

White	Wolf	Young (FL)
Whitfield	Wolsey	Zeliff
Wicker	Wynn	Zimmer
Wise	Young (AK)	

NAYS—43

Barrett (WI)	Lewis (GA)	Ramstad
Becerra	Lofgren	Rangel
Beilenson	Luther	Roemer
Bryant (TX)	Markey	Royce
Camp	Martini	Sensenbrenner
Campbell	Matsui	Stark
Conyers	McDermott	Stockman
Cooley	McKinney	Upton
Frank (MA)	Minge	Vento
Furse	Nadler	Watt (NC)
Hancock	Neumann	Weller
Johnston	Oberstar	Williams
Klecza	Owens	Yates
Klug	Petri	
LaHood	Rahall	

NOT VOTING—22

Bachus	Ford	Molinari
Brown (OH)	Gutknecht	Mollohan
Chapman	Hayes	Paxon
Clay	Houghton	Peterson (FL)
de la Garza	Jefferson	Quinn
Fattah	Kennelly	Wilson
Fields (LA)	Lincoln	
Foglietta	McDade	

□ 1322

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ORDER OF CONSIDERATION OF AMENDMENTS AND POSTPONING VOTES ON AMENDMENTS DURING FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3322, OMNIBUS CIVILIAN SCIENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1996

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during further consideration of H.R. 3322, pursuant to House Resolution 427, it shall be in order to consider the following amendments, or germane modifications thereof, in sequence: The amendment numbered 15 printed by Representative LOFGREN; the amendment numbered 6 printed by Representative KENNEDY of Massachusetts; and the amendment numbered 5 printed by Representative JACKSON-LEE; the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any of those amendments or any amendments thereto; and the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may reduce to not less than 5 minutes the time for voting by electronic device on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote by electronic device without intervening business, provided that the time for voting by electronic device on the first in any series of questions shall be not less than 15 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the material covered in the debate on H.R. 3322 yesterday.

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

There was no objection.

OMNIBUS CIVILIAN SCIENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1996

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 427 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. 3322.

□ 1325

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. 3322) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1997 for civilian science activities of the Federal Government, and for other purposes, with Mr. BURTON of Indiana in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole House rose on Wednesday, May 29, 1996, title II was open for amendment at any point.

Are there any amendments to title II?

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

Mr. Chairman, before we started the debate today, I thought it would be useful maybe to explain the reason for the debate sequence and the way it took place yesterday on the Democrat substitute. Our side simply decided that it was appropriate to allow the Democrats to present, in any way they wished to do and as broad as they wished to present it, their substitute to our bill.

We think that our legislative product stands on its own, that it is a good science bill, it is good for the environment, it is a good long-term bill. The Democrats were obviously proud of their work. We have them the opportunity to fully describe that work before going to a vote, and we thought that was the right way to accommodate the debate in the House.

I do regret that in the course of that debate there were a couple of inaccuracies particularly represented by the gentleman from Texas when he referred to the work of the committee. At one point he referred to the work of the committee as only producing one report last year. I do wish to get that corrected be in the RECORD, and I will submit for be the RECORD a list of 16 reports filed by this committee over the year last year that indicates that this committee was working.

I do think that there is a need to produce quality rather than quantity as the mark of a legislative committee, and that is what we have been doing both legislatively and in terms of the

oversight hearings that we have been conducting. I just want to make certain that any inaccuracies that were stated during that time are in fact corrected, but I hope that we did see that there is a contrast of views when the Democrats present their side and we present our side.

Now we will proceed ahead with the bill and we will go through the amendment process here, and I hope that that amendment process will in fact produce the result of a bill that can be supported on a bipartisan basis on both sides of the aisle.

AMENDMENT NO. 24 OFFERED BY MR. WELDON OF FLORIDA

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WELDON of Florida: Page 26, line 12, strike "\$2,167,400,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,107,400,000".

Page 30, line 11, strike "\$1,957,850,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,017,850,000, of which \$1,594,550,000 shall be for personnel and related costs, \$35,000,000 shall be for travel, and \$388,300,000 shall be for research operations support".

MODIFICATION OF AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WELDON OF FLORIDA

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be replaced with a new amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modification of amendment offered by Mr. WELDON of Florida: Page 26, line 12, strike "\$2,167,400,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,107,400,000".

Page 28, line 2, strike "\$410,600,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$405,600,000".

Page 28, line 3, strike "\$95,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$92,500,000".

Page 28, line 11, strike "\$281,250,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$276,250,000".

Page 30, line 11, strike "\$1,957,850,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,030,800,000, of which \$1,611,000,000 shall be for personnel and related costs, \$31,500,000 shall be for travel, and \$388,300,000 shall be for research operations support".

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the modification offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. WELDON]?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, we have not had an opportunity to review this amendment, and we are looking to determine the offset that has been represented by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. WELDON] at this time.

Further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. WELDON] to explain his particular amendment.

□ 1330

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, if I may proceed, I believe the gentlewoman will agree my amendment is a good amendment.

The bill on the floor of the House has a shortfall for NASA personnel funding. The gentleman from Pennsylvania,

Chairman WALKER, and I, as well as the gentleman from Texas, Mr. STOCKMAN, have worked hard to find a way to overcome the shortfall. My amendment would avoid possible furloughs of NASA employees, which would adversely affect every NASA center and every NASA program by restoring all of the funding shortfall. It provides for full offsets so there is no impact to the budget.

Specifically, my amendment increases funding for NASA program management by \$81.5 million. It fully offsets the increase by decreasing funding in space science by \$60 million, cutting \$8.5 million from NASA's travel account, and cutting \$13 million from various other accounts.

Even with my amendment, the space science account, which I know is an important account for the ranking minority member, still receive a net increase of \$250 million above NASA's fiscal year 1997 request.

Many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have referred to the need to fix the shortfall, and my amendment would do just that. I urge all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the modification of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I do object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

The gentleman from Florida [Mr. WELDON] is recognized for 5 minutes on his original amendment.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I object. Mr. Chairman, I object and I have an amendment that has been prefiled at the desk as No. 13.

The CHAIRMAN. This is the original amendment of the gentleman from Florida. He is entitled to 5 minutes to speak on his amendment.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Are we back to the original amendment, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; it was preprinted in the RECORD.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, for purposes of ascertaining on what basis the Chair is making recognition, I would like to inquire as to who was recognized for the last amendment to this bill?

