk
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sharp
Shaw
Shays
Shepherd
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stump
Stupak
Sundquist
Swett
Swift
Synar
Talent
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas (WY)
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Underwood (GU)
Unsoeld
Upton
Valentine
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Washington
Waters
Watt
Weldon
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

□ 1336

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

RECORDED VOTE

The pending business is the demand of the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER] for a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 201, noes 221, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 156]

AYES—201

Allard
Andrews (TX)
Archer
Armey
Bachus (AL)
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bentley
Bereuter
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Chapman
Clinger
Coble
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Costello
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
Deal
DeFazio
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Fish
Fowler
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Gallegly
Gallo
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Grams
Grandy
Greenwood
Gunderson
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hefley
Herger
Hoagland
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Houghton
Huffington
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hutto
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jacobs
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, Sam
Kasich
Kennedy
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kyl
Lazio
Leach
Lehman
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
Machtley
Manzullo
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McKeon
McMillan
Meyers
Mica
Michel
Miller (FL)
Minge
Molinari
Moorhead
Morella
Murphy
Myers
Nussle
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Penny
Petri
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce (OH)
Quillen
Quinn
Ramstad
Ravenel
Regula
Ridge
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Royce
Santorum
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shays
Shepherd
Shuster
Skeen
Slattery
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Stupak
Sundquist
Talent
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Torkildsen
Upton
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Weldon
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—221

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Applegate
Bacchus (FL)
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (WI)
Beilenson
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bishop
Blackwell
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Byrne
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Clay

Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Cooper
Coppersmith
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
de Lugo (VI)
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Faleomavaega (AS)
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Fingerhut
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Glickman
Gonzalez
Green
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings
Hayes
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hochbrueckner
Hoke
Holden
Hoyer
Hughes
Inslee
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Kopetski
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
Laughlin
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Long
Lowey
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCurdy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Murtha
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Norton (DC)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pickle
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reynolds
Richardson
Roemer
Romero-Barceló (PR)
Rose
Rostenkowski
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Schenk
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sharp
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Spratt
Stark
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Swett
Swift
Synar
Tanner
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Unsoeld
Valentine
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Washington
Waters
Waxman
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NOT VOTING—15

Becerra
Collins (IL)
Gutierrez
Henry
Inhofe
Johnson (CT)
Lloyd
McCandless
McInnis
Roukema
Tucker
Underwood (GU)
Velázquez
Watt
Wilson

□ 1405

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Inhofe for, with Mr. Velázquez against.

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas and Mr. EDWARDS of Texas changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. BARTLETT OF MARYLAND

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I offer two amendments which are at the desk, and I ask unanimous consent they be considered en bloc. I make this request because my amendments would strike language contained in title II and title V of the bill. This request would expedite the process by considering them at once.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland:

Page 126, lines 16 through 24, strike section 504.

Page 127, line 1, redesignate section 505 as section 504.

Page 4, amend the table of contents by striking the item relating to section 504 and by striking "Sec. 505," and inserting in lieu thereof "Sec. 504.".

Page 44, line 7, through page 47, line 4, strike subtitle B.

Page 9, strike lines 8 and 9.

Page 2, amend the table of contents by striking "Subtitle A—Manufacturing Technology and Extension" and by striking the items relating to subtitle B of title II.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland that the amendments be considered en bloc?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BARTLETT] is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendments.

□ 1410

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, what these amendments do is strike language that would create manufacturing centers as a part of the National Science Foundation. There are four very good reasons to strike this language. First of all, there is a fundamental problem that basic research is not really consistent with manufacturing centers and the fundamental role of the National Science Foundation will change if it has a meaningful amount of manufacturing centers associated with it.

A second reason for striking this language is that we already have manufacturing centers associated with the Department of Commerce.

Further, there are already technology centers associated with the National Science Foundation. As a matter of fact, this year's recommended funding includes a 5-percent increase for the technology centers. Their charter is sufficiently broad to permit prototype manufacturing. So the intent of the manufacturing centers, even if you agree it is appropriate to the National Science Foundation, it is already permitted for the National Science Foundation to become involved in as a part of the language authorizing and supporting the technology centers.

Fourth, President Clinton has requested no money for manufacturing centers for the National Science Foundation.

So for these several reasons, the President has requested no money, there is no money in this bill for them, we already have manufacturing centers as a part of the Department of Commerce, and the National Science Foundation, even should there be a desire to do manufacturing there, already has that capability as a part of the technology centers.

Mr. Chairman, this would just create another level of bureaucracy, and it is not needed. I urge support for these two amendments.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendments.

Mr. Chairman, may I say initially that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BARTLETT] is one of the most valuable members of our Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and, in fact, is probably one of the very best qualified by virtue of his knowledge and background of any of the members of the committee.

I find the gentleman's amendment a little puzzling, however, because it strikes a very thin line. In principle I happen to agree with the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BARTLETT] that the primary purpose of the National Science Foundation is to support basic research and not to be diverted in any substantial way from that program. So I do not differ with him, and, in fact, I appreciate his continuing to focus on that very important goal.

The important fact, however, which the gentleman has already mentioned, is that the National Science Foundation is already doing this. It is doing it both in its engineering research centers and in its science and technology centers which the gentleman referred to.

These two initiatives, as a matter of fact, were developed under the Reagan administration and while Dr. Bloch was administrator of the NSF, and he came to NSF with a strong industry background. You might say, and I think it would be accurate to say, that both the Reagan administration and Dr. Bloch felt that the NSF needed the opportunity to show its relevance to important problems like the improvement of manufacturing in this country.

Mr. Chairman, there is a very serious danger when you do that that you may overdo it, and the gentleman is right in encouraging us to focus on it. But his suggestion that we should not be doing it and that this provision should be stricken from the bill, and then acknowledging we are already doing it and doing it under the guise of a technology center or engineering research center, seems to me to be a little, and I am not sure how to describe it, but it does cause me some problems.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know that there would be any great harm done if we just said, well, let them continue to do it under the guise of science and technology centers or engineering research centers, but the fact is that the Foundation wants to be recognized as

making a contribution to the improvement of manufacturing. The programs that they will support, and there is a very modest amount of money in the bill for this purpose, it is actually in the neighborhood of perhaps 1 percent of their budget. But to allow them to directly contribute to this admittedly important national goal, whether you think it should be a goal of the Government or the private sector, I think you would agree that it is very important to improve our manufacturing capability. And for them to come to the table with a special contribution, which is their ability to analyze these problems and to determine whether or not there may be a need for additional, not totally basic research, but relatively basic research, that is, it could be considered focused basic research, focused on problems, for example of metallurgy or something of that sort which could contribute to the improvement of manufacturing, I think that would be unwise.

The previous administration thought it was important that they have the ability to work in this area. I think one might correctly characterize what they are doing as an effort to more overtly get into something that has a very high priority for this country, but that is not an ignoble motive. If they can be helped to assist us in solving these problems and we recognize that through titling directly manufacturing technology, I honestly do not see the harm in doing that.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I am constrained to oppose the gentleman's amendment, and hope that it will be voted down.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, when the committee considered this particular amendment, this is an amendment that only lost by one vote in committee. There was a bipartisan vote in favor of the amendment of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BARTLETT], because the gentleman makes good sense with what he is doing. If you wonder why it makes good sense, take a look at the language in the bill. Please, I hope that Members will read the bill.

Mr. Chairman, we do not have people doing basic research into metallurgy in order to enhance manufacturing. Let me tell you what the bill says that we are asking the director of the National Science Foundation to do.

The bill says that we are asking him to identify areas of research in advanced manufacturing that offer the potential to improve U.S. productivity, competitiveness, employment, and sustainable economic growth.

What in the world does the director of a basic science agency, someone who is hired because of his expertise in basic science, know about employment or sustainable economic growth? I mean, those are research areas of great importance. They are exactly why we have a Department of Commerce. It is the reason why in the first amendment of the day, which the minority agreed to, we made the Commerce Department into the lead agency in this area.

We have manufacturing centers in the Commerce Department. It is exactly where the work should be done. It should be the Secretary of Commerce who is making decisions about productivity, competitiveness, employment, and sustainable economic growth, not the guy who is hired to carry out the basic research functions of the Federal Government.

Then you go further and if you read the bill you find out that the other thing we are now asking the head of our basic research agency to do is we are asking him to provide fellowships, on a cost-shared basis, to employees of U.S. companies with experience in manufacturing to serve for 1 or 2 years as instructors in manufacturing at community colleges.

Mr. Chairman, what in the world does that have to do with the basic research mission of the country? We are asking him in fact to make evaluations that have absolutely nothing to do with his expertise.

If you read further you will find out we are asking him also to establish a program to develop innovative curricula, courses, and materials for use by institutions of higher education for instruction in total quality management.

What in the world does the guy who is our basic science director know about total quality management and the development of curricula for higher education institutions?

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BARTLETT] makes absolute sense. If you read the language of this bill you find out that we are asking our basic science institution to begin doing all kinds of things that have absolutely nothing at all to do with developing the basic science foundation for this country.

□ 1420

In fact, because the President has asked for no money for this program, where the money is going to come from, to do all of these things that I just described, is out of the basic science moneys for the country.

Not only are we asking someone with no expertise in these areas to do something, but then we are going to rob the basic science accounts in order to pay for this turkey. It makes no sense at all.

Why we are doing this is beyond my belief. If we want to create manufacturing centers, we have already got them. We have them at the Department of Commerce. Why in the world are we coming over and doing them at the National Science Foundation? It is exactly the discussion the chairman and I had, as we opened the debate today.

We have all these agencies that have now decided, evidently, for people in support of these agencies who have now decided that this is the sexy, new thing.

We are going to all be out there doing manufacturing innovation, and so we are going to have them at the Science Foundation, and we are going to have them at NASA, we are going to have them at Commerce. We are going to have them at Energy. Who knows, we will probably even have it at the Department of State before we are done here. Maybe we can set them up in Bosnia and solve all the problems of Bosnia with manufacturing centers.

One place they ought not to be is in the National Science Foundation. This does not even have anything to do with the charter of the National Science Foundation.

I mean, we can find no justification for doing this at all. So the gentleman is absolutely right. Let us do what the President wants on this. Let us strike the money. The President did not ask for any money on this. Let us just strike this out. We do not lose any manufacturing centers.

We still have the Department of Commerce. All we do is assure the National Science Foundation is not burdened with something that they ought not to be doing.

Support the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, we thought that we were accomplishing a purpose here that would find favor, finally, in the eyes of the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania and others. We thought that we were underscoring a Republican initiative.

The engineering research centers, Mr. Chairman, were a Republican initiative. They were created by President Reagan in 1985 and supported by President Bush.

We have got photographs here that show former President Reagan at Purdue University, the NSF, National Science Foundation Engineering Research Center. Further pictures are here to prove that he was there. He is writing his name on the blackboard.

Mr. Chairman, as I understand the position which has been presented by the gentleman from Maryland in support of this amendment, he says that the NSF's mission is science and not applied engineering. Manufacturing, R&D is an inappropriate role.

Our response is that the gentleman is wrong. The Organic Act of the National Science Foundation, section 3(c), provides that the Foundation is authorized to initiate and support, to initiate and support scientific and engineering research, including applied research.

The National Science Foundation Board, the advisory board to the NSF, issued a report last year entitled "A Foundation for the 21st Century."

In this report, they strongly urged NSF to increase its support of R&D relevant to industry, especially recommending greater support for engineering research and R&D.

NSF is already involved, Mr. Chairman. We seek to write into this bill a position really supporting what NSF has done in the past, is qualified to do, and encouraging them to proceed.

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

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

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina is very kind, and he has correctly pointed out the Organic Act provisions that support this and so on.

In fact, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BARTLETT] admitted that the National Science Foundation was actually doing some of the things that we are talking about here.

I would like to emulate the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] and ask that we read the bill, because what the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BARTLETT] proposes to strike is really not the manufacturing research centers. He is proposing to strike the language that reads as follows:

> The Director shall work with U.S. companies to identify areas of research in advanced manufacturing technologies that offer the potential to improve the U.S. productivity.

Now, we cooperate with industry. We identify areas of research. That is what the Science Foundation is for.

Furthermore, in subparagraph (2) it goes on to say, "support research at U.S. universities to improve advanced manufacturing technologies."

We are not talking about the National Science Foundation doing what the gentleman already admits they are doing, financing manufacturing research centers, engineering research centers, science and technology centers. We are talking about selecting the areas of research and then helping the universities to support that kind of research.

I think the gentleman is really trying to make a very fine distinction here, which the facts, the history really do not support.

This is totally in line with the mission of the National Science Foundation. And to the extent, as the gentleman has already admitted, that it involves support of actual manufacturing research activities, they are already doing it.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in support of the amendment.

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

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, because I am glad the chairman agreed with me. We ought to read the bill.

The point that I was attempting to make was that in order for the Director to find out whether technologies and practices offer potential to improve productivity, competitiveness, employment, and sustainable economic growth, the Director will have to make those evaluations.

He will have to decide whether or not the technologies that he is dealing with do those things.

My point is, the Director for basic research for the country has no expertise with which to make those judgments. And now we are asking him to make the judgments.

I am fascinated that the gentleman from North Carolina says that the reason why we ought to do this is because President Reagan put in place engineering centers. For weeks I have heard on the floor the judgment made that the Reagan administration and the Bush administration spent all of this money during the period of the 1980's and racked up $3 trillion in debt.

Now, when we want to rack up another $1.5 billion in debt, what do we use to justify that? Well, the Reagan people did it.

I would suggest that maybe this is one of the places where they made a mistake, and maybe it is time to withdraw that.

I thought we had a new Democrat in the White House. Perhaps we do, because this new Democrat in the White House does not want this money. He has not proposed it, and yet the Democrats in the Congress come to us. And what do they want? They want to spend the money despite the fact that the President does not want to and because the administration that put us $3 trillion in debt said we ought to do it.

Now, I have trouble with that logic. I would suggest that if we want to be fiscally responsible and stop adding to the debt, maybe we ought to support the President of the United States, Mr. Clinton, and say no to this money.

It would be a place where we could cut. We do not need to spend it. It is not a good place to spend it. Let us not do it.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALVERT. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania. He makes the point very eloquently.

I do not think that because the Reagan administration made what I think was a mistake in getting the National Science Foundation involved in things other than basic science that we should continue further down that wrong road.

□ 1430

I would simply submit that apparently this present administration agrees with us, because President Clinton has asked for no money for this activity.

There is no reason at all to create another layer of bureaucracy, one that is simply going to hurt a very good institution that has a very noble role to play. This is not the right way to go for the National Science Foundation.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to close by saying two freshman Democrats voted for this amendment, and it is certainly a reform amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. LANCASTER). The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BARTLETT].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland) there were—ayes 8, noes 10.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 170, noes 248, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 157]

AYES—170

Allard
Applegate
Archer
Armey
Bachus (AL)
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bentley
Bereuter
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehner
Bonilla
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Clinger
Coble
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Emerson
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Fish
Fowler
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Gallegly
Gallo
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Grams
Grandy
Greenwood
Gunderson
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hefley
Herger
Hoagland
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Houghton
Huffington
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Kasich
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kyl
Lazio
Leach
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
Machtley
Manzullo
McCollum
McDade
McHugh
McKeon
McMillan
Meyers
Mica
Michel
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Moorhead
Myers
Nussle
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Paxon
Penny
Petri
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Ramstad
Ravenel
Regula
Ridge
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Santorum
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Sundquist
Talent
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Torkildsen
Upton
Walker

Walsh
Weldon
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zimmer

NOES—248

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Bacchus (FL)
Baesler
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (WI)
Beilenson
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bishop
Blackwell
Boehlert
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Cooper
Coppersmith
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
de Lugo (VI)
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Engel
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Eshoo
Evans
Faleomavaega (AS)
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Fingerhut
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings
Hayes
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hochbrueckner
Holden
Hoyer
Hughes
Hutto
Inslee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Klein
Klink
Kopetski
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lehman
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Long
Lowey
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCloskey
McCrery
McCurdy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Morella
Murphy
Murtha
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Norton (DC)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pickle
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Richardson
Roemer
Romero-Barceló (PR)
Rose
Rostenkowski
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Schenk
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sharp
Shepherd
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Smith (NJ)
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Swett
Swift
Synar
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Underwood (GU)
Unsoeld
Valentine
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Washington
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wheat
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NOT VOTING—19

Becerra
Byrne
Collins (IL)
Gutierrez
Henry
Inhofe
Kleczka
Lipinski
Lloyd
McInnis
Meek
Quillen
Reynolds
Rush
Tucker
Velázquez
Vucanovich
Whitten
Zeliff

□ 1455

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Inhofe for, with Ms. Velázquez against.