The CHAIRMAN. Yesterday, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. EHLERS] was, but it is at the discretion of the Chair to determine which Member gains recognition, and both Members who sought recognition at the beginning of the bill today are members of the committee. The Chair has that discretion and the Chair chose to recognize the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, may I further continue my inquiry? Has it not been the practice to alternate recognition between the two

sides of the aisle, particularly if both Members rose at the same time, both members of the committee?

The CHAIRMAN. In this case the Chair is exercising discretion properly.

Mr. BROWN of California. In other words, the Chair is utilizing his unfettered power to recognize whomever he wishes, and does he intend to continue in that practice?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that in this case he is exercising proper discretion.

Mr. BROWN of California. Then we may expect that we will have disregarded the precedent of alternating between the two sides, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair always tries to be fair.

Mr. BROWN of California. We appreciate that very much and hope the Chair is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. WELDON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I want to do a little bit of explanation as to what has been going on here.

I think we all, on both sides of the aisle, share a desire to see this account restored to avoid any possibility of any furloughs and any significant financial shortfall on the part of NASA in terms of paying their employees.

The issue and the debate that has been going on is how do we do this in a fashion that is consistent with our responsibility to stay within the budget to fulfill our obligation to get the budget balanced, the commitment that we have made to the American people, and in that sense come up with appropriate offsets that do not adversely affect any other accounts in excess, and something that is consistent with the overall philosophy of the committee in terms of what our investment in future science and technology is.

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

Mr. WELDON of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. First of all, Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for his amendment and his good work out on the floor to attempt to correct the situation that rose largely because the administration was unable to provide us with good figures from the very outset.

We had an \$81.5 million reduction in program management largely because NASA told us those were the projected levels for employment back in March. They have since come back and said that this is an unacceptable cut and that we were, in fact, cutting the numbers below what they thought were prudent.

We are attempting to, in good faith, change that situation on the floor, and the gentleman from Florida has agreed to try and help in this regard. I am as disappointed as I can be that the gentlewoman from Texas has been stopping us. We are trying to add back the \$1.5 billion she was in favor of doing

and she has objected to an amendment to do just that.

Given that situation, the fact is what the gentleman from Florida, if I understand it correctly, is attempting to do is to find offsets for this money in other places.

One of the things that we had increased substantially in our budget, which means that we really are keeping our commitment to good environment, good science, all of the things that we have said, is to plus up the space science accounts. The No. 1 priority of the program as defined some years ago by the Augustine report, we have put \$250 million more, even after the gentleman's amendment, into that account.

It is one of the real commitments we have made to the future of the NASA science programs. The gentleman protects that space science account. It takes some money out of it, but protects it in many ways. The gentlewoman comes here and she wants to strip all of the money out of the space accounts and put it all back into personnel.

We simply think this is a better approach. I am disappointed she objected. It makes the job more difficult if we cannot get cooperation on this, but I think what the gentleman is doing is an excellent amendment.

It is my understanding that the gentleman from Wisconsin will offer an amendment to the amendment here that will get us back to the right place, and I personally want to thank the gentleman for all the hard work he has put in that is moving us in the right direction.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman, and let me just reiterate that I think we all share a desire to have the proper level of funding in this important account which pays the staff for NASA. They are a very, very hard-working work force, very, very dedicated to the future of our space program.

I know in my particular district, I have Kennedy Space Center, the launch center for NASA, and we have the shuttle program there, we have a very, very dedicated work force. By restoring these funds, I think we are sending a message that we support the staff, we support the personnel and we recognize them for the outstanding job that they have been doing.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SENSENBRENNER TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WELDON OF FLORIDA

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SENSENBRENNER to the amendment offered by Mr. WELDON of Florida: After the item relating to page 26, line 12, insert the following:

Page 28, line 2, strike "\$410,600,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$405,600,000".

Page 28, line 3, strike "\$95,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$92,500,000".

Page 28, line 11, strike "\$281,250,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$276,250,000".

Strike "\$2,017,850,000, of which \$1,594,550,000 shall be for personnel and related costs, \$35,000,000 shall be for travel," and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,030,800,000, of which \$1,611,000,000 shall be for personnel and related costs, \$31,500,000 shall be for travel."

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment that makes the personnel account whole. It adds a total of \$81.5 million to the personnel account, \$73 million comes as a result of reductions in other accounts, and there is a transfer of \$8.5 million from travel into personnel.

The biggest reduction in the other accounts is space science, which is reduced by \$60 million, mission communications by \$5 million, academic by \$3 million, and space communications by \$5 million. This, I think, is the proper way to go about making sure that the personnel account is enough to avoid furloughs. It is done in a fiscally responsible manner in providing offsets to other accounts.

I would urge the adoption of the amendment to the amendment, which would bring the amendment of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. WELDON] back in the shape that he wanted it in prior to the objection to his request to modify it.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WELDON OF FLORIDA

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as a substitute for the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. WELDON of Florida: For the amendment No. 24 offered by Mr. WELDON of Florida. In lieu of the matter proposed in amendment No. 24 insert:

Page 30, line 11, strike "\$1,957,850,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,039,350,000".

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the substitute.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, it is interesting to hear my colleagues debate about now their recently obtained concern about the personnel at NASA and the various centers around the Nation. I appreciate my colleague from Florida and his sincerity. We have had discussions, but I might note that my amendment was prefiled much earlier than those who have now offered both amendments and perfecting amendments.

Let me first say to the chairman that the head of NASA does not want the \$300 million in space science, would prefer to continue the progress that he has made in downsizing, but, most importantly, is concerned about the untimely abuse that will come through this legislation of NASA personnel that have been downsized and outsized.

The amendment that I offer will restore \$81.5 million to ensure to the personnel account that we have the most responsible and safe staff to do the mission of NASA. It is not an increase, it is in recognition of the administration's budget, and is, as well, in recognition of the work that has been done by NASA already.

I think it is important to note that we have had a NASA restructuring process going on since fiscal year 1993. We started with civilian service employees of 24,900, at a 5-to-4 ratio in supervisors. We are now at a civilian service of 21,000, going to a 7-to-8 ratio. We now will move forward in the future to 17,000 civil service with a ratio of 11 to 1. NASA is already a lean, mean operating machine.

With the amendment presently on the floor, it does not in any way consider what NASA has already done. When Mr. Goldin set forth to restructure NASA, he began a trip down a path of personnel reduction which had at its center a logical and employee-caring philosophy. That is why we will result in the number of only 17,000 employees with a supervisory ratio of 11 to 1.

Mr. Chairman, that is real progress. NASA has demonstrated its commitment to this process in achieving these personnel levels. But let me say to my colleagues what will happen if we follow the present amendment on the floor, that of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. WELDON]. To put it bluntly, the salaries and expenses reduction is impossible to achieve, according to NASA, without drastic action. Unless a miracle occurs, and we have both buyout legislation and a lot of takers, there is simply no feasible way to implement this reduction without resorting to furloughs, and that furlough would be an estimated time of 10 to 12 days.

I ask my colleagues, Mr. Chairman, what does that do to both the loyal employees at NASA and, more importantly, what about the many calls I get into my office about the questions of safety. We have already begun the process of downsizing. Why would this legislation pointedly go at the personnel and not respond to what has already been occurring by Dan Goldin?

Mr. Chairman, I encourage my Republican colleagues to join me on this amendment. I appreciate the sincerity with which they have attempted to modify what I have already done. We need to go forward with restoring the \$81.5 million that says to NASA we applaud what you are doing, we recognize the sacrifice that has already been taken by your employees, and, yes, we are concerned about the safety and the lives of both our employees but as well those astronauts that take their lives in their hands on behalf of the American people and on behalf of American science.

□ 1345

It is my intent, Mr. Chairman, to offer this amendment and to be able to

say that we expect that NASA will RIF a total of 1,400 employees by October 1, 1996. Why are we forcing them to do even more and then furloughing for now from 12 to 14 days?

This is an outrageous cut. I ask my colleagues to join me in providing for an \$81.5 million restoration to allow NASA to do the job that it has to do.

Mr. Chairman, I offer my amendment to correct a problem within this legislation which, if it goes uncorrected, will fall upon the backs of the thousands of loyal, hardworking NASA employees across this country. Mr. Chairman, I am referring to language in H.R. 3322 which will result in an \$81.5 million reduction in the NASA personnel account, from what the President has requested.

I do not understand why an agency which has been at the forefront of streamlining itself and lowering its cost to the American taxpayer should be punished for its accomplishments. Under Mr. Goldin, the NASA Administrator, the agency has taken extraordinary steps, without congressional prodding, to reinvent itself into an organization which is more focused on its mission and the people it serves.

When Mr. Goldin set forth to restructure NASA, he began a trip down a path of personnel reduction which had at its center logical and employee-caring philosophy. When this restructuring began, NASA had 24,900 civil servants with a supervisor ratio of 5.4 to 1. Now, the agency has 21,325 civil servants and when it is all said and done, the agency will have a mere 17,488 employees with a supervisor ratio of 11 to 1. Mr. Chairman, that is real progress. NASA has demonstrated its commitment to this process and achieving these personnel levels, but we must allow it to do so in an orderly and caring fashion for its employees. Many in this Chamber have assailed the way many corporations are throwing aside their loyal and valuable employees for the sake of Wall Street and quarterly returns. I call upon these same Members to practice what they preach and help NASA treat its employees fairly.

NASA has accomplished all of this through the use of buyouts, hiring freezes, redeployment, privatization, and outplacement, to name a few. It has a plan and a schedule. I encourage my colleagues to allow it to continue.

If this egregious cut should become law, there will be serious repercussions for the men, women, and families of NASA. The agency will be forced to furlough, for up to possibly 3 weeks, most of its employees. When was the last time anyone in Congress went without pay for such an extended time? This \$81.5 million cut in salaries and expenses is ill-conceived, cannot be achieved without drastic action affecting all NASA centers, and it jeopardizes NASA's ability to safely deliver its programs. The impacts envisioned by the agency are a reduction in force [RIF] total 1,400 employees by October 1, 1996, a physical and legal impossibility or an agency-wide furlough of approximately 21,000 employees for 12 to 14 days.

In addition a \$34 million cut, as some have proposed will still put an unacceptable strain on implementation of the zero-based review recommendations, including major changes in center roles and missions and consolidation of center capabilities; NASA needs the full amount of requested funding to accomplish

the complex agency restructuring currently underway.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] insist on his point of order?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my point of order.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is unfortunate that this little tiff should develop. There is a mistake in the bill, and an effort is being made to correct it. That mistake was pointed out by the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HALL], when the bill was in the subcommittee. It was pointed out when the bill was in markup in the full committee, and an amendment was offered to correct it in the full committee.

Mr. Chairman, that amendment to correct the problem in the full committee was resisted by both the chairman of the full committee and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. WELDON] and all of the Republicans together, who at that point did not feel that they had made a mistake.

Now they have come to realize that a mistake was made, I think, when they saw that the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] had filed an amendment which would have corrected the error and might be recognized to present that amendment and the case for adopting her amendment would have been overwhelming.

But, Mr. Chairman, that led then to undoubtedly some strategic discussions on the other side. Should those on our side who had pointed out the problem at the subcommittee level, the full committee level, and by filing an amendment to correct it on the floor, be allowed to correct it, or should the majority now in their new-found wisdom be allowed to correct the mistake?

Apparently, they decided that in their new-found wisdom they would be allowed to correct the mistake, and they are riding roughshod over the normal processes of the House and over the position of the minority that this is something which ought to be corrected in the simplest possible way.

So, Mr. Chairman, they have presented an amendment which, though slightly flawed in its original aspect, will be attempted to be corrected by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SENSENBRENNER]. The flaws in the original amendment, including finding a whole series of offsetting cuts which would do, if not equal, at least considerable damage to the program at NASA, and I think they hope to avoid this possibility. But the whole point of this is really a game-playing operation.

The NASA budget has been cut by several hundred million dollars. It has been plussed up in order to substantiate the chairman's frequently reiterated position that he is a strong proponent of science. It has been plussed up to add money that the agency did not ask for and will find difficulty spending, and then they have made this

terrible cut, which will have the effect of causing a layoff or furlough of a substantial number of employees. And, as I say, in their wisdom they have finally recognized that this is not the right way to go.

But since I offered the amendment to correct this in the full committee and I offered it in my substitute yesterday, I take considerable umbrage at the aura of sanctimoniousness that is now enshrouding the majority which they seek to correct a mistake of their own making, and I ask that the amendment of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. WELDON] be rejected and the substitute of the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] be adopted.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think the difference between the substitute amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] and the Sensenbrenner-Weldon amendment shows the difference between the two parties in the House of Representatives.