Messrs. LAZIO, POSHARD, and BARTON of Texas changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendments were rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. LANCASTER). Are there further amendments to title II?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MANTON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MANTON: Page 35, lines 4 through 15, strike paragraphs (20) and (21) and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(20) the term 'United States company' means an entity which the Secretary finds, based on a demonstration by such entity—

"(A) maintains substantial employment in the United States;

"(B) agrees, with respect to a technology arising from assistance provided under this Act or the National Competitiveness Act of 1993, to promote the manufacture within the United States of products resulting from that technology;

"(C) agrees to procure parts and materials for such products from competitive United States suppliers; and

"(D) either—

"(i) is a United States-owned company; or

"(ii) is a company incorporated in the United States that has a parent company incorporated in a country which the Secretary finds—

"(I) affords to United States-owned companies opportunities comparable to those afforded to any other company to participate in programs and to have access to resources and information equivalent to the opportunities authorized under this Act or the National Competitiveness Act of 1993 to foreign-owned entities engaged in commerce in the United States;

"(II) has a standards development and conformity assessment process that is open and transparent, and that results in standards that are fair and reasonable and do not discriminate against United States products and production processes;

"(III) affords to United States-owned companies local investment opportunities comparable to those afforded any other company; and

"(IV) affords adequate and effective protection for the intellectual property rights of United States-owned companies;

"(21) the term 'United States manufacturer' means a United States company which the Secretary finds, based on a demonstration by such company, makes substantial investments in the United States in research, development, and manufacturing (including the manufacture of major components or subassemblies in the United States);

"(22) the term 'United States-owned company' has the meaning given such term in section 28(j)(2) of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278n(j)(2));

Page 35, lines 16 and 19, redesignate paragraphs (22) and (23) as paragraphs (23) and (24), respectively.

Mr. MANTON (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. MANTON. Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS], who is the chairman of the Subcommittee on Commerce, Consumer Protection and Competitiveness, of which I am a member, would be making this amendment, but she is in Chicago on official business with the Vice President. So, therefore, as a member of the committee, let me say that we, the Subcommittee on Commerce, Consumer Protection and Competitiveness, of which I am a member, has followed the Science Committee's work on H.R. 820. Many of the competitiveness issues addressed in the bill have also been considered by our subcommittee.

Rather than ask for a sequential referral of the bill, the Committee on Energy and Commerce has worked with the chairman of the Science Committee to develop an amendment which addresses my concerns.

I am pleased to be offering this amendment with the support of both Chairman BROWN and the manager of the bill Mr. VALENTINE.

My amendment does one very important thing: It ensures that in order for a foreign-owned firm to participate in the competitiveness programs and resources authorized by this legislation, U.S. firms must have reciprocal access to competitiveness programs and resources in the foreign owner's country.

Simple fairness dictates that we not give foreign firms opportunities to improve their competitiveness, if the home countries of those foreign firms deny U.S. firms access to their competitiveness programs and resources.

In addition, the amendment requires foreign countries to maintain an open and transparent standards development process that does not discriminate against U.S. products and production processes, in order for their firms to be eligible to benefit from the programs and resources authorized by this legislation.

The importance of having these conditions is clear when we consider that the purpose of this bill is to transfer technology and expertise in order to make companies more competitive.

These programs include such things as federally funded manufacturing technology centers that would be set up throughout the country to help U.S. companies learn and apply the technologies, techniques, and processes associated with systems management technology, electronic data exchange, or improving manufacturing productivity. The bill also sets up a loan and loan guarantee program to help small-

and medium-sized businesses develop critical and advanced technologies.

By participating in these programs, foreign firms not only get access to technology, but also learn a great deal about the technological competitiveness of their U.S. competitors.

It is simply contrary to the interest of U.S. firms for our Government to permit foreign participation in such programs, if foreign governments deny American firms access to their technology.

This amendment is consistent with the intent of the bill, as reported by the Science Committee, and I understand, has the support of the manager of the bill, Mr. VALENTINE.

The bill, as reported, referenced the definition of U.S. company found in the law authorizing joint ventures between Government and industry for advanced technology.

The definition required that in order for a foreign-owned company to participate in joint ventures, the foreign owner's country must not discriminate against U.S. companies in similar joint venture programs.

This amendment requires that there be reciprocity in foreign programs that are similar to those authorized under this bill.

Access for U.S. firms to foreign standards setting systems is a major concern of U.S. business. For example, the Chamber of Commerce has said that:

> Questions about EC standards policy currently lead the list of U.S. business concerns regarding Europe 1992.

A major U.S. business fear is that the European Community [EC] will institute product standards specifically designed to benefit EC industries.

For example, the European pipefitting industry recently tried to push through changes in the standard width of pipefittings which would have prevented the American pipefitting industry from selling to European Community nations.

In conclusion, I support this legislation and the contribution it would make to U.S. competitiveness.

With the changes that would be made by this amendment, I believe we can help make sure that the same advantages this bill would give to foreign firms in our country can be enjoyed also by U.S. firms operating abroad.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote for the amendment.

□ 1500

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is a purely protectionist amendment which is offered, as the gentleman described it perfectly. It is an attempt to introduce a very strong protectionist element into this bill. And I realize I am going to lose this argument. But I am going to make the argument in opposition so that it is there for the record.

Mr. Chairman, I realize this is going to be approved. In all honesty, I am not going to be real sad about it being approved, because I think it will make it impossible for the President to sign the bill. I think he will have so many problems with GATT, with this particular provision, that it will make it very difficult, if not impossible, for the bill to be signed with this amendment in this form. So, I am going to welcome that.

But I think we ought to know just exactly what this amendment does and how bad it is.

This is going to prevent, literally, hundreds of businesses in all of your districts from being eligible for the program. If your business, for instance, is foreign-owned, despite the fact that they may be doing the bulk of the manufacturing in this country, they may have been invited in here, Governors going around the world inviting companies in, trying to get them to become good American citizens. Well, sorry about that, but, "You won't be eligible under this amendment." This amendment says that all of those thousands of employees in your districts simply will not be eligible for participation in this program.

If you happen to have a big company that does some of its manufacturing outside the country, they may not be eligible under this. That also creates a problem despite the fact that they would be a wholly U.S.-owned company, they will not be able to participate under this program because they do not meet these very stringent conditions.

For instance, let me tell you about what they do in this: Under the present advanced technology programs, we say that under R&D programs there must be comparable opportunities provided in foreign countries to those provided in this country. Under this amendment it says there have to be equivalent opportunities. That is precise language. In other words, they will have to have R&D programs exactly like our program in other countries, or they will not be eligible. If anybody thinks that any country in the world is going to have a program that is exactly word for word like H.R. 820, I think they are just absolutely in dreamland. They must be smoking something that the President would not inhale if they think that that is the reality of what is going to happen.

And yet that is what this amendment says; it says absolute equivalency has to be adopted.

Then it also has this other qualification for U.S. companies that is very interesting. It says here that they have to agree to procure parts and materials for such products from competitive U.S. suppliers. Now, there is no exclusion in there for materials that may not even be available in this country. For instance, a lot of high-technology products are dependent on materials from overseas, things like rhodium and platinum and things like that that are not even available in this country. Well, you would not be able to include those in your high-technology product because you would not be able to buy them or you would not be a U.S. company anymore.

Now, that just does not make any sense. You have got to have the ability to shop in the global marketplace in order to get the products you need, at least the materials you need, in order to do this. If we had talked about parts, that is one thing, but when you talk about materials, that means raw materials. It means that the raw materials that our U.S. industry is dependent on from around the world they will not be able to use anymore in our high-technology products or the company would be rendered ineligible for this program.

Now, I do not think that that is what the author meant. I do not think that is what they intended to have happen. But that is the way the language is written. The language is bad language. It means that the companies are going to be in a terribly disastrous position and literally thousands of workers in your districts will be working for companies that under this particular provision will not be regarded as U.S. companies.

I think that is wrong. I think it is absolutely protectionist, that it makes no sense in a global environment. The gentleman says it expands U.S. competitiveness. No. What this really does is it says we believe there are many, many U.S. businesses that cannot compete in the world anymore and we want to protect them with bad stuff like this.

We ought to vote "no." I suspect the House will vote "yes." But when they do vote "yes," they are going to give the President of the United States one whale of a big problem in signing this bill.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity to commend the distinguished chairman of the Science and Technology Committee, Mr. BROWN of California, and the manager of H.R. 820, Mr. VALENTINE, for their cooperation in regards to this important legislation. Through their efforts our committees have been able to work together to address issues of concern to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

The amendment offered by Mr. MANTON is a result of their joint efforts and I believe it enjoys the support of these gentlemen, along with the efforts of Chairman CARDISS COLLINS of the committee, I strongly support it.

The amendment is clarifying in nature. It provides a new definition of the terms "United States manufacturer." That definition applies to American firms and to foreign-owned or con-

trolled firms. American firms should have no trouble meeting the conditions of this amendment.

It ensures that in order for a foreign-owned or controlled firm engaged in commerce in the United States to participate in the competitiveness programs and resources authorized by this legislation, American firms must have reciprocal access to competitiveness programs and resources in the foreign owner's country. Simple fairness dictates that we not give foreign firms our technology and opportunities to improve their competitiveness, if the home countries of those foreign firms deny American firms access to their competitiveness programs and resources.

In addition, the amendment would require the Secretary of Commerce on a case-by-case basis to find, for example, that foreign countries maintain an open and transparent standards development process that is fair and reasonable and does not discriminate against U.S. products and production processes. In order for foreign firms to be eligible to benefit from the programs and resources authorized by this legislation, they must demonstrate to the Secretary that such a finding is warranted.

The importance of having these conditions is clear when we consider that the purpose of this bill is to transfer technology and expertise in order to make companies more competitive.

These programs include such things as federally funded manufacturing technology centers that would be set up throughout the country primarily to help American companies learn and apply the technologies, techniques, and processes associated with systems management technology, electronic data exchange, or improving manufacturing productivity. The bill also sets up a loan and loan guarantee program to help small- and medium-sized businesses develop critical and advanced technologies. The bill does not deny such access to foreign-owned or controlled firms. It does, however, condition that access.

By participating in these programs, foreign firms not only get access to technology, but also learn a great deal about the technological competitiveness of their U.S. competitors. It is simply contrary to the interest of American firms for our Government to permit foreign participation in such programs, if foreign governments deny American firms access to their technology.

Access for U.S. firms to foreign standards setting systems is a major concern of U.S. business. For example, the Chamber of Commerce said, in a November 30, 1992, letter to me, that, "Questions about EC standards policy currently lead the list of U.S. business concerns regarding Europe 1992."

A major U.S. business fear is that the European Community [EC] will institute product standards specifically designed to benefit EC industries. For example, the European pipefitting industry recently tried to push through changes in the standard width of pipefittings which would have prevented the American pipefitting industry from selling to European Community nations.

Most importantly, the amendment makes clear that all companies provide substantial jobs in this country.

In conclusion, I support this legislation and the contribution it would make to U.S. competitiveness. With the changes that would be made by this amendment, I believe we can help make sure that the same advantages this bill would give to foreign firms in our country can be enjoyed also by U.S. firms operating abroad. I will work cooperatively with Chairman BROWN in any conference on this bill.

As far as the broader issue of technology transfer generally, we certainly have a number of important, competent, and highly qualified laboratories and research and development centers across the country. We need as a nation to develop coordinated policy which allows our labs, researchers, and private industry to flourish and to commercialize exciting new technology which will benefit our Nation.

The Energy and Commerce Committee's Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigation held a hearing on the status of our national technology transfer program on July 25, 1991. At that time we found that our Nation's commitment to competitiveness lacked a clear focus and coordinated mission and, without a more comprehensive approach, the competitiveness of U.S. industry could suffer.

Indeed the case could be made that our Nation's companies already suffer in their efforts at global competitiveness due to our lack of coordinated Federal policy. Most other countries already have national policies designed to facilitate the valuable relationship between federal research and commercial development. Instead of creating an adversarial relationship with private industry, other countries work with industry in many ways—even in the implementation and development of regulations and standards—which can give their industries competitive advantages in the world marketplace.

We must find ways to emulate those countries while not sacrificing our responsibilities. Our Government must do as much as possible to facilitate what promises to be a very worthwhile relationship between our Federal research facilities and our Nation's private industry. Indeed, the ability of American companies to compete globally will be affected by the careful implementation of this policy. This bill will help us move in that direction.

Let me also mention how important I believe the Department of Energy Labs are to this overall goal. We have assembled in those facilities some of the Nation's finest scientists and researchers. It is imperative that we find a sensible way to tap into that knowledge pool in a manner which ensures we can best realize the full commercial benefits of technology from those labs. I look forward to working with the administration and my colleagues to ensure we utilize these vital national resources. At the same time, I express concern that each individual Lab appears to be conducting their own negotiations in a manner that exasperates and frustrates U.S. industry. It is a costly process that our committee is examining and I hope that we can improve upon it. We need to increase the efficient use of this Nation's vast array of Federal resources, to maximize the commercialization of important technology, and to insure an overall national benefit from our Federal research and industrial commercialization.

I look forward to working with my colleagues as this bill and other legislative initiatives designed to improve our efficiency in this area move through the process. I also look forward to working with the administration which has been a leader on this issue during this Congress and should be commended for its efforts in this important area.

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, December 4, 1992.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This in response to your letter regarding the European Community (EC) standards process and the Department's related activities. The EC is our largest export market, accounting for more than $100 billion of U.S. exports, nearly 30 percent of our global total. U.S. exports to the EC have doubled since 1985, responding to expectations regarding the EC 1992 internal market program.

Much of the EC 1992 program concerns the harmonization of standards and their implementation. European standards provide the critical underpinning for the new EC regional testing and certification regime. This regime will affect more than half the value of U.S.-manufactured exports to the EC, a figure exceeding $50 billion in 1991. We have been working for three years to gain increased access for U.S. products by means of a more open standards regime in Europe.

We have made it a top priority to gain better access for U.S. businesses to European standards development since 1989. Our goal has been to ensure that the European standards development process is open and transparent and that the resulting standards do not discriminate against U.S. products and production processes. We have worked closely with U.S. private sector interests in this process including U.S. manufacturers, standards developers and the testing community. A detailed account of our dialogue on this issue with our EC Commission counterparts and European regional standards organizations was provided most recently at a hearing held June 9, 1992, before two subcommittees of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. Enclosed is copy of testimony given at

these hearings by the Department's Assistant Secretary for International Economic Policy.

We have had considerable success. In response to concerted U.S. government and private sector efforts, European standards developers have formally committed to giving first consideration in their standards development work to existing standards from the International Standards Organization (ISO) and the International Electrotechnical Commission (IEC), where the United States has a full "seat at the table." They have also taken steps to coordinate their regional work with ISO and IEC efforts, where possible.

Our close monitoring of EC standards development has shown that new EC standards relating to implementation of legal requirements established under EC internal market legislation do meet the "fair and reasonable" test in most instances. In those few cases where there is a potential for discrimination, or where new standards have no clear scientific basis, we have moved quickly to raise this at the highest levels with the EC. We continue to press the Europeans to open regional standards work to wider participation and to consider all available recognized standards before initiating new regional work.

As a case in point, last year the U.S. pipefittings industry reported efforts by European representatives to push through a revision of the international standards, which would have shut U.S.-manufactured fittings out of the European market. The U.S. industry initiated a formal appeal against the revision through the ISO, and we worked directly with EC Commission officials on the trade implications of this revision. The ISO upheld the U.S. appeal, and European standards officials agreed to comply with the ISO decision.