Mr. Chairman, the Jackson-Lee substitute is an add-on. There are no offsets. It adds on \$81.5 million to make the personnel account whole. They do not look at reordering priorities. They do not look at keeping the total appropriation or total authorization for NASA the same. They just want to spend some more money and not offset any of the accounts, even those that they think have been set at too high a level by the majority on the committee.

The Weldon amendment, as amended by my amendment, provides the same amount of money for the NASA personnel account as the Jackson-Lee amendment, \$81.5 million to stop all of those terrible things that the gentlewoman from Texas and the gentleman from California say will happen.

But what the Weldon and Sensenbrenner amendments do is to offset other parts of NASA, so that our amendment is budget neutral. It does not increase the total amount of money that will be spent on NASA. It is budget neutral.

So, Mr. Chairman, if Members are for just plussing up the NASA account without making offsets, vote for the Jackson-Lee amendment. If Members are not for that, vote to reject it and vote for the Sensenbrenner amendment and then the Weldon amendment, as amended by the Sensenbrenner amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to enter this debate or this conversation here and say first, as I enter it, I respect the opinions of both sides and I know that we have all worked together very hard to make sure that we find a way to make NASA the kind of organization that NASA needs to be. Most of us here today have given long years doing that; many people much longer than I have. However, I am concerned about the direction that we are talking

Mr. Chairman, I, of course, represent the Marshall Space Flight Center, and those Marshall employees there are certainly concerned about where they fit into NASA's budget picture.

I want to say in behalf of the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE], I know that she represents the Houston Johnson Space Flight Center, or at least parts of that area down there. I want my Marshall NASA employees to know that we respect them, that we are working for them.

Mr. Chairman, I am concerned that with the offsets that will be occurring under the Sensenbrenner-Weldon approach to this same issue, that we are having to raid other parts of NASA's budget. I wish, in fact, we could have a more complete NASA budget so that we did not have the raid those things. But I do want to say that I support the Jackson-Lee amendment and would encourage the Members to support it as well.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Alabama for his comments. I think both of us have had the opportunity, along with our Republican colleagues, to talk about the effectiveness of what has already occurred with NASA in terms of the downsizing and the impact that has occurred on our respective centers, Marshall, Kennedy, Johnson, and many others.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to certainly emphasize that the key point and distinction between the Weldon-Sensenbrenner amendment proudly shows that we are restoring moneys that do not impact negatively on other programs. Their amendment includes some deletions from the ROS accounts, which provides for safety measures and other operational needs in our various centers.

This amendment emphasizes the NASA staff, the work they have done, the safety necessities that we need to have in terms of keeping the appropriate amount of staff. It also reaffirms, if you will, already the RIF program that is in place where we will be seeing some 1,400 employees go by October 1996.

This causes NASA to be able to continue its mission without the tragedy of a furlough of some 2 weeks. How disruptive that will be for that to occur in the business of what NASA has to do. It will allow for the opportunity for travel for monitoring the cooperation between Russia and our space station partners.

So, Mr. Chairman, I think that with respect to what has been offered by the Republicans, after my amendment was offered on May 8, I believe the restoration of \$81.5 million, which is not an increase but a restoration of funds that would meet the needs of these NASA employees with the downsizing occurring, is a more appropriate direction to

take, and I would ask my colleagues to support wholeheartedly this amendment.

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

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

Mr. BROWN of California. This conversation from the other side dealing with the budget and no offsets is really sort of a shell game, which we all know. The majority has cut the President's budget by several hundred million dollars. This would partially restore that, this amendment of the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

The fact is, Mr. Chairman, the Subcommittee on Appropriations has already marked this bill up and has a larger figure in it than the majority has in their authorization bill.

So, whatever discussion of budget impact that is being made here, and I hear it all too frequently, is in the mind of the chairman of the committee, nothing more, because the Committee on Appropriations has already moved to correct the problem that is represented here, and we are not adding to or subtracting from the budget in the slightest.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak on behalf of the Weldon amendment. My dear friend and colleague who is in the district right next to mine, the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE], and I are very good friends and we try to work together and ensure, Mr. Chairman, that we have a safe and sound NASA.

My dear friend and colleague from Texas made a statement that we are cutting funds from the safety program. I want to reiterate and clarify that we are not doing that.

In fact, Mr. Chairman, I am a little bit concerned about the fact that when we offered this amendment to restore the money, the gentlewoman objected. I think what we are trying to do here is to make sure we have a balanced budget and we have a space station.

Frankly, my belief is if we do not balance the budget and have a space station, then we will not have a space program. This is a reasonable accommodation on both viewpoints. What we have done is restructured it so that we can fully employ the people of NASA.

Mr. Chairman, I have to speak from my heart because my wife currently works there, and I saw the pain and the suffering when our President of the United States cut Space Station Freedom. I went to a party in which they were saying good-bye to Space Station Freedom. And I more than anyone else want to see space station be completed. I want to see NASA whole again. And I have to tell you, Mr. Chairman, this amendment makes NASA whole again, and it protects the people.

Mr. Chairman, we have a great concern for the integrity and the people down in our district. They are very

hard-working people that have a vision, and that vision of America is a first-class space program. We look around the world, and, Mr. Chairman, as we are looking around the world, we see Japan and we see Russia. Everybody is going into space. But, Mr. Chairman, without this amendment, we are not going to have a space program, because we need to make sure we are responsible to our grandchildren and our children that the budget is balanced so that we can pay for the space program.

Mr. Chairman, I come home at night and on weekends, and I meet my wife and she tells me of the passion and love with which people work at NASA. Mr. Chairman, you may not know this, but the engineers that work at NASA could go out in other sectors of this country and get more money, but they are doing it because they love NASA and they love this Nation. They are taking pay cuts. And they took RIF's. That is true. And we want to make sure that it is a sound financial planning.

Let me say something to you, Mr. Chairman, when we sit around the table and we discuss our budget, we have to make decisions. We have a fixed income in what we get every time. And this amendment which the gentleman from Florida has offered is the same thing as American families do. They sit around the table and make those hard decisions. We are incorporating the money that was inadvertently taken out and put it back there to ensure the viability of the space program.

And I know one day when I grow old and look back and look at my tenure here, Mr. Chairman, serving in this fine institution, I will know we did the right thing by supporting this amendment because what we are doing is we are looking out for the budget and we are looking out for the space program. And we are going to see a great and glorious space program.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman of the committee and also my chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, for coming down to the district and telling the folks firsthand just what it means to us in Congress that we are dedicated to restoring those funds.

On behalf of the people in my district, Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentleman for the consideration of this amendment and also like to say that I give my full support for it, and I am also going to tell my wife that we fought for the people of Texas and also for the people of NASA.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STOCKMAN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas.

□ 1400

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Texas. Feeling his passion, I would want him to do the right thing. But I do have to emphasize to the gentleman

from Texas that he might want to reconsider his facts. Here we are, on the House floor, complaining about \$81.5 million straight up for the NASA personnel. The Committee on Appropriations has already authorized some \$600 million more than what the authorizing committee has done, which has Republican leadership.

Mr. Chairman, let me say to my colleagues that the question your wife will ask you, have they cut the ROS? And you have cut the ROS by \$34 million. That does not go to the safety issue. It takes away from safety. The right way to go is to support the Jackson-Lee amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I know my friend from Texas would want to be on the right mark by supporting the right amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I yield to my colleague, the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from Texas for yielding. More importantly, I thank him because he has been certainly a hard worker on the issues involving Texas and Texas economic opportunities and the needs of working Texans.

This bill is for working Americans. Particularly as it relates to NASA, I cannot seem to get my Republican colleagues to understand that this is a restoration, some \$81.5 million, so much less than the authorization already appropriated by the Committee on Appropriations. When we begin to look at the Weldon-Sensenbrenner, we begin to see the chipping away to what NASA has already accomplished. It has accomplished a sufficient and efficient downsizing. By October, we will find some 1,400 who will be RIF'd.

If we do not pass the Jackson-Lee amendment, we will begin to see undercutting of safety issues by the undercutting of ROS. We also are going to see cutting of academic programs, space communications, the inability to work with our foreign space station partners, like Japan and Russia, because we will have no travel budget and, of course, science.

I think we really have to maintain a truth in speaking here, and that is that we are simply trying to restore the \$81.5 million, one for safety and one for the responsible carrying out of NASA's mission with the right kind of personnel.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN], the ranking member of the full committee.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, this entire bill that is before us, including the NASA part, is built on this gigantic fiction that we have to do this in order to influence the Committee on Appropriations and in order to keep the budget, to balance the budget, neither of which are true. We do not

have to cut the President's budget by several hundred million dollars in order to balance the budget because his budget is balanced.

We are not influencing the appropriators. They have already acted to appropriate, to recommend the House appropriate an amount roughly what was in my substitute, may be a little bit more. Now the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SENSENBRENNER] and others can keep harping on this fact that this bill, their bill is absolutely essential to balancing the budget and to influence the appropriators. The facts belie their statement.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the Members on the other side to try looking at the facts for a change instead of the figments of the imagination of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. COLEMAN. If I might, reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, only add that I think it is time for all of us to wake up and recognize that a good deal of the downsizing that went down at NASA went on long before the new majority became the new majority in the Congress. Indeed, this President and Vice President, AL GORE, had done a great deal in attempting to make Government work for the United States and for its citizens.

I think that what we have done at NASA is a shining example of what can be done when we all agree to put our shoulder to the wheel. I would hope that my colleagues in the majority would not walk about and continue to talk like they are the ones who invented economy in government. After all, a lot of us know that much of this began in 1993. Many of us, when this administration came into office, said it is about time.

We want very much, Mr. Chairman, to not harm the employees at NASA. We want very much, Mr. Chairman, to not harm the issue of science for the United States. We think that, without the amendment offered by my colleague from Houston, that could occur.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute and move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, this has been a fascinating discussion. First of all, again I am disappointed that the gentleman from California, a ranking member of the committee, feels it necessary as part of these debates to personalize them and attack me as though this is all being done personally. The fact is that what we are attempting to do is make some changes in the direction of government.

Now, listen carefully to what the other side is telling us. The amendment that I am opposing here, and it has been presented by the gentlewoman from Texas, increases spending by \$81.5 million in this bill. Now, what we keep hearing from the majority is we can increase spending, increase spending, increase spending, increase spending, in-

crease spending, increase spending, increase spending, and balance the budget. Now, if anybody has ever figured out a way to do that in their own household, I congratulate them. I would love to think that we can continue to increase spending, increase spending, increase spending, increase spending and end up balancing our budget at the end of the day. But that is exactly what we are being told, that somehow money just drifts out of nowhere, that the American people will just continue to ante up, empty their pocketbooks to give to Government so that people in Washington can increase spending. That is what the gentlewoman does with her amendment.

Now, the gentleman from Florida has offered another amendment, combined with the gentleman from Wisconsin. What they say is, yes, let us make NASA whole, where a mistake was made by the administration in what they submitted to the Congress. But let us do it by taking out of some other accounts.

Now, we have heard from the other side that, well, that is an irresponsible approach; you cannot take it out of other accounts. Well, why not? Let us think of the other accounts we are taking it out of. First of all, we are taking it out of an account that he other side said in their debate is an account that the administration does not even want.

Now, I happen to disagree with the administration on that. I think plussing up space science is in fact a good thing for the country. In fact, I have a letter from Carl Sagan and some other members of the Planetary Society that endorse the numbers in our bill because they feel very strongly that plussing up those numbers is the right way to go. But we have lowered them a little bit in order to accommodate this mistake that was made.

The other side does not want to do that. The other side does not want to plus up that account for space science. Stick with the President's budget. The President's budget, which over the period of 7 years drops over a cliff and drops into a valley. That is what they support. That is what they are out here defending. But there is one other place where we take a good deal of money. We take a good deal of money out of the travel accounts. Now, what they are claiming is that NASA needs \$45 million for travel.

We say that perhaps that NASA could get along with \$31 million for travel. I guess that is one of those things where we can have a debate. Is it 31 or is it 45? We think that, in order to preserve the integrity of the personnel process at NASA, maybe they can get by with \$31 million for travel. That is the main difference here, whether or not you want to cut the space science account some to accommodate this and whether or not you want to cut the travel accounts. The rest of them are minor matters.

The gentlewoman from Texas does not want to cut at all. She just wants

to spend the money. Just plus up the accounts, and live with the fiction that by spending more and more and more and more and more and more you can truly balance budgets and stop us from having deficits. I just do not believe that that works anymore. I just think that is the old way of doing things. That is the old status quo argument. We have had that for 40 years in the House of Representatives of spending more and more and more on every bill and somehow not ending up with balanced budgets, ending up with huge deficits.