The Commerce Department, along with the U.S. Trade Representative's Office, recently initiated formal discussions with EC Commission officials on provisions for a U.S.-EC agreement on product conformity assessment. This would provide for EC recognition of U.S.-produced tests and certificates of conformity, and vice versa. Under this mutual recognition agreement (MRA), U.S. products could be certified directly to EC requirements by an independent third party located in the United States, using any relevant standards, including U.S. standards. This would greatly facilitate U.S. exports. Several U.S. industries have requested that the U.S. Government negotiate an MRA covering EC legal requirements relevant to their product areas, including information technology equipment, medical devices, pressure equipment and recreational craft.

Thank you for your interest in this important area. Should you wish to have a member of your staff discuss the question of EC standards in more detail, I would be delighted to have my office make the arrangements.

Sincerely,

BARBARA HACKMAN FRANKLIN.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE
OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Washington, DC, November 30, 1992.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce, House of Representatives, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. DINGELL: I received your November 12, 1992, letter of Secretary of Commerce Franklin regarding your concerns on the issue of EC product standards development and the implications for U.S. business The U.S. Chamber has been following Europe's standards development program closely since 1988. We consider it the most critical market access issue of the EC's internal market program, particularly for those U.S. companies exporting directly to the EC.

Enclosed is a series of U.S. Chamber reports on the EC 1992 program to keep U.S. business informed of the latest internal market developments. In each report, the issue of EC product standards, testing and certification requirements is highlighted. In addition, I am enclosing a paper entitled Product Standards in Europe's Internal Market: A Status Report for U.S. Business which highlights the opportunities and obstacles posed by these new product standards or American companies doing business with Europe.

Over the last four years, the U.S. Chamber has made its concerns known on the EC's standards, testing and certification program. We have worked closely with the Administration and the EC to ensure that U.S. Companies' access to the European market is not impeded because of these new product standards. The result has been greater transparency and openness in the EC's standards development process. This is largely due to the ongoing standards discussions between the U.S. Government and the EC. The next critical market access issue centers on the accompanying testing and certification requirements to indicate conformity to certain EC standards. U.S. exporters could be effectively shut out of the EC market if they find it difficult to test and certify their products to meet EC standards. The current negotiations to establish mutual recognition agreements and subcontracting arrangements will determine the degree of access extended to U.S. exporters. The Chamber will continue to be actively engaged on this issue.

If you have any additional questions on the Chamber's activities in this area, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

WILLARD A. WORKMAN.

Mr. Chairman, let me read what the Honorable Barbara Hackman Franklin had to say:

We have made it a top priority to gain better access for U.S. businesses to European standards development since 1989. Our goal has been to insure that the European standards development process is open and transparent and that the resulting standards do not discriminate against U.S. products and production processes.

That is all this amendment asks—that it is open and transparent, and that the resulting standards do not discriminate against American products and production processes. That is all we are asking here. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER]—and I say this with respect and affection—totally misreads the language of the amendment, totally misunderstands what it is, and I am sure that after he has had an opportunity to read it, he will probably support it.

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

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

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, to go back to the first page of the amendment where it says that they agree to procure parts and materials for such products from competitive U.S. suppliers, could the gentleman tell me what happens if those materials are not available in the United States?

□ 1510

Mr. DINGELL. Well, then, clearly they would not be available, because it has to be from competitive U.S. suppliers.

Mr. WALKER. It says in the amendment, Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, that you have to agree to procure the materials from competitive U.S. suppliers. If those materials are not available in the United States, it means that this amendment would prevent them from doing products that did not contain U.S. materials.

Mr. DINGELL. The amendment does not require them to procure supplies and materials from nonexistent U.S. suppliers, or suppliers who do not make that available.

I am sure that now that the gentleman understands this, he will be happy to support the amendment. I urge my colleagues to support the Manton amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

(At the request of Mr. WALKER, and by unanimous consent, Mr. DINGELL was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield on just one other point?

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

Mr. WALKER. The gentleman indicated that comparability was the standard here. If the gentleman will look on page 2 of the amendment, he will find that what has changed from the advanced technology program that presently governs this language is that the word "equivalency" is put in. That is an entirely different standard than the word "comparability," and the equivalency standard in fact is absolutely the same.

Now, that would be a very tough standard to meet because it really does mean that the language of this particular bill would have to be in effect in all other countries, if the gentleman will look on line 8.

Mr. DINGELL. Well, here is what the language of the law now says. It says:

(i) the company is a United States-owned company; or

(ii) the Secretary finds that the company is incorporated in the United States and has a parent company which is incorporated in a country which affords to United States-owned companies opportunities, comparable to those afforded to any other company, to participate in any joint venture similar to those authorized under this Act; affords to United States-owned companies local investment opportunities comparable to those afforded to any other company; and affords adequate and effective protection for the intellectual property rights of United States-owned companies.

I cannot believe that my good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, would be opposed to seeing to it that other countries would want their people to procure competitively priced American goods and services.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, he has made my point. He has read the current law which talks about a comparability standard, rather than an equivalency standard. The amendment before us substitutes the word "equivalent" for the word "comparable," which makes it a totally different test and one which will be very, very difficult for anybody to meet.

Mr. DINGELL. Let me help the gentleman, because the language is required under either current law, or under the language of the amendment to be comparable. It is at page 2, lines 4 and 5.

Mr. WALKER. Look at line 8.

Mr. DINGELL. It says opportunities, comparable to those afforded to any other company, to participate in programs and have access to resources and information that is paid for by the American taxpayer.

Mr. WALKER. The gentleman does not read far enough. He needs to go to line 8.

The CHAIRMAN. The additional time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] has expired.

Mr. VALENTINE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I want to suggest that one of the statements made by our esteemed friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, one of the statements that he made, I want to say that it is the exact absolute truth. I do not want to say the other things he has said in connection with this amendment are not the truth, but when the gentleman in his statement said that many foreign companies will not qualify, he is right. That is what it is about.

This amendment was designed, and I want to compliment the chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce and the author of the amendment. It improves the legislation substantially because it guarantees that the tax money coming from the American taxpayers into this program will not end up in the hands of foreign companies unless they do certain things. Those certain things are as follows, and I am amazed that the gentleman from Pennsylvania, of all people, would be opposed to this legislation and then suggest to us that a Democratic President might veto the bill.

Have they stood in the House too long and said what a President might veto or might not veto, to recognize the fact that we have a new man in the White House?

As we begin to develop new Government industry methods of cooperation, it is critical that taxpayers' money be used to create jobs in the United States, not overseas. That is what the amendment guarantees. We do not want this assistance to go to making jobs and investments overseas.

I am amazed that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] would want to suggest otherwise.

Therefore, to accomplish that, we have to limit this assistance in participation that these companies have and that the jobs and investments in this country are appropriate.

Finally, the amendment, the proposed definition, does not discriminate against foreign-owned subsidiaries doing business in the United States. It only says that they are permitted to participate in this program as long as their parent companies do not discriminate against U.S. companies doing business in their country. And what is wrong with that?

This legislation, I say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, with private capital, they can do anything they want to with it, but we are talking about money from the taxpayers of the United States.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I demand that the gentleman's words be taken down.

Mr. VALENTINE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman finds any problem with those words, I withdraw them.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I demand the words be taken down.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from North Carolina ask that the words be withdrawn?

Mr. VALENTINE. I have stated, Mr. Chairman, that if the gentleman finds any fault with any words that I have spoken, I withdraw those words. He has no control over my thoughts.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from North Carolina withdraws his words.

Mr. VALENTINE. I do, yes, Mr. Chairman.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, since the words were not taken down, how do we know which words he was withdrawing?

Mr. VALENTINE. I have withdrawn all words in my statement that apply to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Oh, the gentleman is withdrawing his entire statement then, if I understand correctly?

Mr. VALENTINE. Was it all offensive to the gentleman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman withdraws those words which refer to the gentleman from Pennsylvania. The other words will remain in the gentleman's statement.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the Chair.

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

I think there are two issues here. The first is the problem of Congress in identifying and bandying around the use of the term called protectionism and protection.

I maintain that Japan is the most protectionist nation in the world.

I maintain that most foreign countries deny American products due access, strip away American jobs, destroy our industrial and manufacturing base and have threatened our freedoms, and while we do that we get into philosophical debates and arguments about protectionism.

Now, let us take a look at the amendment. The reason it is being offered by the Committee on Energy and Commerce is because is that their own committee would not allow it to come up by one of its own members.

This is usually the language that I get in trouble on with these sophisticated Harvard graduates from the Ways and Means Committee, who in my opinion their policies are so dumb that if they threw them at the ground they would miss.

No. 1, this has nothing to do with protectionism. This amendment says that if a foreign firm has a subsidiary in America and that foreign country denies American firms in America an opportunity to participate in their programs, yes, they are being denied, shut out, shut down, closed off.

If President Clinton does not sign this, I do not think we elected a Democrat.

The American workers are tired of philosophical Members of Congress selling our jobs down the drain and bringing lame, half-witted protectionist debates here.

If this is protectionism, I am stone cold guilty, and proud of it.

I want to commend the Energy and Commerce Committee for bringing the amendment over. I think it is time that if we are going to open our flea market, let these other countries come in, treat them as favorably as we can, but when it is time to reciprocate—Sorry, Charlie—and then we get a bunch of people standing up debating the philosophical context of protectionism. Let us get off it.

If you vote against this amendment, here is what you are voting against. You want foreign countries who deny American manufacturers the opportunity to participate in their technology, you want to give them the opportunity, even though they screwed us, to be able to get it out of the goodness of our little legislative hearts.

□ 1520

Mr. Chairman, this is garbage. This gentleman does not think it goes far enough.

Mr. Chairman, I think our entire trade policy should say, "If you deny access to Uncle Sam, you are denied access until you open the doors. We want free trade, but we're not going to be held hostage by your illegal trade

and unfair trade practices, and, if you do that, we're not going to let a bunch of Members debate protectionism and try and scare us in our hometowns."

Just for the record, Mr. Chairman, the number of building permits declined in America, new claims for unemployment are up, the average work week for factories has decreased, consumer confidence is falling, orders for new commercial building and business equipment have declined; on, and on, and on.

Mr. Chairman, I think this amendment is very good. I would recommend to the House that they accept it, pass it overwhelmingly, and, hopefully, the White House will get the same message.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Is there further debate on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MANTON]?

If not, the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MANTON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title II?

If there are no further amendments to title II, the Clerk will designate title III.

The text of title III is as follows:

TITLE III—CRITICAL TECHNOLOGIES

Subtitle A—Benchmarking Science and Technology

SEC. 301. BENCHMARKING UNITED STATES SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY AGAINST FOREIGN CAPABILITIES.

The Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980, as amended by this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following new title:

"TITLE IV—BENCHMARKING SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

"SEC. 401. FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.

"(a) FINDINGS.—As other countries have gained strength in new technologies and as centers of technical excellence have developed around the world, it has become increasingly important for United States companies and research organizations to understand their scientific and technological capabilities relative to those of other global competitors.

"(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this title are to conduct and coordinate the collection, evaluation, and dissemination, to United States companies, State and local governments, and nonprofit organizations, of information on foreign science and technology, specifically information assessing foreign capabilities relative to comparable United States capabilities.

"SEC. 402. PROGRAM RESPONSIBILITIES.

"(a) DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE.—The Department of Commerce shall be the lead agency of the Federal Government in making available information for assessing the comparative strength of United States scientific and technological capabilities. The Secretary, acting through the Under Secretary, shall—

"(1) collect within the Federal Government and disseminate to United States companies, State and local governments, and nonprofit organizations information regarding foreign process and product research and technologies of importance to United States companies and the Federal Government, and regarding related technology assessment activities already underway in the Federal Government;

"(2) provide such information and analyses in electronic form, and ensure, consistent with confidentiality and security considerations, that they will be available through the clearinghouse to the outreach network created under section 303 of this Act;

"(3) work, in coordination with the Federal Coordinating Council for Science, Engineering, and Technology, as appropriate, to streamline Federal Government procedures for collecting, evaluating, and disseminating information analyzing foreign scientific and technological information; and

"(4) conduct appropriate planning for more comprehensive collection, evaluation, dissemination, and application of foreign science and technology information.

"(b) OTHER AGENCIES.—All executive departments and agencies shall assist the Secretary in carrying out this title.

"(c) ADDITIONAL AUTHORITIES.—The Secretary, acting through the Under Secretary, is authorized to—

"(1) arrange for access to information collected and developed under this title, in electronic form or otherwise, by authorized and interested parties, including charging and retaining fees;

"(2) provide for the collection of additional information to fulfill the purposes of this title;

"(3) provide for analysis of foreign research and development activities and technological capabilities, particularly in those areas where the United States is considered to be at par or lagging foreign capabilities or where foreign capabilities are projected to overtake those of the United States;

"(4) enter into joint ventures authorized under section 212(a)(1)(A) of Public Law 100–519 (15 U.S.C. 3704b(a)(1)(a)) in carrying out this title;

"(5) consult with users of such information, as appropriate, on the usefulness of available foreign scientific and technological information and on the need for additional information and assessment activities and consult with other affected agencies of the Federal Government to promote consistent and useful collection, assessment, and analysis of foreign technological information; and

"(6) establish and administer the fellowship program described in subsection (d).

"(d) FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM.—(1) The Secretary, acting through the Under Secretary, shall establish and administer a fellowship program to support Technology Fellows to assist the Under Secretary in carrying out activities under this title relating to those countries that are major competitors of the United States in critical technologies, and to identify opportunities for technology transfer to the United States or technological collaboration for United States industries.

"(2) Technology Fellows shall—

"(A) regularly report to the Department of Commerce on work planned, in progress, and accomplished; and

"(B) provide support to the Department of Commerce as requested by that Department.

"(3) Fellowships awarded under the program established under this subsection shall—

"(A) be awarded for a period of 2 years;

"(B) be reasonable and appropriate; and

"(C) include provisions for living and office arrangements in the host country.

"(4) Only individuals who—

"(A) have at least a bachelors degree in engineering or science; and

"(B) have at least 5 years of work experience in manufacturing or technology development,

shall be eligible for a fellowship under this program.".

Subtitle B—Advanced Technology Program

SEC. 321. DEVELOPMENT OF PROGRAM PLAN.

The Secretary, acting through the Under Secretary and the Director, shall, within 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, submit to the Congress a plan for the expansion of the Advanced Technology Program established under section 28 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278n), with specific consideration given to—

(1) closer coordination and cooperation with the Advanced Research Projects Agency and other Federal research and development agencies, including joint funding of large scale consortia, as appropriate;

(2) broadening of the scope of the program to include and focus on as many critical technologies identified pursuant to section 603(d) of the National Science and Technology Policy, Organization, and Priorities Act of 1976 (42 U.S.C. 6683(d)) as is appropriate; and

(3) changes that may be needed when annual funds available for awards and cooperative agreements under the Program reach levels of $200,000,000 and $500,000,000.

SEC. 322. LARGE SCALE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CONSORTIA.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.—The Secretary, acting through the Director, shall establish a program for the support of large-scale research and development consortia.

(b) SELECTION PROCEDURES AND REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) GENERAL RULE.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the selection and making of awards to large-scale research and development consortia under this section shall be carried out in accordance with procedures and requirements applicable to joint ventures described in section 28(b)(1) of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278n(b)(1)).

(2) EXCEPTION.—Notwithstanding section 28(b)(1)(B)(ii) of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278n(b)(1)(B)(ii)), for purposes of awards made under this section, a minority share of the cost of large-scale research and development consortia may be provided by the Federal Government for up to 7 years.

(c) PROJECT SELECTION.—Preference shall be given for selection under this section to large-scale research and development consortia that would not be undertaken by the private sector without a Federal investment of $50,000,000 or more per year.

(d) SELECTION CRITERIA.—In selecting large-scale research and development consortia under this section, the Secretary, acting through the Director, shall give priority to consortia that best achieve the following goals:

(1) Significant contribution to broad economic growth.

(2) Significant contribution to the national quality of life.

(3) Significant contribution to environmental sustainability.

(4) Promotion of private sector partnership with Federal research and development activities.

(5) Substantial improvement of the international competitiveness of United States companies.

(6) Involvement of several competitor firms in the development of the key consortia technologies.

(7) Strengthening of the linkages between domestic suppliers, systems developers, and end-users.

(8) Participation by domestic end-users from several industrial sectors.