Mr. Chairman, now we have started a new day. We have decided that we are going to set priorities for real. I know the gentleman from Texas resents that idea. He thinks it is a terrible thing our committee has had to live with, setting priorities. But it is a good thing for us as a country to set real priorities to make real decisions and fundamentally making the direction of this country back toward balanced budgets and toward giving the American people back more of what they earn for themselves.

That is what we should be about here, not adding spending but doing the right thing and doing it within the context of what we can afford.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am always deeply challenged when the chairman of the committee ups and makes one of his great orations. I will be very brief, actually.

The gentleman is talking to the wrong audience. He should be addressing his remarks with regard to balancing the budget and keeping spending down to his Republican colleagues on the Committee on Appropriations, who have already marked up a bill that spends at least \$600 million more than his bill authorizers. Now, maybe he wants it that way. I do not know. But I suggest he may need to make that speech to some of those on the Committee on Appropriations and get them to go back and bring their bill down to what he has in this bill.

Now, is this a good bill? He cited the commendations he received from Carl Sagan. Here is a letter which each Member got from the National Space Society, which is the recognized premier civilian organization in this area. It says as follows:

The administration is seeking to fund NASA in 1997 at \$13.8 billion, a \$400 million reduction from the current year's budget. The House science authorization bill would cut that down to only \$13.5 billion, a \$300 million cut. Members of the National Space Society strongly object to the proposed reduction in NASA's budget and believe the cuts in funding undermine America's leadership in advanced technology and lessen our Nation's ability to create economic opportunities.

Obviously their point came across very well to the appropriators, because the appropriators proceeded to appropriate even more than is in the authorization bill and even more than was in

my substitute. I am establishing my record as a conservative Member of Congress by the fact that I went below the appropriators in my substitute.

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

Mr. Chairman, I think there are two important aspects of this debate. The first is how much money can we add to various spending proposals and at what point. I would like to point out that this is still the beginning of the process, not the end of the process. In fact, an amendment that I offered yesterday with respect to the National Science Foundation increased spending for the National Science Foundation in its research and related activities account without an offset, because the Committee on the Budget, which is working on this same issue, along with us and along with the Committee on Appropriations, had found a means to pay for its within the House-passed budget resolution.

As we proceed through the system, if the different committees of responsibility find ways to increase spending, in this particular case on civilian research and development, which I very much support, then I personally could at that point certainly support that.

At this point, however, dealing with the bill before us, therefore, I intend with regret, because I understand the gentlewoman's motivation, to vote against the Jackson-Lee amendment, in favor of the Sensenbrenner amendment and Weldon amendment.

However, I would like to say there is a larger debate here. Our ranking member, the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN], referred to the fact that we do not need to make any changes from the President's proposals because the President's budget is balanced. Although we are now talking about NASA, I think the same subject comes up again, as we discussed yesterday with respect to the National Science Foundation, and which will come up with respect to almost every spending proposal I could think of. That is, Mr. Chairman, that the President proposes in almost every account more spending for the next fiscal year, which is fiscal year 1997, beginning October 1 of this year.

But the point is we are voting on fiscal year 1997 now, during 1996, which is the calendar year of the election year. Therefore, there is a proposed bump in spending almost everywhere by the administration, frankly to enhance their posture in the election. The point I want to make, I think this is going to be paid for elsewhere by the administration by deeper cuts than proposed by the majority in Congress in later years.

I know that is the case with respect to the National Science Foundation's salaries accounts, because we debated that yesterday. I know the administration proposed a bump up, followed by a steep decline in spending, well below congressional majority proposals.

So far as I know, that is correct with respect to the administration's NASA proposals for spending in subsequent fiscal years as rated by the Congressional Budget Office, that both sides have agreed to use to monitor spending and evaluate spending, would have deeper cuts in future years than is proposed in the House-passed budget resolution. If I am wrong on that, I would appreciate the figures being submitted during this debate. But so far as I know, this is a proposal for higher spending at one point to be followed by a lot deeper spending cuts elsewhere.

Mr. Chairman, I think that the majority's proposal is best here for NASA, as well as for other Government agencies.

□ 1415

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

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I just want to point out that when AAAS did their evaluation and compared what we did to the administration's plan that they are now defending, the AAAS, the authority on all this, the American Association for the Advancement of Science, in their R&D analysis said that NASA would fare slightly better under the House's plan, losing 23 percent instead of 29 percent in the administration's projections.

So when the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COLEMAN] a few minutes ago when he spoke said that the President and the Vice President have slashed NASA employees, he is absolutely right, and now when we look out into the future, as the gentleman points out, the AAAS says in their report that we are better in our House plan than the administration is in their plan, and I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHIFF. I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I am not sure what the gentleman from Pennsylvania is directing his comments toward. We are talking about real numbers, we are talking about what is occurring now and not prospectively, and what is happening now is that real numbers are \$81.5 million being eliminated with additional cuts from ROS of \$34 million, which does not allow us to respond to already downsize NASA in its present form.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, if I may reclaim my time very briefly, I want to say that we are all proposing to add the money back right now, but what is more important is the gentleman from California, the senior member of the Committee on Science and former chairman, made a specific reference to the President's budget, and my only point was to show that the President's budget means all of the President's budget, just like a congressional budget means all of the congressional budget.

We have both agreed to try to reach a balanced budget, and it is not accurate to refer to 1 year of any budget and not show what the other effects would be.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, my concern is not whether or not we bust the budget. My concern is not that we are cutting the budget; it is how we are cutting the budget. It does not add up when we say we are protecting the personnel and we take away all their tools. It does not do anything but cause for more inefficiency. It is a problem being created by this amendment of Mr. WELDON's, and that is why I think that the more sensible way is with the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

For example, when he cuts the travel budget by 30 percent, he will then jeopardize the ability of NASA civil service personnel to perform necessary project-related travel, like the trips to Russia to monitor Russian progress on the space station program, space station-related trips between Kennedy Space Center and the Johnson Space Center, travel to support launch operations of scientific payloads et cetera. I just do not think it makes sense the way that he is cutting.

As my colleagues know, we can cut the budget, but if it does not coordinate, if we leave NASA without utilities, without money for custodial services, then we really have not done anything to improve operations; we have simply cut without thinking. And that is exactly what the Weldon amendment does. I do not think it makes sense.

I think it does make sense to have a orderly downsizing, as they are doing now, that they have already accomplished, and they are continuing to accomplish. But when they say that they are protecting the personnel, they take away all their tools, then how irresponsible is that? I do not believe that we want to go that irresponsible way.

I believe that the way we must go, and it does not bust the budget, it does not exceed what the Committee on Appropriations has recommended, is to adopt the Jackson-Lee amendment.

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

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. So if I am to understand, the gentlewoman from Texas thinks that NASA should spend \$45 million for travel rather than \$31 million for travel; is that correct?

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. I think that we need to coordinate the real basic needs for what travel it is and look at those figures rather than deciding we just want to slash something.

Mr. WALKER. Just so I understand, the decision here is between \$45 million for travel and \$31 million for travel. The gentlewoman mentioned traveling

to Russia. We do not understand why they would have to do that since we already have a full-time NASA office in Russia. But nevertheless what she is saying is that what she believes is that we ought to be spending more money for travel rather than saving that money.

Is that correct?

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Let me say that the gentleman from Pennsylvania can make a simplistic argument like that, and it might sound like it makes sense, but it does not make sense unless the gentleman can relate it to reality, relate it to basic needs of a program.

We can all pay with numbers. But unless those numbers make sense in reality, we are wasting other dollars.

Mr. WALKER. If the gentlewoman from Texas would continue to yield, she is the one that mentioned travel to Russia. She says that is one of the things this money was used for.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I am saying exactly what it would cut. If the gentleman would tell me exactly what the dollars he is talking about would pay for, then we can relate. But I am talking about cutting essential travel to carry out the duty of NASA.

Mr. WALKER. And the gentlewoman does not think they can do that on \$31.5 million.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. I think we ought to look back in that testimony and see. I do not know that they can do it with \$31 million. It might not make sense.

I think that the gentleman from Pennsylvania ought to be the one explaining to me why they can make all these trips with \$31 million rather than talking about and trying to excite the public.

Mr. WALKER. If the gentlewoman would continue to yield, I am perfectly willing to have them do it on \$31 million.

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

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] is making the point that my colleagues want to engage in profligate spending and he wants to save this 15 or whatever million dollars it is. We discussed that yesterday, and we came to the conclusion that this money was not being saved, and we know it is not, but it is going to be spent in other directions. He wants to spend it to increase the military budget by \$12 billion or \$14 billion, and I said that, and then he added also we want to make a very substantial tax cut for what he calls middle-income America.

It is not a matter of saving, never has been. It is a matter of priorities. If my colleagues' priority is spending more for defense and for tax cuts for the wealthy, they want to cut it any

way they can, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], living in this land that he does, it is time to make the case that what he is doing is prudent when he is merely asserting his values, with which I strongly disagree.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield? Do I understand the gentleman from California is opposed to tax cuts for the middle class?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. CHAMBLISS). The time of the gentleman from Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON has expired.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, let me talk about the Jackson-Lee amendment for a few minutes, and I think the Members who are here and who are watching it now realize that we are talking about authorization bill here. The Committee on Appropriations has already appropriated \$600 million more than this bill authorizes, and what we are trying to do with my colleagues from Houston, Ms. JACKSON-LEE's amendment, is to provide \$81.5 million in additional authorization to make sure we do not have as much as 3 weeks' furlough of the employees there. That is really not a way to run a government, a business, or an airline, or a railroad, or anything else where we plan to authorize less than what we are going to spend so we can lay off those workers there because we are not planning for it.

Again, it does not make any sense because all we are doing is authorizing, we are not spending a penny with this bill today. The Committee on Appropriation and the appropriations bill will spend the penny; we are just authorizing them to do it. And since they have already come up with \$600 million more, again my colleagues may disagree with that, well, then let us talk to the Committee on Appropriations.

But NASA has already downsized and done everything they can. NASA has already downsized, and they have become leaner, meaner. In fact, whether it be the administration or those of us in Congress who have made them provide a better value for the American taxpayer, they have cut 4,000 civil service jobs since 1993 and plan to continue to cut another 4,000 by the fiscal year 2000. And the reduction in work force will not generate the savings for this coming year because NASA cannot technically execute a reduction in work force or a RIF, one early enough to generate that savings even if it is not authorized.

That is what I think we need to go back to, and from what I understand, this \$81.5 million that is needed for the authorization to make sure that we do not have that furlough of those employees, these are full-time NASA em-

ployees where planning but not authorizing funding for them, to furlough them for 10 to 12 to 21 days sometime during the year. Again that is not the way anybody should run their business, and we should not expect the Government to run that way either because we are just authorizing it today.

The future of our work force depends on the high-skilled and the skilled jobs that the space station, the aerospace industry provides, and again we should not treat those employees, whether they are NASA or whether they are contract, in saying, "Well, we've sorry we're going to lay you off for 21 days because we don't have the authorization to spend the money even though one hand we could do it, but on the other hand we are not giving it to you."

That just does not make any sense.

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BROWN of California. With regard to this money that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] is pointing to that he now wants to save the difference in the transportation items, I would like to point out that the figure which is referred to here, the amount for transportation, was in the bill at the subcommittee level, it was in the bill when it was marked up at the full committee level, it was in the bill yesterday, as a matter of fact. And now Mr. WALKER has decided, without hearings, I might say, or any other indication, that that is really too much and it is wasted. So he is going to cut \$15 million out of it in order to correct this waste.

Now my real question to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] is:

Why did he suddenly find that this money is being wasted instead of at the subcommittee level, which he did not allow markups in, or the full committee level, which he did allow markups in, or even smaller in the debate?

If they were wasteful expenditures, he should have proposed in his manager's amendment that all this waste be removed. But, no he did not find out about it until it was necessary to correct the mistake which he also should have corrected in the full committee level and did not.

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Since the Committee on Appropriations has come up, I think we should clarify, before we get too much misinformation on the floor: In our appropriation bill we cut \$309 million out of essentially the operating accounts of NASA. The appropriators cut \$542 million out of the operating accounts of NASA and in their bill. Now their total is higher, in large part because there are some fixed asset accounts that they count into their numbers, but if we look at the operating accounts that NASA has to spend before

going out to brag about what has happened in the appropriation committee, take a look, folks, because the fact is there is \$558 million in a fixed asset account that is counted in there, and we actually—

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. In reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, we are talking about the Jackson-Lee amendment, \$81.5 million. The Committee on Appropriations has authorized \$600 million. That \$81.5 million could come out of that \$600 million, and I could be corrected, but that is what I have been told. I do not know about the fixed asset part of this amendment.