(9) Promotion of the diffusion of nonproprietary information to United States companies through strong links with organizations such as trade and professional groups.

(e) INDEPENDENT TECHNICAL REVIEW.—The Secretary, through the Director, shall provide for technical review at least once every three years of large-scale research and development consortia receiving support under this section, by the National Institute of Standards and Technology, other national laboratories, the Department of Commerce Technology Advisory Board established under section 401 of this Act, or independent research organizations that are not a participant in the large-scale research and development consortium being reviewed. Such review shall be for the purpose of determining progress toward the objectives for which such large-scale research and development consortium was formed, with recommendations for improvement, funding adjustments, or termination of Federal support. The Secretary, through the Director, shall transmit to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate an annual status report summarizing significant accomplishments in achieving those objectives.

(f) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term "large-scale research and development consortia" means a joint venture described in section 28(b)(1) of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278n(b)(1)).

SEC. 323. TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.

Section 28 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278n) is amended—

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

"(k) Notwithstanding subsections (b)(1)(B)(ii) and (d)(3), the Director may grant an extension of not to exceed 6 months beyond the deadlines established under those subsections for joint venture and single applicant awardees to expend Federal funds to complete their projects, if such extension may be granted with no additional cost to the Federal Government.";

(2) in subsection (b)(2), by inserting ", and with independent research organizations" after "especially small businesses"; and

(3) in subsection (j)—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (1) and (2) as paragraphs (2) and (3), respectively; and

(B) by inserting before paragraph (2), as so redesignated, the following new paragraph:

"(1) the term 'independent research organizations' means nonprofit organizations organized primarily for the purpose of conducting or managing research activities;".

Subtitle C—Civilian Technology Loan Program

SEC. 331. LOAN AND LOAN GUARANTEE AUTHORITY.

To the extent provided in appropriation Acts, the Secretary, acting through the Under Secretary, may make, or enter into agreements to make, loans and loan guarantees, either directly or in cooperation with other lenders, to small and medium-sized qualified business concerns in accordance with this subtitle.

SEC. 332. OPERATING PLAN AND EFFECTIVE DATE.

(a) OPERATING PLAN.—The Secretary, acting through the Under Secretary, shall prepare (in consultation with the Advisory Committee established under section 344, other appropriate executive agencies, the States, United States companies, the financial community, and other appropriate parties) and submit to the Congress on or before November 1, 1993, an operating plan to carry out this subtitle. In preparing such plan, the Secretary shall consider and evaluate alternative approaches to achieving the purposes of this subtitle and shall develop recommendations, as appropriate, to fulfill the purposes of this subtitle in the most effective and efficient manner achievable. Such evaluations and recommendations shall be included in the plan submitted under this subsection.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Except as provided in subsection (a), the provisions of this subtitle shall take effect on October 1, 1994.

SEC. 333. TERMS AND CONDITIONS.

Loans and loan guarantees made under section 331 shall be in such form and manner and under such terms and conditions as the Under Secretary may prescribe by regulation, and shall be subject to the following terms and conditions:

(1) Loans awarded or guaranteed shall be for sound financing of research, development, demonstration, or utilization of critical technologies or advanced technologies.

(2) Loans shall only be awarded or guaranteed if the Under Secretary finds that—

(A) sufficient collateral, which may include both tangible and intangible assets, is pledged; or

(B) the borrower is sufficiently financially sound,

to reasonably ensure repayment.

(3) Loans awarded or guaranteed may not exceed 50 percent of total eligible project costs. For purposes of this section, the term "eligible project costs" shall be defined by the Under Secretary by regulation.

(4) The total principal amount of outstanding loans awarded or guaranteed to a single borrower may not exceed $2,000,000 at any time.

(5) Loans awarded or guaranteed shall be senior to any other debt obligations of the borrower, except to the extent that the Under Secretary considers necessary to accommodate the borrower's ability to raise sufficient debt or equity capital from non-Federal sources to pay the balance of eligible project costs that are not covered by such loans.

(6) Interest on a loan, or portion of a loan, awarded or guaranteed by the Federal Government under this subtitle shall be at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, at the time such loan is made, to equal the then current average market yield on outstanding debt obligations of the United States with remaining periods to maturity comparable to the maturity of such loan, plus an additional charge of up to 1 percent applied by the Under Secretary to cover expected defaults and reasonable administrative costs of carrying out this subtitle. For purposes of this section, the term "default" shall be defined by the Under Secretary by regulation.

(7) Except as provided in paragraph (8), the maturity of loans awarded or guaranteed under this subtitle may not be less than 2 years or greater than—

(A) 10 years; or

(B) the useful life of property, plant, equipment, or other assets, as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, which have been pledged as collateral for such loan,

whichever is greater.

(8) The Under Secretary may extend the maturity of or renew a loan or extend the guarantee of a loan for additional periods, not to exceed 5 years, only if such extension or renewal will aid in the orderly liquidation of such loan.

(9) Payment of interest on direct loans made by the Federal Government under this subtitle may be deferred by the borrower, upon approval by the Under Secretary, only to the extent that the borrower has established to the satisfaction of the Under Secretary that the borrower has not realized sufficient earnings and returns of capital to make such payment without incurring undue financial hardship, and that there is a reasonable prospect that such loan and interest thereon will be repaid.

(10) The Under Secretary may guarantee payment of 100 percent of principal and interest on a loan made under section 331.

(11) The Under Secretary may establish, charge, and regulate fees to cover loan origination and servicing costs that are reasonable and necessary.

SEC. 334. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR LENDERS AND BORROWERS.

The Secretary, acting through the Under Secretary, shall, upon request, provide technical assistance and services, as appropriate and needed, to lenders and borrowers under this subtitle, and shall ensure that such lenders and borrowers have ready access to appropriate assistance available under title III of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980, or under any other Act, in order to aid such lenders and borrowers in achieving the purposes described in section 333(1). The Secretary may charge fees for technical assistance and services provided under this section in amounts sufficient to cover the reasonable cost of such assistance and services. The Secretary may waive such fees on a case-by-case basis. Fees paid to the United States under this section shall be deposited in an account established by the Under Secretary and shall be available solely for carrying out this subtitle, to the extent provided in advance in appropriations Acts.

SEC. 335. OUTREACH TO ECONOMICALLY DEPRESSED AREAS.

The Secretary, acting through the Under Secretary, shall seek to ensure that qualified business concerns located in areas determined by the Secretary to have a depressed economy, or a significant concentration of defense-related industries, or chronically high unemployment, are notified of the availability of financial assistance through the program established under this subtitle and, to the extent practicable, to encourage and facilitate the participation of such qualified business concerns in such program.

SEC. 336. SOCIALLY AND ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED INDIVIDUALS.

The Secretary shall, to the fullest extent possible, ensure that at least 10 percent of amounts loaned under this subtitle shall be made available to qualified business concerns owned or controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals (within the meaning of section 8(a) (5) and (6) of the Small Business Act, and including women).

SEC. 337. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this subtitle, the terms "advanced technologies", "critical technologies", and "qualified business concern" have the meaning given such terms in section 342 of this Act.

Subtitle D—Civilian Technology Development Program

SEC. 341. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the "Civilian Technology Development Act of 1993".

SEC. 342. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this subtitle—

(1) the term "advanced technologies" means technologies eligible for assistance under the Advanced Technology Program established under section 28 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278n);

(2) the term "articles" means articles of incorporation for an incorporated body, and the functional equivalent, or other similar documents specified by the Under Secretary, for other business entities;

(3) the term "critical technologies" means technologies identified as critical technologies pursuant to section 603(d) of the National Science and Technology Policy, Organization, and Priorities Act of 1976 (42 U.S.C. 6683(d));

(4) the term "Department" means the Department of Commerce;

(5) the term "executive agency" has the meaning given such term in section 105 of title 5, United States Code;

(6) the term "license" means a license issued by the Under Secretary under section 345;

(7) the term "licensee" means a company licensed under section 345;

(8) the term "preferred securities" means preferred stock or a preferred limited partnership interest or other similar security, as defined by the Under Secretary by regulation;

(9) the term "private equity capital" means the paid-in capital and paid-in surplus, on hand or legally committed to be provided, of a licensee organized as a corporation, or the partnership capital, on hand or legally committed to be provided, of a licensee organized as an unincorporated partnership, but does not include any funds—

(A) borrowed by the licensee from any source;

(B) obtained from the sale of preferred securities; or

(C) derived directly or indirectly from any Federal source;

(10) the term "qualified business concern" means a United States company described in section 28(d)(9)(B) of the National Institute Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278n(d)(9)(B)), if—

(A) the business of such company includes the pursuit, under the Small Business Innovation Research (SBIR) program, of applications described in section 9(e)(4)(C) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(e)(4)(C));

(B) the principal business of such company is the development or application of a critical technology;

(C) such company is eligible for assistance under the Advanced Technology Program (ATP) established under section 28 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278n); or

(D) such company is principally engaged in the development or exploitation of inventions, technological improvements, new processes, or products not previously generally available (within the meaning of section 851(e)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986);

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

(12) the term "State sponsored licensee" means a company licensed under section 345 in which a State or instrumentality of a State has at least a 25 percent investment interest in the private equity capital of such licensee;

(13) the term "university sponsored licensee" means a company licensed under section 345 in which a single university or consortium of universities has at least a 25 percent investment interest in the private equity capital of such licensee; and

(14) the term "venture capital" means consideration for such—

(A) common stock;

(B) preferred stock;

(C) debt with equity features which may include equity warrants or rights to convert into common stock and which provides for interest payments contingent upon and limited to the extent of earnings; or

(D) other financing,

as the Under Secretary determines to be substantially similar to equity financing, issued by a qualified business concern.

SEC. 343. ESTABLISHMENT AND PURPOSE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established within the Technology Administration of the Department of Commerce a national program to stimulate and supplement the availability of long-term investment capital for the formation, development, and growth of qualified business concerns throughout the United States. The Secretary, through the Under Secretary, shall, through such program, provide for the selection, licensing, monitoring, and financial and technical support of professionally managed technology investment companies which in turn shall provide financial, management, and technical assistance to qualified business concerns, with preference given to satisfying the seed and early-stage financing needs of such concerns that are not being met by other sources on reasonable terms.

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this subtitle are—

(1) to contribute to United States economic competitiveness, employment, and prosperity;

(2) to promote the advancement, maturation, and application of critical and other advanced technologies;

(3) to supplement and stimulate long-term investment in qualified business concerns; and

(4) to encourage and facilitate the formation and growth of professionally managed technology investment companies throughout the United States that will give preference to satisfying the capital needs of qualified business concerns, especially during their early stages of development.

(c) RESPONSIBILITIES.—(1) In carrying out this subtitle, the Secretary, acting through the Under Secretary, and subject to the availability of appropriations, shall—

(A) consult with and, to the extent permitted by law, utilize the capabilities of other executive agencies, as appropriate, to ensure the efficient and effective implementation of this subtitle;

(B) explore, with other executive agencies, ways to avoid duplication of effort by consolidating the administration of the program established by this subtitle with any other similar Federal program, and as part of such consolidation may delegate administrative functions, as necessary and appropriate, to another executive agency; and

(C) consult with the Secretary of Energy on all policy matters related to the Civilian Technology Development Program that deal with development or utilization of energy technologies.

(2) To the extent permitted by law, other executive agencies shall cooperate with the Under Secretary in carrying out this subtitle.

(d) OPERATING PLAN.—The Secretary, acting through the Under Secretary, shall prepare (in consultation with the Advisory Committee established under section 344, other appropriate executive agencies, the States, United States companies, the financial community, and other appropriate parties) and submit to the Congress on or about November 1, 1993, an operating plan to carry out this subtitle. In preparing such plan, the Secretary shall consider and evaluate alternative approaches to achieving the purposes of this subtitle and shall develop recommendations, as appropriate, to fulfill the purposes of this subtitle in the most effective and efficient manner achievable. Such evaluations and recommendations shall be included in the plan submitted under this subsection.

(e) OUTREACH TO ECONOMICALLY DEPRESSED AREAS.—The Secretary, acting through the Under Secretary, shall seek to ensure that qualified business concerns located in areas determined by the Secretary to have a depressed economy, or a significant concentration of defense-related industries, or chronically high unemployment, are notified of the availability of financial assistance through the program established under this subtitle and, to the extent practicable, to encourage and facilitate the participation of such qualified business concerns in such program.

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Except as provided in subsection (d) and in sections 344 and 351(a), the provisions of this subtitle shall take effect on October 1, 1994.

SEC. 344. ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established a Civilian Technology Development Advisory Committee (in this section referred to as the "CTD Advisory Committee").

(b) COMPOSITION.—The CTD Advisory Committee shall be composed of 7 members, appointed by the Under Secretary from among private individuals who, because of their experience and accomplishments in technology development, maturation, and adoption, business development, venture capital, finance, or other relevant areas, are exceptionally qualified to perform the duties of the CTD Advisory Committee. The Under Secretary shall designate 1 member to serve as chairman.

(c) DUTIES.—The duties of the CTD Advisory Committee shall include advising the Under Secretary on all matters related to policy, planning, execution, and evaluation of the program established under this subtitle.

(d) TERMINATION.—Section 14 of the Federal Advisory Committee Act shall not apply to the CTD Advisory Committee.

SEC. 345. ORGANIZATION AND LICENSING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Any incorporated body, limited partnership, or State instrumentality organized and chartered or otherwise existing under State law for the purpose of performing the functions and conducting the activities contemplated under this subtitle, that possesses the powers, capabilities, and expertise reasonably necessary to perform such functions and conduct such activities, may apply for a license under this subtitle in such form and manner as the Under Secretary may prescribe.

(b) ARTICLES.—The articles of any applicant shall specify in general terms the objects for which the applicant is formed, the name assumed by such applicant, the area or areas in which its operations are to be carried on, the place where its principal office is to be located, and the amount and classes of its shares of capital stock. Such articles may contain any other provisions not inconsistent with this subtitle that the applicant may see fit to adopt for the regulation of its business and the conduct of its affairs. Such articles and any amendments thereto adopted from time to time shall be subject to the approval of the Under Secretary.

(c) BUSINESS PLAN.—The business plan of any applicant shall specify in general terms—

(1) how the applicant proposes to achieve the objects for which it is formed, to operate and govern its business, and to fulfill the purposes and satisfy the requirements of this subtitle;

(2) the board members or general partners and the management and professional staff of the applicant, and the professional training, experience, reputation, and investment performance record, if any, of each such individual, along with a description of the applicant's current and proposed management structure;

(3) all current or committed private investors in the applicant, together with the amount, terms, conditions, and conveyances associated with such investment, and appropriate background information on each private investor; and

(4) such other information as the Under Secretary may require.

Such business plan and any material amendments thereto adopted from time to time shall be subject to the approval of the Under Secretary.

(d) APPROVAL OF ARTICLES AND BUSINESS PLAN; LICENSING.—The articles and business plan of an applicant for a license shall be forwarded to the Under Secretary for consideration and approval or disapproval. In determining whether to approve a prospective licensee's articles and business plan and permit it to operate under the provisions of this subtitle, the Under Secretary shall give due regard, among other things, to the general business reputation, character, suitability, and demonstrated ability, experience, and performance in the development, growth, and financing of qualified business con-

cerns, of the proposed owners and management of the prospective licensee, and the likelihood of successful operations of the prospective licensee including adequate profitability and financial soundness. After consideration of all relevant factors, if the Under Secretary approves the company's articles and business plan and determines that the applicant satisfies or will satisfy the requirements of this subtitle, the Under Secretary may approve the company to operate under the provisions of this subtitle and issue the company a license for such operation.

SEC. 346. CAPITAL AND MANAGEMENT REQUIREMENTS.

(a) CAPITAL.—(1) The private equity capital of a licensee shall be adequate to ensure a reasonable prospect that the licensee will be operated soundly and profitably, and managed actively and prudently in accordance with its articles and business plan. Such private equity capital shall not be less than $5,000,000, except that, in the case of a State sponsored licensee or a university sponsored licensee, such private equity capital shall not be less than $2,500,000. At the time of issuance of a license, not less than 75 percent of the private equity capital of the licensee shall be available or committed to be available for new investment in accordance with this subtitle.

(2) Private and public pension funds may contribute to the private equity capital of a licensee without restriction as to the amount of such contribution.

(3) State and local government entities may contribute not more than 40 percent of the total private equity capital of a licensee.

(4) The aggregate amount of shares in any such licensee or licensees which may be owned or controlled by any stockholder, or by any group or class of stockholders, may be limited by the Under Secretary.

(b) MANAGEMENT.—The management and operational control of a licensee shall be carried out by suitable private individuals who possess the professional training, experience, and capabilities reasonably necessary to achieve the purposes of this subtitle.

SEC. 347. FINANCING FOR LICENSEES.

(a) AUTHORITY TO PURCHASE AND GUARANTEE PREFERRED SECURITIES.—To encourage and facilitate the formation and growth of licensees and qualified business concerns, the Under Secretary may purchase or commit to purchase nonvoting preferred securities, with or without equity warrants, issued by a licensee, or guarantee, or commit to guarantee, the payment of 100 percent of the redemption price of and dividends on such preferred securities, to the extent provided in appropriations Acts, if the licensee has demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Under Secretary that it is financially sound and that it has complied with or will comply with the requirements of this subtitle, the terms of its license, and any rule, regulation, or order issued under this subtitle. Such purchases and guarantees shall constitute direct loans and loan guarantees within the meaning of paragraphs (1) and (3) of section 502 of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990, respectively. A trust or pool acting on behalf of the Under Secretary may purchase preferred securities that are guaranteed under this subsection.

(b) TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF PREFERRED SECURITIES.—(1) Guarantees and purchases of preferred securities, or commitments to make such guarantees and purchases, under this section may be made on such terms and conditions as the Under Secretary shall establish by regulation or set forth in contract to ensure compliance with this subtitle and to protect the interests of taxpayers and the United States in the event of default or otherwise. For purposes of this paragraph, the Under Secretary shall by regulation define the term "default".

(2)(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), preferred securities issued under this section shall be senior in priority for all purposes to all non-Federal equity interests in a licensee unless the Under Secretary, in the exercise of reasonable investment prudence and in considering the financial soundness of the licensee, determines otherwise.

(B) The equity interests of a university or consortium of universities, or of a State or instrumentality of a State, in a licensee shall be equal in priority to Federal equity interests in such licensee for all purposes unless the Under Secretary, in the exercise of reasonable investment prudence and in considering the financial soundness of the licensee, determines otherwise.

(3) Preferred securities issued under this section shall be redeemed by the issuer not later than 10 years after their date of issuance for an amount equal to 100 percent of the original issue price plus any accrued and unpaid dividends. In order to facilitate the orderly liquidation of a licensee's investments, redemption of such preferred securities may be extended by mutual consent for no more than 5 years beyond such expiration date.

(4) Preferred securities issued under this section shall pay dividends at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury at the time of issuance to equal the then current average market yield on outstanding marketable debt obligations of the United States with remaining periods to maturity comparable to the time to required redemption of such preferred securities, plus such additional charge, if any, toward covering expected defaults and reasonable administrative costs of carrying out this subtitle as the Under Secretary may determine to be reasonable and appropriate. Such additional charge shall not exceed 2 percent.

(5) Dividends on preferred securities issued under this section shall be cumulative and preferred and paid out of net realized earnings and returns of capital available for distribution, as defined by the Under Secretary by regulation.

(6) The payment of dividends on preferred securities issued under this section may be deferred by the issuer until such time as, and to the extent that, the issuer realizes earnings and returns of capital available for distribution. Accumulated and unpaid dividends on such preferred securities shall be paid by the issuer before or at the time of redemption of the preferred securities and before any distribution of net realized earnings and returns of capital of the issuer to its non-Federal equity investors, except as provided in subsection (e)(2) (B) and (C). With respect to preferred securities issued under this section to a party other than the Under Secretary, during the time of any deferral under this paragraph, the Under Secretary shall make, on behalf of the issuer, required dividend payments to the holder of the preferred securities, its agents or assigns, or the appropriate central registration agent, if any. The authority to make dividend payments provided in this paragraph shall be limited to the extent of amounts provided in advance in appropriations Acts for such purposes.

(7) For purposes of this subsection, the term "dividends" means dividends on preferred stock and returns on preferred limited partnership interests or other similar securities, as defined by the Under Secretary by regulation.

(c) LIMITATIONS AND RESTRICTIONS.—(1) The total principal amount of debt, as evidenced by notes, bonds, debentures, or certificates of indebtedness, plus the total face amount of preferred securities purchased or guaranteed by the Under Secretary under subsection (a), issued and outstanding from a licensee shall not exceed 200 percent of the private equity capital of the licensee.

(2) The total face amount of preferred securities purchased or guaranteed by the Under Secretary under subsection (a) and outstanding from a licensee or a combination of licensees which are commonly controlled, as defined and determined by the Under Secretary, shall not exceed $50,000,000.

(3)(A) If preferred securities issued under this section are outstanding, then the issuing licensee shall be subject to the following restrictions:

(i) The total principal amount of debt, as evidenced by notes, bonds, debentures, or certificates of indebtedness, of a licensee issued and outstanding may not exceed 50 percent of the private equity capital of the licensee.

(ii) The annual management expenses of a licensee shall not exceed an amount which the Under Secretary determines to be reasonable and appropriate.

(iii) The aggregate amount of obligations and securities acquired and for which commitments may be issued by a licensee for any single qualified business concern shall not exceed $2,000,000 or 20 percent of the private equity capital of such licensee, whichever is greater, unless the Under Secretary approves a greater amount.

(B) For purposes of this paragraph, the term "management expenses" includes expenses incurred in the normal course of operations, but shall not include the cost of legal, accounting, and consulting services provided by outside parties and by affiliates of the licensee which are not normal practice in making and monitoring investments consistent with the purposes of this subtitle.

(d) USE OF CAPITAL BY LICENSEES.—(1) A licensee issuing preferred securities under this section shall invest or commit to invest—

(A) an amount equal to the face value of such preferred securities that are outstanding; plus

(B) an amount of its private equity capital equal to 50 percent of the amount described in subparagraph (A),

in the venture capital of qualified business concerns in accordance with section 349.

(2) At least 50 percent of the amount of investments required under paragraph (1) shall be for seed and early stage financing, as defined by the Under Secretary by regulation. The Under Secretary may alter the percentage requirement under this paragraph to the extent necessary, in the determination of the Under Secretary, to achieve the purposes of this subtitle and maintain prudent investment diversification.

(3) Proceeds to a licensee derived from preferred securities issued under this section may be used by the issuer to redeem any preferred securities issued under this section that have been outstanding at least 5 years, as provided in subsection (b)(3).

(4) Proceeds to a licensee derived from preferred securities issued under this section that have not been invested pursuant to paragraphs (1) and (2) or used for redemptions pursuant to paragraph (3) and are not reasonably needed for the operations of the licensee shall be invested in direct obligations of, or obligations guaranteed as to principal and interest by, the United States, or in certificates of deposit maturing within one year or less, issued by any institution the accounts of which are insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

(e) PROFIT DISTRIBUTION BY LICENSEES.—(1) Any distribution of net realized earnings and returns of capital made by a licensee that exceeds amounts required for the purposes stated in paragraph (2) shall be distributed pro rata to all investors entitled to such distributions. The United States shall receive no funds under this paragraph.

(2)(A) Except as provided in subparagraphs (B) and (C), any distribution of net realized earnings and returns of capital made by a licensee shall first be used to pay accumulated and unpaid dividends owed on outstanding pre-

ferred securities issued under this section and to satisfy the redemption requirements of subsection (b)(3).

(B) For purposes of subparagraph (A), the redemption requirements of subsection (b)(3) shall be considered to be satisfied if necessary and appropriate actions, as determined by the Under Secretary, have been undertaken by the licensee to ensure that such requirements will be satisfied.

(C) If a licensee is operating as a limited partnership or as a corporation described in subchapter S of chapter 1 of subtitle A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 or an equivalent passthrough entity for tax purposes, it may distribute to the partners or shareholders an amount equal to the estimated amount of Federal, State, and local income taxes due from such partners and shareholders on their share of undistributed taxable income for the current taxable year before payments described in subparagraph (A) are made.

(f) USE OF PAYMENTS TO THE UNITED STATES.—Amounts received by the United States from the payment of dividends and the redemption of preferred securities pursuant to this section, and fees paid to the United States by a licensee pursuant to this subtitle, shall be deposited in an account established by the Under Secretary and shall be available solely for carrying out this subtitle, to the extent provided in advance in appropriations Acts.

SEC. 348. ISSUANCE AND GUARANTEE OF TRUST CERTIFICATES.

(a) AUTHORITY TO ISSUE TRUST CERTIFICATES.—The Under Secretary is authorized to issue trust certificates representing ownership of all or a fractional part of preferred securities issued by licensees and guaranteed by the Under Secretary under this subtitle. Such trust certificates shall be based on and backed by a trust or pool approved by the Under Secretary and composed of preferred securities and such other contractual obligations as the Under Secretary may undertake to facilitate the sale of such trust certificates.

(b) GUARANTEE OF TRUST CERTIFICATES.—The Under Secretary is authorized, upon such terms and conditions as are deemed appropriate, to guarantee the timely payment of the principal of and interest on trust certificates issued by the Under Secretary or his agent for purposes of this section. Such guarantee shall be limited to the extent of the redemption price of and dividends on the preferred securities, plus any related contractual obligations, which compose the trust or pool.

(c) PREPAYMENTS AND REDEMPTIONS.—In the event that preferred securities or contractual obligations in such trust or pool are redeemed or extinguished, either voluntarily or involuntarily, the guarantee of timely payment of principal and interest on the trust certificates shall be reduced in proportion to the amount of redemption price and dividends such redeemed preferred security or extinguished contractual obligation represents in the trust or pool. Dividends or partnership profit distributions on such preferred securities and related contractual obligations, shall accrue and be guaranteed by the Under Secretary only through the date of payment on the guarantee. During the term of the trust certificate, it may be called for redemption, whether voluntary or involuntary, of all preferred securities residing in the pool.

(d) FEES.—The Under Secretary may collect fees for a guarantee under this section that are reasonable and customary.

(e) PAYMENT OF CLAIMS.—(1) In the event the Under Secretary pays a claim under a guarantee issued under this section, it shall be subrogated fully to the rights satisfied by such payment.

(2) No State or local law, and no Federal law, shall preclude or limit the exercise by the Under Secretary of ownership rights in the preferred securities residing in a trust or pool against which trust certificates are issued.

(f) REGISTRATION AND INTERMEDIARY OPERATIONS.—(1) The Under Secretary shall provide for a central registration of all trust certificates sold pursuant to this section. Such central registration shall include with respect to each sale, identification of each licensee, the interest rate or dividend rate paid by the licensee, commissions, fees, or discounts paid to brokers and dealers in trust certificates, identification of each purchaser of the trust certificate, the price paid by the purchaser for the trust certificate, the interest rate paid on the trust certificate, the fees of any agent for carrying out the functions described in paragraph (2), and such other information as the Under Secretary deems appropriate.

(2) The Under Secretary shall contract with an agent or agents to carry out on behalf of the Under Secretary the pooling and the central registration functions of this section including, notwithstanding any other provision of law, maintenance on behalf of and under the direction of the Under Secretary, such commercial bank accounts as may be necessary to facilitate trusts or pools backed by securities guaranteed or purchased under this subtitle, and the issuance of trust certificates to facilitate such poolings. Such agent or agents shall provide a fidelity bond or insurance in such amounts as the Under Secretary determines to be necessary to fully protect the interests of the Federal Government.

(3) Prior to any sale, the Under Secretary shall require the seller to disclose to a purchaser of a trust certificate issued pursuant to this section, information on the terms, conditions, and yield of such instrument.

SEC. 349. VENTURE CAPITAL FOR QUALIFIED BUSINESS CONCERNS.

Each licensee may provide venture capital to qualified business concerns, in such manner and under such terms as the licensee may fix in accordance with the regulations of the Under Secretary.

SEC. 350. OPERATION.

(a) COOPERATION.—Wherever practicable the operations of a licensee, including the generation of business, may be undertaken in cooperation with banks or other licensees, investors, or lenders, incorporated or unincorporated, and any servicing or initial investigation required for loans or acquisitions of securities by the licensee under the provisions of this subtitle may be handled through such banks or other licensees, investors, or lenders on a fee basis. Any licensee may receive fees for services rendered to such banks and other licensees, investors, and lenders.

(b) ADVISORY SERVICES.—Each licensee may make use, wherever practicable, of the advisory services of the Federal Reserve System and of the Department of Commerce which are available for and useful to industrial and commercial businesses, and may provide consulting and advisory services on a fee basis and have on its staff persons competent to provide such services. A licensee may not charge fees for such services that are provided to a qualified business concern in which it has an investment.

SEC. 351. REGULATIONS; LIABILITY.

(a) REGULATIONS.—The Under Secretary is authorized to prescribe regulations governing the operations of licensees, and to carry out the provisions of this subtitle, in accordance with the purposes of this subtitle.

(b) LIABILITY OF THE UNITED STATES.—Nothing in this subtitle or in any other provision of law imposes any liability on the United States with respect to any obligations entered into, or stocks issued, or commitments made, by any licensee operating under the provisions of this subtitle.

SEC. 352. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR LICENSEES AND QUALIFIED BUSINESS CONCERNS.

(a) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary shall, upon request, provide technical assistance and services, as appropriate and needed, to licensees and to qualified business concerns receiving financial assistance under this subtitle, and shall ensure that such qualified business concerns have ready access to appropriate assistance available under title III of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980, or under any other Act, in order to aid such qualified business concerns in their development or utilization of critical or other advanced technologies. Technical assistance and services under this subsection shall include providing licensees and qualified business concerns with—

(1) an assessment of the technological and scientific feasibility of a project, or an analysis of a specific field of technical or scientific endeavor;

(2) improved access to technology developed by the Institute and assistance in obtaining access to technology developed by other Federal agencies and laboratories;

(3) expert analysis of the economics of technology development undertaken by a qualified business concern; and

(4) any other assistance or service that the Under Secretary determines, after consultation with licensees and qualified business concerns, is necessary and appropriate to enhance prospects for success and to reduce technical risk for licensees and qualified business concerns.

(b) FEES.—The Secretary may charge fees for services and technical assistance provided under subsection (a) in amounts sufficient to cover the reasonable cost of such services and assistance. The Secretary may waive fees established under this subsection.

SEC. 353. PERFORMANCE MEASURES; ANNUAL REPORT.

(a) PERFORMANCE MEASURES.—The performance of the program established under this subtitle shall be evaluated relative to progress made in achieving its purposes and shall be measured in relevant and meaningful terms such as significant accomplishments in advancing technology, businesses formed and financed, jobs created, taxes generated, licenses granted and maintained, capital invested, and other criteria the Under Secretary may deem appropriate.

(b) ANNUAL REPORT.—The Under Secretary shall prepare, in consultation with the advisory committee established under section 344, and submit annually a report to the Congress containing a full and detailed account of operations under this subtitle. Such report shall include—

(1) an assessment of progress made in achieving the purposes of this subtitle;

(2) performance measures established under subsection (a);

(3) a list of licensees along with their location, area of operations, investment objectives, capitalization, and net asset value, both at cost and at current fair market value;

(4) an audit setting forth the amount, type, recipient, and source of disbursements, receipts, and losses sustained by the Federal Government as a result of operations under this subtitle during the preceding fiscal year and since inception of the program;

(5) the Under Secretary's plans to ensure the provision of licensee financing to all areas of the country and to all qualified business concerns, and plans to notify and to encourage and facilitate the participation of qualified business concerns as required by section 343(e), including steps taken to accomplish those goals;

(6) steps taken by the Under Secretary to carry out this subtitle and to ensure compliance with statutory and regulatory standards relating thereto; and

(7) recommendations with respect to program changes, statutory changes, and other matters, including tax incentives, to improve and facilitate the operations of licensees and to encourage the use of their financing facilities by qualified business concerns.

SEC. 354. REPORTS, INVESTIGATIONS, AND EXAMINATIONS.

(a) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—Each license issued under this subtitle shall require a licensee with outstanding preferred securities to provide the Under Secretary such information, including companies financed, disbursements made along with associated terms and conditions, receipts, portfolio valuation and net asset value at cost and at estimated fair market value, and other financial statements, that the Under Secretary may require to satisfy the requirements of section 353(b) and to determine, in a timely manner, compliance with this subtitle and regulations promulgated under this subtitle. Such reporting shall be—

(1) except as otherwise provided in this subsection, consistent with the reporting practices and standards of the venture capital industry;

(2) uniform for all licensees;

(3) submitted annually to the Under Secretary, with valuation and other information provided more frequently as the Under Secretary may require; and

(4) certified by the Board of Directors or the General Partners of the licensee.

The Under Secretary may exempt from making such reports any licensee which is registered under the Investment Company Act of 1940 only to the extent necessary to avoid duplication in reporting requirements.

(b) VALUATIONS.—The Under Secretary shall, by regulation, establish guidelines for estimating the fair market value of investments held by a licensee as required under subsection (a). The board of directors of a corporate licensee and the general partners of a partnership licensee shall have the sole responsibility for making a good faith determination of the fair market value of investments held by such licensee, based on guidelines established under this subsection.

(c) INVESTIGATIONS.—The Secretary may undertake investigations to determine whether a licensee or any other person has engaged or is about to engage in any acts or practices which constitute or will constitute a violation of any provision of this subtitle, or of any rule, regulation, or order issued under this subtitle. The Secretary shall permit any person to file a statement in writing, under oath or otherwise as the Secretary shall determine, as to all the facts and circumstances concerning the matter to be investigated. For the purpose of any investigation, the Secretary is empowered to administer oaths and affirmations, subpoena witnesses, compel their attendance, take evidence, and require the production of any books, papers, and documents which are relevant to the inquiry.

(d) EXAMINATIONS.—Each licensee shall be subject to examinations made at the discretion and direction of the Under Secretary by examiners selected or approved by, and under the supervision of, the Under Secretary. The Under Secretary may enter into contracts with private parties to perform such examinations. The cost of such examinations, including the compensation of the examiners, may in the discretion of the Under Secretary be assessed against the licensee examined and when so assessed shall be paid by such licensee.

SEC. 355. REVOCATION AND SUSPENSION OF LICENSES; CEASE AND DESIST ORDERS.

(a) GROUNDS FOR REVOCATION OR SUSPENSION.—A license may be revoked or suspended by the Secretary—

(1) for willful or repeated violation of any provision of this subtitle or any rule, regulation, or order issued thereunder; or

(2) if the licensee no longer serves the purposes for which it was granted a license.

(b) CEASE AND DESIST ORDERS.—Where a licensee or any other person has not complied with any provision of this subtitle, or of any rule, regulation, or order issued thereunder, or is engaging or is about to engage in any acts or practices which constitute or will constitute a violation of such provision, rule, regulation, or order, the Secretary may order such licensee or other person to cease and desist from such action or failure to act. The Secretary may further order such licensee or other person to take such action or to refrain from such action as the Secretary considers necessary to ensure compliance with such provisions, rules, regulations, or orders. The Secretary may also suspend the license of a licensee, against whom an order has been issued, until such licensee complies with such order.

(c) SUBPOENAS.—The Secretary may require by subpoenas the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of all books, papers, and documents relating to the hearing from any place in the United States.

(d) ENFORCEMENT.—If any licensee or other person against which or against whom an order is issued under this section fails to obey the order, the Secretary may apply to the district court of the United States for the district where the licensee has its principal place of business, for the enforcement of the order.

SEC. 356. INJUNCTIVE RELIEF.

(a) IN GENERAL.—If the Secretary determines that a licensee or any other person has engaged, or is about to engage, in any acts or practices which constitute a violation of any provision of this subtitle, or of any rule, regulation, or order issued under this subtitle, the Secretary may apply to the appropriate district court of the United States for injunctive relief.

(b) RECEIVERSHIP.—Whenever it is necessary in order to achieve the purposes of injunctive relief granted under subsection (a), and upon proper application by the Secretary, the court may order the attachment of assets of a licensee and may appoint a receiver to administer such assets under the direction of the court.

SEC. 357. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST.

For the purpose of controlling conflicts of interest which may be detrimental to qualified business concerns, to licensees, to the shareholders or partners of either, or to the purposes of this subtitle, the Under Secretary shall adopt regulations to govern transactions with any officer, director, shareholder, or partner of any licensee, or with any person or concern, in which any interest, direct or indirect, financial or otherwise, is held by any officer, director, shareholder, or partner of (1) any licensee, or (2) any person or concern with an interest, direct or indirect, financial or otherwise, in any licensee. Such regulations shall include appropriate requirements for public disclosure (including disclosure in the locality most directly affected by the transaction) necessary to the purposes of this section.

SEC. 358. REMOVAL OR SUSPENSION OF DIRECTORS AND OFFICERS.

(a) GROUNDS.—The Secretary, after an opportunity for agency hearing, may serve upon any director or officer of a licensee a written notice of its intention to remove such director or officer from office, temporarily or permanently, whenever in the opinion of the Secretary such director or officer—

(1) has willfully and knowingly—

(A) committed any substantial violation of this subtitle or any rule, regulation, or order issued under this subtitle; or

(B) committed or engaged in any act, omission, or practice which constitutes a substantial breach of his fiduciary duty as such director or officer,

and that such violation or such breach of fiduciary duty is one involving personal dishonesty on the part of such director or officer; or

(2) has been convicted of a felony involving dishonesty or breach of trust.

(b) HEARING.—A hearing under this section shall be on the record and shall be held in the Federal judicial district or in the territory in which the principal office of the licensee is located unless the party afforded the hearing consents to another place. A hearing under this section shall be fixed for a date not earlier than 30 days nor later than 60 days after the date of service of such notice, unless an earlier or a later date is set by the Secretary at the request of (1) such director or officer and for good cause shown, or (2) the Attorney General of the United States. Unless such director or officer shall appear at the hearing in person or by a duly authorized representative, he shall be deemed to have consented to the issuance of an order of such removal.

SEC. 359. VIOLATIONS.

(a) PARTICIPATION.—Whenever a licensee commits a violation of this subtitle, or any rule, regulation, or order issued under this subtitle, such violation shall be deemed to be also a violation on the part of any person who, directly or indirectly, authorizes, orders, participates in, or causes, brings about, counsels, aids, or abets in the commission of such violation.

(b) BREACH OF FIDUCIARY DUTY.—It shall be a violation of this subtitle for any officer, director, employee, agent, or other participant in the management or conduct of the affairs of a licensee to engage in any act or practice, or to omit any act, in breach of his fiduciary duty as such officer, director, employee, agent, or participant, if, as a result thereof, the licensee has suffered or is in imminent danger of suffering financial loss or other damage.

(c) DISQUALIFICATION.—Except with the written consent of the Secretary, it shall be a violation of this subtitle for any person to take office, or to continue to serve, as an officer, director, or employee of a licensee, or to become or continue to serve as an agent or participant in the conduct of the affairs or management of a licensee, if such person—

(1) has been convicted of a felony, or any other criminal offense involving dishonesty or breach of trust; or

(2) has been found civilly liable in damages, or has been permanently or temporarily enjoined by an order, judgment, or decree of a court of competent jurisdiction, by reason of any act or practice involving fraud or breach of trust.

SEC. 360. CIVIL PENALTIES.

Any person who is found by the Secretary, after notice and opportunity to be heard on the record in accordance with section 554 of title 5, United States Code, to have committed a violation of this subtitle or any rule, regulation, or order issued under this subtitle shall be liable to the United States for a civil penalty of not more than $1,000 for each violation. Each day of a continuing violation shall constitute a separate violation. The amount of such civil penalty shall be assessed by the Secretary by written notice. The Secretary may compromise, modify, or remit, with or without conditions, any civil penalty which is subject to imposition or which has been imposed under this section.

SEC. 361. ANTITRUST SAVINGS CLAUSE.

This subtitle shall not be construed to modify, impair, or supersede the operation of the antitrust laws. For purposes of this section, the term "antitrust laws" has the meaning given it in subsection (a) of the first section of the Clayton Act (15 U.S.C. 12(a)), except that such term includes the Act of June 19, 1936 (49 Stat. 1526; 15

U.S.C. 13 et seq.), commonly known as the Robinson Patman Act, and section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 45) to the extent that such section 5 applies to unfair methods of competition.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there amendments to be offered to title III?

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. VALENTINE

Mr. VALENTINE. Mr. Chairman, I offer amendments, and I ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments en bloc offered by Mr. VALENTINE:

Page 49, line 21, insert "for expenditure, subject to appropriations" after "and retaining fees".

Page 73, line 17, strike "Private" and insert in lieu thereof "To the extent permitted by other law, including the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.), private".

Page 52, line 23, strike "shall" and insert in lieu thereof "may".

Mr. VALENTINE (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments en bloc be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VALENTINE. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I am offering would make two technical changes to title III of the bill.

The first change would provide authority to the Department of Commerce to spend fees collected and retained for services rendered only to the extent provided in advance by appropriations act. This language would conform the bill to the House rules prohibiting appropriations in a legislative bill.

The second change would make clear that language in title III(d) of the bill allowing pension funds to invest in civilian technology development companies does not supersede existing law governing pension fund investments.

This modification affirms existing pension laws and is offered at the request of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. Chairman, I suggest that these changes are technical in nature and should not be controversial, and I urge the adoption of the amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there further debate on the amendments offered by the gentleman from North Carolina?

If not, the question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. VALENTINE].

The amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title III?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WALKER

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SANGMEISTER). The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALKER:

Page 56, after line 19, insert the following new section:

SEC. 324. COUNTRY QUALIFICATION NOTICE.

Section 28 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278n) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(1) The Secretary shall provide prospective applicants for assistance under this section with guidance as to their eligibility under subsection (d)(9)(B)(ii). No such applicant shall be required to provide evidence that a country is a country described in such subsection (d)(9)(B)(ii).".

Amend the table of contents accordingly.

Mr. WALKER (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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that this is a noncontroversial amendment that the majority is, in fact, prepared to accept. It deals with a subject area that was discussed in the committee where the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN], and I agreed to some language that I think will help.

This deals with a requirement for the Secretary of Commerce to advise U.S. companies if they meet the foreign participation requirements of the advanced technology program which are already in law. There are many businesses with foreign parent firms who conduct business in the United States and act as true U.S. firms. They create jobs and fully participate as corporate citizens in our communities.

In the electronics industry, for example, a number of foreign-owned firms produce televisions in this country. In contrast, only one U.S. television manufacturer remains, and it builds no sets in this country. Many of us have small- and medium-sized U.S. subsidiaries in our districts which employ our constituents and who are valuable members of the community. Current proposal requirements state that foreign-owned companies must indicate the country in which the applicant and parent company are incorporated and provide evidence that the country of incorporation affords similar opportunities for U.S.-owned firms.

The cost of applying for an ATP grant can run into the tens of thousands of dollars. Furthermore, most small- and mid-sized firms to which the grants are targeted do not have the resources to show that a country is complying with trade agreements.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment simply requires the Commerce Department to advise U.S. companies desiring to apply for an ATP grant so they will be relieved of the onerous requirement of providing the evidence that their home country qualifies and will know up front if their investment in the grant application process is worth their time and money.

As I said, Mr. Chairman, I think we have an agreement to this particular language. It does no damage to the program. It simply makes the program work somewhat better.

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

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from California with regard to this amendment if, in fact, he wants to indicate that this is something that we have worked out.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I very much appreciate the spirit of conciliation which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] is showing. He had an amendment which I happened to feel very strongly in favor of, although it does not necessarily reflect the majority views of the committee, but objections were raised to his amendment by the Department of State, and he has kindly offered to modify it to recognize the problems presented by the Department of State.

Mr. Chairman, I find the modifications acceptable, and we would have no objections to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] for that.

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise to comment upon a jurisdictional issue of interest to the Committee on Ways and Means related to H.R. 820, the National Competitiveness Act of 1993.

H.R. 820 attempts to promote new technologies and enhance the competitiveness of American companies on the cusp of entrepreneurship and innovation. I applaud these goals.

The staff of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology has cooperated with the staff of the Committee on Ways and Means to make certain that the incentives provided by H.R. 820 are designed in such a way that they do not raise tax or debt management issues, thus triggering a referral to the Committee on Ways and Means. I believe that those efforts have been successful. Further, I understand that the report of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology on H.R. 820 includes language clarifying that certain fees authorized by the bill are not intended to be more generalized tax levies and are in-

tended only to cover the costs of the programs they finance.

I would request, however, that the legislative history accompanying the bill as it moves forward make absolutely clear that the fees contained in the legislation will qualify under the appropriate criteria for classifying various charges as regulatory fees instead of taxes. The four criteria are:

Fees shall be solely to cover the costs of the Government activity that they are intended to fund;

The aggregate amount of fees collected during any fiscal year should not exceed the aggregate amount of costs of the program that the fees fund;

Those subject to the fees shall only include those persons who directly avail themselves of, or are directly subject to, the activities of the program in question; and,

The fees shall be structured so that any person's liability is reasonably in proportion to the activities of the program with respect to that person, and shall not discriminate between foreign and domestic entities.

Mr. Chairman, thank you for allowing me the opportunity to clarify these important jurisdictional issues.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 820, the National Competitiveness Act of 1993.

Every one of us here today realizes that as a result of years of misplaced priorities and flawed fiscal policy, our economy is struggling to recover.

An essential element to this comprehensive recovery plan must be the development of a national Industrial strategy which will help rebuild the basic industries in our country.

This is clearly reflected in President Clinton's proposal which anticipates significant investment in key programs designed to foster long-term growth and expansion of the Nation's productivity. This initiative will strengthen the very foundation of our economy.

It is completely unacceptable that, although our scientific capability is superb, we have allowed ourselves to fall behind our foreign counterparts in the mere application of this knowledge to commercial purposes.

All of that knowledge, the years of research and development which has been invested in achieving state-of-the-art technologies, is being wasted. We have not yet mastered the technique of relaying this knowledge to the industries which will put it to use.

This wasted knowledge is nothing more than a wasted chance to put thousands of people back to work. H.R. 820 bridges this gap by authorizing $1.49 billion for the Commerce Department to develop programs which will assist American industries develop and implement advanced technologies.

This includes broadening the network of outreach centers to teach advanced manufacturing techniques to help businesses become more efficient and to develop critical technologies.

This technology transfer, provided by the National Competitiveness Act, will help our key industries—the most dynamic sector of our economy—regain their competitive edge, and enable them to compete in what has rapidly become a global marketplace.

Last year, this House overwhelmingly passed legislation virtually identical to H.R. 820—only to see it become lost in a political quagmire at the close of the session.

Let us not turn our backs on this opportunity to breathe life back into our ailing economy, create quality jobs and restore America to her role as the world's technological and scientific superpower.

I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 820, the National Competitiveness Act of 1993.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 820, the National Competitiveness Act. For years, I have been a staunch advocate of this type of legislation which broadens Federal involvement in the development of our critical civilian technology.

This act provides funds to U.S. companies wishing to upgrade their manufacturing technology and establishes a Nationwide network of outreach centers to help private firms develop and adopt advanced manufacturing technologies.

The development of efficient industrial technology is essential if we want to create jobs in this country. H.R. 820 represents vital investment in our technological capability and therefore the success of our 21st century technology base. This kind of active investment in technology will improve the ability of U.S. manufacturers to compete in global markets.

America's position in the international market has been slipping now for decades. For the past 20 years, our economic competitors have made great strides in developing and applying technology for civilian industries to where the United States is no longer the unmatched scientific superpower it once was. This decline concerns all of us. Millions of jobs are tied to America's manufacturing industries. When these industries suffer, American workers suffer.

I recognize that the Government cannot by itself reverse the industrial decline facing America, but I believe it must play a more active role in protecting the welfare of American industry. Businesses need the support of Government to compete fairly and effectively in the international arena where foreign Governments are backing their own industries.

We must not step aside and watch foreign firms continue to take over our markets and endanger our industrial base and national security. Without increased Federal commitment to civilian research and development, our industrial base will continue to dwindle. A strong technological base is vital to our future economic growth and the future health of our Nation. I urge my colleagues to support this important and long overdue legislation.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to offer my strong support for H.R. 820, the National Competitiveness Act of 1993. While H.R. 820 is not the cure for all the ills plaguing the American economy, I am convinced that it is a necessary step in building an economy prepared to compete in the 21st century. This legislation will promote long-term economic growth that allows American firms to thrive while creating good, high-paying jobs for our workers.

The National Competitiveness Act addresses some of the most difficult economic challenges facing our country. In part, it does this by building on proven existing programs such as the Boehlert-Rockefeller State Technology Extension Program and the Hollings Manufacturing Technology Centers. These programs are aimed at moving new ideas, technologies and techniques into the hands of our small and medium-sized firms—firms whose creativity represents the lifeblood of our economy.

This bill also contains new, innovative programs that will support companies working at the technological frontier. For example, it includes a Government guarantee program designed to move more venture capital into companies trying to bring emerging technologies to market.

Through the use of loans and guarantees and with requirements for matching funds from States or private firms tied to almost every element of this bill, H.R. 820 seeks to minimize taxpayer costs while maximizing the leverage of every dollar spent. The most important thing to come out of this bill is probably not any specific program so much as the push it gives the Government toward building cooperative, collaborative relations with the private sector. I am convinced that one of the most critical elements in our economic renaissance will be forging intelligent partnerships between the Government and our businesses and workers. The National Competitiveness Act promises to help create this new environment.

Mr. VALENTINE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

□ 1530

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. RICHARDSON) having assumed the chair, Mr. SANGMEISTER, 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. 280) to amend the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980 to enhance manufacturing technology development and transfer, to authorize appropriations for the Technology Administration of the Department of Commerce, including the National Institute of Standards and Technology, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to publicly explain my absence from the House of Representatives during floor session May 6, 1993.

On Saturday, May 1, my wife and I became the proud parents of Clarisa Isabel Reyes-Becerra, our first child. It was of critical personal importance for me to spend the first week of my daughter's life at home in Los Angeles.

For the record, I wish to indicate my voting preferences for the rollcall votes taken during last week's legislative business. My constituents and interested parties have the right to know my positions on these issues, even though I was not able to offically vote.

Rollcall number:

156. H.R. 820. National Competitiveness Manufacturing Technology Centers, Position: Nay.

157. H.R. 820. National Competitiveness Manufacturing Programs. Position: Nay.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. RICHARDSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, the House will meet at noon on Monday, May 10. There will be no legislative business.

On Tuesday, May 11, there will be nine suspensions. Recorded votes, if requested, will take place after consideration of all the suspensions.

On Wednesday, May 12, and Thursday, May 13, we will go back to the National Competitiveness Act and complete consideration by Thursday.

The House will meet at 11 on Friday, May 14. There will be no legislative business.

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

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, depending upon how long the House wants to go on Wednesday, my guess is we could probably finish up the National Competitiveness Act. Is there an intention to do that if it is desirable, or is it the intention to quit in fairly good time on Wednesday and proceed then with the bill on Thursday?

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, that is a possibility. We will consult with the gentleman. I will state there is a possibility that we may deal with a conference report on Thursday. But given the fact we may conclude on Wednesday, there is a possibility of no legislative business on Thursday.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, the conference report we would potentially be dealing with is the NIH conference report, is that correct?

Mr. RICHARDSON. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, let me ask about a couple of other bills that I know are at least being considered right now. I think there is a supplemental appropriation before at least one of the subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations dealing with some additional money the White House wants. Could that make it to the floor next week?

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, most likely it will not.

Mr. WALKER. It will not. There was also talk that we might have some resolution on Bosnia come to the floor, if in fact that situation heats up.

Mr. Speaker, is there any intention at this point of bringing up any resolution on Bosnia?

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, it is not presently scheduled. If it does necessitate action by the House, we will consult with the minority and with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, MAY 10, 1993

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KLEIN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

□ 1220

PRESIDENT AWARE OF REPUBLICAN CUTS

(Mr. BUNNING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BUNNING. Mr. Speaker, Tuesday night, our President accused the Republicans of failing to recommend spending cuts to reduce the deficit.

Yesterday, I suggested here on the floor that the President was not telling the truth. And I held up a copy of the 84 page document in which the Republicans of the House Budget Committee did recommend $429 billion in specific budget cuts.

Today, I offer as evidence, a letter dated April 5, 1993—signed by Bill Clinton—thanking our colleague JOHN KASICH for sharing a copy of the Republican budget proposal with him.

I also have a copy of a letter from the President's Budget Director—providing OMB's analysis of the cuts in the Republican budget.

So, the President did know about it. He just does not want to tell the truth—that the Republicans did do a better job of cutting spending than he did.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following correspondence above mentioned:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, April 5, 1993.

Hon. JOHN R. KASICH,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE KASICH: Thank you for sharing with me a copy of your budget proposal.

Although we may disagree, I appreciate your involvement in this process to improve the lives of all Americans.

With best wishes,

Sincerely,

BILL CLINTON.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET,
Washington, DC, April 15, 1993.

Hon. ERNEST ISTOOK, Jr.,
Committee on Appropriations, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ISTOOK: During the House Appropriations Treasury/Postal Subcommittee hearing on the OMB budget, I said that I would provide you with an OMB analysis of Representative Kasich's budget substitute. The analysis is attached.

I hope this information is helpful.

Sincerely,

LEON E. PANETTA,
Director.

Enclosure.

ANALYSIS OF KASICH SUBSTITUTE BUDGET

1. Rejects Administration investment proposals in areas such as: highways, environment, rural development, technology, housing, WIC, Head Start, Education, Worker Training, Immunizations, Capital Gains, and R and E tax credit.

2. Deeper Spending Cuts threaten:

Elderly and Retirees: $34 billion in additional Medicare and Medicaid cuts—many of which hit beneficiaries; and $19 billion in additional cuts hitting civilian and military retirees.

Children: $8 billion, in WIC/nutrition programs is cut over five years (a $12 billion cut from Administration proposal).

Development: Mass transit is cut by $5 billion over five years; and Community Development Block Grants are cut below baseline.

Education, Training and Social Services: Cuts five-year funding by $54 billion—or 17.5 percent—below House Budget Committee.

Federal workers: Federal pay is frozen for five years.

3. Other specific spending cuts: terminates Legal Services Corporation, eliminates wastewater treatment grants (as does Administration budget, but Administration budget includes a substantial investment for clean water), deep cuts in airport improvement grants, eliminates Amtrak's N.E. corridor program, 50% reduction in Arts and Humanities, $2 billion in cuts in public housing, no Federal civilian retirement until age 62, $700 million savings by switching to a dollar coin, Repeals Davis-Bacon, and $68 billion over five years from administrative cost savings and personnel reductions, compared to $16 billion over five years in the Administration budget.

4. Much of Kasich proposed cuts are unspecified—and unrealistic: Over 40 percent of Kasich's 1994 outlay cut is shown in allowances, with no indication defense, administration of benefit program, or essential services such as air traffic control, law enforcement and veterans services. The HBC resolution allocates all 1994 cuts by function. While it will ultimately be up to the Appropriations Committees to decide the allocation of discretionary funding, the HBC resolution provides an honest accounting of the 1994 implications of the cuts and increases assumed; the Kasich alternative does not.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. WALKER) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. KIM, for 5 minutes, on May 26.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WALKER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GUNDERSON.
Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
Mr. BALLENGER.
Mrs. MORELLA.
Mr. BOEHLERT.
Mr. TALENT.
Mr. CALVERT.
Mr. BILIRAKIS.
Mr. THOMAS of California.
Mr. GILLMOR.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. VALENTINE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MATSUI in eight instances.
Mr. ROWLAND.
Mr. LIPINSKI.
Mr. BERMAN.
Mr. LANTOS.
Mr. STUDDS.
Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER.
Mr. RUSH.
Mr. VISCLOSKY.
Mr. MANTON.
Mr. HOYER.
Mr. SCHUMER.
Mr. MCDERMOTT.
Mr. PENNY.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 37 minutes p.m.) under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 10, 1993, at 12 noon.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports and amended reports of various House committees concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized by them during the third and fourth quarters of 1992, pursuant to Public Law 95–384, as well as a report concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized by a miscellaneous group, House of Representatives, during the 1992 year, are as follows:

AMENDED REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 1992

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Visit to England, Sept. 4 to 9, 1992:											
Delegation expenses	9/4	9/9	England						118.95		118.95
Committee total									118.95		118.95

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

RONALD V. DELLUMS, Chairman, Apr. 27, 1993.

AMENDED REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1992

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Visit to England, The Netherlands, Germany, Nov. 8 to 19, 1992: Delegation expenses.	11/8	11/11	England						166.64		166.64
Visit to Belgium, Germany, and Italy, Nov. 15 to 22, 1992: Delegation expenses.	11/21	11/22	Italy				688.22				688.22
Visit to Korea, People's Republic of China, Hong Kong, and Japan, Nov. 24 to Dec. 5, 1992: Delegation expenses.	12/3	12/5	Japan						2,826.01		2,826.01
Committee total							688.22		2,992.65		3,680.87

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

RONALD V. DELLUMS, Chairman, Apr. 27, 1993.

AMENDED REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 1993

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Shared administrative costs for participation in CSCE Forum on Security Cooperation (Vienna, Austria).											828.20
Committee total											828.20

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

STENY HOYER, Apr. 22, 1993.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 1993

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem[1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency[2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency[2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency[2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency[2]
Visit to Germany, France, and Belgium, Feb. 6 to 11, 1993:											
Hon. Norman Sisisky	2/6	2/7	Germany		192.01				166.64		358.65
	2/7	2/10	France		852.00						852.00
	2/10	2/11	Belgium		264.00						264.00
Commercial transportation							787.55				787.55
Visit to Belgium, Poland, Hungary, and Italy, Feb. 4 to 14, 1993:											
Hon. Floyd Spence	2/4	2/7	Belgium		963.00						963.00
	2/7	2/9	Poland		492.00						492.00
	2/9	2/11	Hungary		495.00						495.00
	2/11	2/14	Italy		924.00						924.00
Hon. Marilyn Lloyd	2/4	2/7	Belgium		963.00						963.00
	2/7	2/9	Poland		492.00						492.00
	2/9	2/11	Hungary		495.00						495.00
	2/11	2/14	Italy		924.00						924.00
Hon. Solomon P. Ortiz	2/4	2/7	Belgium		963.00						963.00
	2/7	2/9	Poland		492.00						492.00
	2/9	2/11	Hungary		495.00						495.00
	2/11	2/12	Spain		304.00						304.00
	2/12	2/14	Italy		672.00						672.00
Hon. James V. Hansen	2/4	2/7	Belgium		963.00						936.00
	2/7	2/9	Poland		492.00						492.00
	2/9	2/11	Hungary		495.00						495.00
	2/11	2/14	Italy		924.00						924.00
Mr. Peter M. Steffes	2/4	2/7	Belgium		963.00						963.00
	2/7	2/9	Poland		492.00						492.00
	2/9	2/11	Hungary		495.00						495.00
	2/11	2/12	Spain		304.00						304.00
	2/12	2/14	Italy		672.00						672.00
Mr. Andrew K. Ellis	2/4	2/7	Belgium		963.00						963.00
	2/7	2/9	Poland		492.00						492.00
	2/9	2/11	Hungary		495.00						495.00
	2/11	2/14	Italy		924.00						924.00
Mr. Ronald J. Bartek	2/5	2/7	Belgium		546.00						546.00
	2/7	2/9	Poland		492.00						492.00
	2/9	2/11	Hungary		495.00						495.00
	2/11	2/14	Italy		924.00						924.00
Commercial transportation							510.99				510.99
Visit to Panama, Feb. 7 to 11, 1993:											
Hon. Gene Taylor	2/7	2/11	Panama		528.00						528.00
Mr. Douglas H. Necessary	2/7	2/11	Panama		528.00						528.00
Visit to Germany, Switzerland, Croatia, Italy, Turkey, and England, Feb. 8 to 17, 1993:											
Hon. Ike Skelton	2/8	2/9	Germany		150.00						150.00
	2/9	2/9	Switzerland								
	2/9	2/10	Croatia								
	2/10	2/12	Italy		150.00						150.00
	2/12	2/14	Turkey		354.00						354.00
	2/14	2/17	England		537.00						537.00
Commercial transportation							5,992.45				5,992.45
Mr. Archie D. Barrett	2/8	2/9	Germany		150.00						150.00
	2/9	2/9	Switzerland								
	2/9	2/10	Croatia								
	2/10	2/12	Italy		504						504.00
	2/12	2/14	Turkey		354.00						354.00
	2/14	2/17	England		909.00						909.00
Commercial transportation							5,992.45				5,992.45
Delegation expenses	2/12	2/14	Turkey				75.00		1,034.11		1,109.11
Visit to Macedonia, Croatia, and Slovenia, Feb. 11 to 16, 1993:											
Hon. Frank McCloskey	2/11	2/12	Macedonia		244.53						244.53
	2/12	2/15	Croatia		626.89						626.89
	2/15	2/16	Slovenia		228.90						228.90
Commercial transportation							3,565.65				3,565.65
Committee total					26,377.33		16,924.09		1,200.75		44,502.17

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

RONALD V. DELLUMS, Chairman, Apr. 27, 1993.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON BANKING, FINANCE AND URBAN AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 1993

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem[1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency[2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency[2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency[2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency[2]
Jeff Morelli	3/27	3/30	Germany	1,200	720.00		929.00				1,649.00
Committee total					720.00		929.00				1,649.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HENRY GONZALEZ, Apr. 21, 1993.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE AND TECHNOLOGY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 1993

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem[1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency[2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency[2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency[2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency[2]
Michael D. Quear	1/29	2/2	Switzerland		1,100.00				33.00		1,133.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE AND TECHNOLOGY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 1993—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Commercial air							1,531.65				1,531.65
Committee total					1,100.00		1,531.65		33.00		2,664.65

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

GEORGE E. BROWN Jr., Chairman, Apr. 20, 1993.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, CANADA-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1992

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
William Broomfield	4/9	4/13	United States		837.50		(3)				837.50
Dante Fascell	4/9	4/13	United States		418.00		(3)				418.00
Hon. Sam Gibbons	4/9	4/13	United States		836.75		(3)				836.75
Frank Horton	4/9	4/13	United States		870.77		(3)				870.77
Hon. Harry Johnston (acting-chair)	4/9	4/13	United States		851.00		(3)				851.00
Hon. John LaFalce	4/9	4/13	United States		839.00		(3)				839.00
John Miller	4/9	4/13	United States		855.79		(3)				855.79
Hon. Jim Oberstar	4/9	4/13	United States		419.00		(3)				419.00
Hon. Louise Slaughter	4/9	4/13	United States		836.00		(3)				836.00
Andrea Adelman	4/9	4/13	United States		848.82		(3)				848.82
Kathleen Bertelsen	4/9	4/13	United States		836.00		(3)				836.00
Bob Boyer	4/9	4/13	United States		838.07		(3)				838.07
Dean Curran	4/9	4/13	United States		848.44		(3)				848.44
Elizabeth Daoust	2/25	2/28	United States		734.10		[4] 280.00				1,014.10
Elizabeth Daoust	4/8	4/13	United States		1,170.73		[4] 140.00				1,310.73
Deborah Hickey	4/9	4/13	United States		860.52						860.52
George Ingram	4/9	4/13	United States		836.00						836.00
Randy Scheunemann	4/9	4/13	United States		419.50						419.50
Delegation expenses: Official delegation functions, inflight expenses, supplies and miscellaneous.									28,037.60		28,037.60
Committee total					14,155.99		[4] 420.00		23,037.60		42,613.59

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Department of Defense.
[4] Commercial transportation.

SAM GEJDENSON.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DELLUMS: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 194. A bill to withdraw and reserve certain public lands and minerals within the State of Colorado for military uses, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 103-56, Pt. 2). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of California: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 236. A bill to establish the Snake River Birds of Prey National Conservation Area in the State of Idaho, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 103-80, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MILLER of California: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 765. A bill to resolve the status of certain land relinquished to the United States under the act of June 4, 1897 (30 Stat. 11, 36), and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 103-81, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. DELLUMS: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 1378. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, with respect to applicability of qualification requirements for certain acquisition positions in the Department of Defense; with amendments (Rep. 103-83). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DELLUMS: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 1040. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to revise and standardize the provisions of law relating to appointment, promotion, and separation of commissioned officers of the reserve components of the Armed Forces, to consolidate in a new subtitle the provisions of law relating to the reserve components, and for other purposes (Rept. 103-84). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTED BILLS SEQUENTIALLY REFERRED

Under clause 5 of rule X, bills and reports were delivered to the Clerk for printing, and bills referred as follows:

Mr. MILLER of California: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 873. A bill entitled: "Gallatin Range Consolidation and Protection Act of 1993," with amendments; referred to the Committee on Agriculture for a period ending not later than May 7, 1993, for consideration of such provisions of the bill and amendment as fall within the jurisdiction of that committee pursuant to clause 1(a), rule X (Rept. 103-82, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BALLENGER (for himself, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. COBLE, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. MCMILLAN, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. PARKER, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. ROSE, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. VALENTINE, and Mr. PAYNE of Virginia):

H.R. 2004. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to require that certain revenues attributable to tariffs levied on imports of textile machinery and parts thereof be applied to support research for the modernization of the American textile machinery industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BALLENGER:

H.R. 2005. A bill to suspend until January 1, 1995, the duty on p-Acetanisidide; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2006. A bill to suspend until January 1, 1995, the duty on diazo-2,1,4-sulfonic acid and its salts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2007. A bill to suspend until January 1, 1995, the duty on 4,4'-(hexafluoroisopropyldene(bis(phthalic anhydride); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2008. A bill to suspend until January 1, 1995, the duty on chloranil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2009. A bill to suspend until January 1, 1997, the duty on phospholan mixed with

ethylene glycol; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARTINEZ (for himself, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. OWENS, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mrs. MINK, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. REED, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. GENE GREEN, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. KLINK, Ms. ENGLISH of Arizona, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. BAESLER, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. MCCURDY, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BACCHUS of Florida, Mr. BARLOW, Mr. BEILENSON, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. BROWDER, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. CARR, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COPPERSMITH, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. DEAL, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. DICKS, Mr. ENGLISH of Oklahoma, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FISH, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. PETE GEREN, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. GORDON, Mr. HAYES, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. HORN, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. HOYER, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. KENNEDY, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. KLEIN, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LAROCCO, Mr. LAZIO, Mr. LEACH, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mrs. LLOYD, Ms. LOWEY, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCHALE, Mr. MACHTLEY, Ms. MALONEY, Mr. MANTON, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MFUME, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. MORAN, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. ORTON, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. PENNY, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. ROSE, Ms. SCHENK, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SHEPHERD, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. SLATTERY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. STOKES, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. SWETT, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. TANNER, Mr. TAUZIN, Ms. THURMAN, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. TORRES, Mr. UPTON, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. VENTO, Mr. VOLKMER, Ms. WATERS, Mr. WATT, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WHEAT, and Mr. WISE):

H.R. 2010. A bill to amend the National and Community Service Act of 1990 to establish a Corporation for National Service, enhance opportunities for national service, and provide national service educational awards to persons participating in such service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BALLENGER:

H.R. 2011. A bill to suspend until January 1, 1995, the duty on 2,4-Dinitro aniline; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BILBRAY:

H.R. 2012. A bill to authorize the President to award a gold medal on behalf of the Congress to Richard "Red" Skelton, and to provide for the production of bronze duplicates of such medal for sale to the public; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BLACKWELL (for himself, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. FROST, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MINETA, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. TUCKER, Mr. UNDERWOOD, and Mr. WYNN):

H.R. 2013. A bill to establish a commission to review the provisions of law stating that service performed by Filipino World War II veterans is not considered to be service in the Armed Forces of the United States for purposes of most veterans' benefits under the laws of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. BYRNE (for herself, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. FINGERHUT, and Mr. MORAN):

H.R. 2014. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, and the Federal Transit Act to provide an increased Federal share for projects which have a cost of $2,000,000 or more and to which value engineering is applied and results in a certain minimum project cost savings; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. EWING:

H.R. 2015. A bill to reliquidate certain entries on which excessive countervailing duties were paid, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GUNDERSON (for himself, Mr. PENNY, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. PETE GEREN, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. MCCURDY, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CANADY, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. FILNER, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ, Mr. HANCOCK, and Ms. PRYCE of Ohio):

H.R. 2016. A bill to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to encourage mediation of charges filed under title VII of such act and the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, to amend the Revised Statutes to encourage mediation of complaints filed under section 1977 of the Revised Statutes, and to decrease resort to the courts; jointly, to the Committees on Education and Labor and the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER (for himself, Mr. ACKERMAN, Ms. DANNER, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. HUGHES, Ms. FURSE, Mr. EVANS, Mr. BLACKWELL, Mr. KLINK, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. RUSH):

H.R. 2017. A bill to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act to require the testing of ash generated from the incineration of municipal solid waste before its disposal; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HUNTER:

H.R. 2018. A bill to require that States receiving State Legalization Impact Assistance Grants [SLIAG] cooperate with the Immigration and Naturalization Service and the Border Patrol in the apprehension, detention, and transfer of illegal immigrants; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACOBS (for himself, Mr. KOPETSKI, and Ms. PELOSI):

H.R. 2019. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve revenue collection and to provide that a taxpayer conscientiously opposed to participation in war may elect to have such taxpayer's income, estate, or gift tax payments spent for nonmilitary purposes, to create the U.S. Peace Tax Fund to receive such tax payments, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means, Education and Labor, and Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LEACH:

H.R. 2020. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to modify the authority of wheat and feed grain producers to conduct haying and grazing on reduced acreage, acreage devoted to a conservation use, or acreage diverted from production under a land diversion program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LIPINSKI:

H.R. 2021. A bill to establish procedures to resolve undercharge claims by motor carriers based on negotiated but unfiled or illegal tariff rates, to ensure the proper, timely, and accurate filing and enforcement of motor carrier rates in tariffs, to reaffirm the requirement for written transportation contracts, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Public Works and Transportation, the Judiciary, and Education and Labor.

By Mr. MATSUI (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. JACOBS, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, and Mr. MINETA):

H.R. 2022. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to generally treat bonds issued for section 501(c)(3) organizations in a manner similar to governmental bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATSUI (for himself, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. STARK, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. COYNE, Mr. ANDREWS of Texas, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. HOAGLAND, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. CRANE, Mr. THOMAS of California, Mr. SHAW, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. BEREUTER, and Mr. SHAYS):

H.R. 2023. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the treatment of governmental plans under the rules governing retirement plans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATSUI (for himself and Mr. THOMAS of California):

H.R. 2024. A bill to clarify the tax treatment of intermodal containers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCDERMOTT:

H.R. 2025. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the tax treatment of associations resulting from mergers of certain farm credit associations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2026. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage energy efficiency and the production and use of renewable energy; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. MEEK:

H.R. 2027. A bill to make emergency supplemental appropriations and transfers for fiscal year 1993 to provide disaster assistance for areas of Florida damaged by Hurricane Andrew; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 2028. A bill to make appropriations for fiscal year 1994 for a community adjustment and economic diversification program in connection with Homestead Air Force Base, FL; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 2029. A bill to authorize the provision of community adjustment and economic di-

versification assistance in connection with the closure of Homestead Air Force Base, FL; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2030. A bill to designate Homestead Air Force Base, FL, and the county within which the military installation is located, as an enterprise zone for purposes of title VII of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1987; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. PAYNE of Virginia (for himself, Mr. WOLF, Mr. COYNE, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. ANDREWS of Texas, and Mr. SUNDQUIST):

H.R. 2031. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an election to exclude from the gross estate the value of land subject to a qualified conservation easement if certain conditions are satisfied, to permit a qualified conservation contribution where the probability of surface mining is remote and to make technical changes to alternative valuation rules; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PENNY:

H.R. 2032. A bill to recognize the organization known as the Black Veterans of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

H.R. 2033. A bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to provide for better protection of children from physical and mental abuse; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROWLAND (for himself and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H.R. 2034. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to revise and improve veterans' health programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SANTORUM:

H.R. 2035. A bill to terminate the Department of Defense independent research and development program and to replace that program with a grant program to be used for support of basic research; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2036. A bill to cancel the F/A-18 aircraft upgrade program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2037. A bill to reduce the rate of procurement of DDG-51 destroyers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2038. A bill to amend the Housing Act of 1949 to decrease the number of loans made under section 502 of such act and increase the regular payments made to borrowers under such loans; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 2039. A bill to terminate new water projects of the Bureau of Reclamation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SKEEN:

H.R. 2040. A bill to establish a commission on the commercial application of certain defense-related facilities, equipment, processes, and technologies; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. SNOWE (for herself, Mr. GILMAN, and Mr. MCCOLLUM):

H.R. 2041. A bill to provide that members of terrorist organizations are ineligible to receive visas for admission to the United States, to improve the State Department Visa Lookout System procedures, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on the Judiciary and Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STENHOLM (for himself, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. MONTGOMERY, and Mr. INHOFE):

H.R. 2042. A bill to amend the Davis-Bacon Act and the Copeland Act to provide new job opportunities, effect significant cost savings by increasing efficiency and economy in Federal procurement, promote small and minority business participation in Federal contracting, increase competition for Federal construction contracts, reduce unnecessary paperwork and reporting requirements, clarify the definition of prevailing wage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. STUDDS (for himself, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. MANTON, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, Ms. FURSE, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. BEILENSON, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. VENTO, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. STOKES, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Miss COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. EVANS, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. BERMAN, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. WALSH, Mrs. MINK, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. MEEHAN, Ms. MALONEY, Mr. TORRES, Mr. MORAN, Mr. OLVER, Mr. NADLER, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. PORTER, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. BLACKWELL, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. SABO, Ms. SHEPHERD, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, and Mr. HINCHEY):

H.R. 2043. A bill to reauthorize and amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. TORRES (for himself, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mr. PASTOR):

H.R. 2044. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to discourage criminal street gang activity; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHEAT:

H.R. 2045. A bill to suspend until January 1, 1997, the duty on 0,0-dimethyl-s-[(4-oxo-1,2,3-benzotriazin-3(4h)-yl)methyl] phosphorodithioate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2046. A bill to suspend until January 1, 1997, the duty on 4-Fluoro-3-Phenoxy Benzaldehyde; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DURBIN:

H. Con. Res. 95. Concurrent resolution concerning congressional approval of the introduction of U.S. Armed Forces in the former Yugoslavia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HOYER (for himself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. APPLEGATE, and Mr. CARDIN):

H. Con. Res. 96. Concurrent resolution concerning the removal of Russian troops from the independent Baltic States of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mrs. BENTLEY introduced a bill (H.R. 2047) to clear certain impediments to the licensing of a vessel for employment in the coastwise trade and fisheries of the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 163: Mr. PETE GEREN.

H.R. 207: Mr. MCCLOSKEY.

H.R. 214: Mr. SHUSTER and Mr. BARTLETT.

H.R. 300: Mr. SERRANO and Mr. FISH.

H.R. 350: Ms. DELAURO, Mr. FILNER, Mr. OWENS, Mr. REED, Ms. WATERS, and Mr. WYNN.

H.R. 431: Mr. SERRANO, Mr. HASTINGS, and Ms. CANTWELL.

H.R. 462: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. MINETA, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. RIDGE, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. WALSH, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. EVERETT, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MFUME, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. INSLEE.

H.R. 511: Mr. TOWNS and Mrs. MORELLA.

H.R. 512: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.

H.R. 526: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 535: Mr. BLILEY, Mr. DEUTSCH, and Mr. MOORHEAD.

H.R. 537: Mr. NADLER, Ms. MALONEY, and Ms. VELAZQUEZ.

H.R. 556: Mrs. MORELLA.

H.R. 567: Mr. ZIMMER.

H.R. 667: Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

H.R. 737: Mr. SERRANO and Mr. KLECZKA.

H.R. 749: Mr. BROWDER.

H.R. 758: Mr. BEVILL, Mr. DUNCAN, Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, and Mr. VALENTINE.

H.R. 762: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.

H.R. 764: Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. CLYBURN, Ms. MOLINARI, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mrs. MINK, Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. DE LA GARZA.

H.R. 786: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 789: Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. COLEMAN, Ms. DANNER, Mr. EDWARDS of Texas, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. SABO, Mr. RICHARDSON, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. BUNNING, and Mr. NATCHER.

H.R. 846: Mr. BLACKWELL, Mr. COPPERSMITH, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. SWETT, Mr. HANCOCK, Ms. FOWLER, Mr. STUMP, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. MACHTLEY, and Mr. TORRES.

H.R. 902: Mr. WYNN and Mr. POMEROY.

H.R. 997: Mr. SISISKY, Mr. HEFNER, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. LANCASTER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. VALENTINE, and Mr. BROWDER.

H.R. 998: Mr. JACOBS.

H.R. 1048: Mr. FROST.

H.R. 1090: Ms. FOWLER.

H.R. 1133: Mr. PALLONE, Mr. DIXON, Mr. WYNN, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. MURTHA, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. CLAY, Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY, and Mr. STUDDS.

H.R. 1141: Mr. ROTH.

H.R. 1172: Ms. MCKINNEY and Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY.

H.R. 1181: Mr. KOPETSKI, and Mr. STUMP.

H.R. 1200: Mr. GIBBONS.

H.R. 1257: Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana.

H.R. 1295: Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. BARLOW, and Mr. STRICKLAND.

H.R. 1308: Mr. FLAKE, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, and Ms. DANNER.

H.R. 1406: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. EVANS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. BOEHLERT,

Mr. PICKETT, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, and Mr. VENTO.

H.R. 1434: Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, and Ms. THURMAN.

H.R. 1489: Mr. LANTOS.

H.R. 1493: Mr. MCHUGH.

H.R. 1608: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. LEVY, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. TANNER, and Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi.

H.R. 1670: Ms. FOWLER.

H.R. 1687: Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana.

H.R. 1697: Mr. PASTOR, Mr. TEJEDA, Mr. WALSH, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mrs. CLAYTON, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. BYRNE.

H.R. 1702: Ms. MOLINARI.

H.R. 1744: Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. FROST, Mr. PETE GEREN, and Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.

H.R. 1754: Mr. WATT and Mr. SLATTERY.

H.R. 1755: Mr. SLATTERY.

H.R. 1786: Mr. MCDERMOTT and Ms. CANTWELL.

H.R. 1811: Mr. NUSSLE.

H.R. 1812: Mr. NUSSLE.

H.R. 1815: Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mr. WALSH, Mr. BACHUS of Alabama, and Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 1890: Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. KING, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. YATES, Ms. BYRNE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. WISE, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. BISHOP, and Mr. HAMBURG.

H.R. 1900: Mr. STOKES, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. BROWDER, Mr. STARK, Ms. ENGLISH of Arizona, Mrs. CLAYTON, and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 1944: Mr. BILBRAY and Mrs. VUCANOVICH.

H.R. 1983: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mrs. MORELLA, and Mr. UNDERWOOD.

H.J. Res. 38: Mr. MEEHAN and Mr. MINGE.

H.J. Res. 61: Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, and Mr. WELDON.

H.J. Res. 83: Mr. QUILLEN.

H.J. Res. 92: Mr. HAMBURG, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. TORRES, Mr. MANN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. MFUME, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. DURBIN Mr. HOAGLAND, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mr. SHARP, Mr. WISE, Mr. FILNER, Mr. TANNER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. EMERSON.

H.J. Res. 131: Mr. MENENDEZ, Mrs. MINK, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. KREIDLER, Mr. GENE GREEN, Mr. ENGEL, and Ms. PELOSI.

H.J. Res. 133: Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. BARLOW, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. SKELTON, and Mr. HUGHES.

H.J. Res. 139: Mr. CRAMER.

H.J. Res. 157: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. KREIDLER, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. MORAN, Mr. PARKER, and Mr. QUILLEN.

H.Con. Res. 85: Mr. LIGHTFOOT.

H. Res. 53: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. PETE GEREN, and Mr. FINGERHUT.

H. Res. 101: Mr. SMITH of Michigan.

H. Res. 135: Mr. BORSKI and Mr. ACKERMAN.

H. Res. 154: Mr. BARTLETT and Mr. KING.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 737: Mr. HINCHEY.