We are talking about saving employees from having a reduction in work force for 10 to 12 to 20 days by having some reasonable planning in the authorization, and that is what authorizations are supposed to be about, Mr. Chairman, that we plan for those employees to do their work full-time.

Mr. Chairman, I encourage adoption of the Jackson-Lee amendment.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am concerned as I have listened now, this is the second day I have listened to this debate in the Committee on Science and here on the floor, and I am just a little bit surprised that one of my dear colleagues from Florida really wants to cut personnel in such a way that it will affect Florida employees and citizens of Florida.

But I am concerned about all of the appropriations. I am concerned, first of all, to say that any time we are dealing with personnel, we cannot just jump without some studies. I do not think any one has ever looked at the negative impact of this particular issue that would cut money out of personnel.

First of all, the question I would like to ask is: Has anybody looked at the inflationary increase that these people will have to use to live by?

□ 1430

Have Members looked at the benefits that will be due to them in this forthcoming budget which we are trying to authorize here? If we are arguing about figures, we had better think about some of the things that influence figures. Things that influence figures are not just the way we feel philosophically. What influences figures should be what impact will this have on the employees who make up the personnel of NASA. That is the first thing we are going to think about.

Then, if we are just thinking about budget cutting, we could cut any budget that each committee has put on. If we are just going to do that, then just wantonly cut the budgets, instead of going into a personnel budget and reducing it by so many million dollars.

Mr. Chairman, I do not have this argument with what the President's budget is. I am talking about the policy of authorizing something that will

give the personnel of the NASA a chance to operate like personnel of other industries.

All the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] is asking, and I am here to support her amendment, all she is asking is that we restore the NASA personnel account to the level that was requested by the President. I am hearing different things on that, standing here, but that is what her amendment is asking. I agree with that.

Mr. Chairman, if we do not pass her amendment, according to what is currently going on on the floor now, these personnel members, these are human beings, just like us in the Congress. We do not want our benefits cut, we do not want our salary cut due to the whims and whimsical ideas that people have. We want to be sure that if they are cut, there is a sound reason.

Think about what this will do, Mr. Chairman. What this will do is put them on a furlough. Have we not had enough furloughs here in the Federal Government? Have we not had enough Government employees and contractors of Government, to cause their personnel benefits and cause their pay to be cut? Have we not had enough of that? When will we learn our lesson?

Another thing, in dealing with the agency, I am hoping that somebody spoke to this agency, to NASA, and said, how can we best cut the personnel that will not negatively impact on you? I am not sure that this was ever done, because we are dealing pretty much with the budget here. We are not dealing with how these agencies should be run. I do not think any of us know that much about what is going on back in these agencies. I am not sure they even talked to them before they decided to bring up these cuts.

I am only talking about commonsense administration, commonsense, humane things that a government should not be doing; that is, cutting personnel without consulting the agency and saying to the agency, these are our objectives, these are our goals, how can we best reach that? That has not been done because, as I understand it, there was no consultation with the agency and there is no basis for this sharp reduction.

I close, Mr. Chairman, by saying if there is going to be a sharp reduction, particularly in personnel, it should be thought through, it should go through the authorizing committee, and then submit it, naturally, as we have to do to appropriations, but think about the impact, first. I beg the Members to support the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE]. It is a humane amendment. It is based on the future of the personnel of NASA. They are dedicated people in that agency, Mr. Chairman. I would appeal to the House to pass the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Florida. I think it is extremely important.

Let me indicate that the Sensenbrenner-Weldon amendment simply robs from Peter to say Paul. That is the clarification we need. Though they are belatedly offering to restore these funds, which the Jackson-Lee amendment does straight up, they then gut academic programs, they gut the space communications, they gut travel, so we cannot relate to our foreign space partners in the space station, and they gut science.

And NASA has indicated that we will see no savings with their reductions in 1997, fiscal year 1997, none whatsoever, because they cannot move that quickly. They are already downsizing, cutting jobs, cutting employees, as of October, 1996. The gentlewoman is absolutely right that Florida, Texas, and Alabama will be hurt drastically.

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

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

Mr. WELDON of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I just think we ought to have a clarification from the last set of remarks we just had. The gentlewoman from Florida accused my colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. WELDON], of seeking to slash personnel. Thank goodness the gentlewoman from Texas tried to make a clarification on that.

The fact is that both of these amendments put back in the full money for personnel accounts. The only question here is whether or not we are going to save some money out of travel accounts and out of some other accounts in order to pay the personnel, or whether or not we are going to do simply an add-on that adds on deficit spending.

Mr. Chairman, I think we ought to clarify that. There was very little good information in that last set of remarks, because it simply did not relate to the topic before us. Again, the gentleman needs to be congratulated. He is doing the responsible thing here of plusing up those personnel accounts, but doing so in a way that we can afford it and the taxpayers do not end up having it taken out of their pocketbook.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. I thank the gentleman. I will try to make my comments briefly.

Mr. Chairman, this has been a lengthy debate. I think it has been fairly productive. I just want to explain a little to my colleagues how we got into this situation. Our staff on the committee sat down with the NASA officials and were given figures on the amount of money they needed for the support of their staff, the full-time equivalents. Then 2 days before we went to committee markup, they came in with a whole new set of numbers and said they needed \$81.5 million more.

It is true that the ranking member did seek in his substitute to restore that money, and I commend him for that. But he also sought about \$1.5 billion additional of spending that we did not have. It would amount to borrowing more money from our children to pay for what we are doing now. I think that was irresponsible, and his substitute was defeated in committee, as it was on the floor. Nobody on the minority side presented an amendment that would exclusively restore this account.

Mr. Chairman, I have been working diligently with the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SENSENBRENNER], with the full committee chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], as well as with the chairman of the Subcommittee on VA, HUD and Independent Agencies, the gentleman from California, Mr. JERRY LEWIS, to make sure these funds are restored.

I think my amendment, with the perfecting amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SENSENBRENNER], is a good, reasonable, responsible way to accomplish the goal. And we all agree on the goal, we just disagree on how we do it.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge my colleagues to vote in support of the Weldon-Sensenbrenner amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I really do not like to belabor this, but sometimes it seems necessary to keep saying the same thing over again to get it across.

The gentleman from Florida [Mr. WELDON] is acting properly here to restore funding that, whether as he claims, it is the fault of the administration, or as I claim, it is the fault of the committee chairman himself, we both realize it needs to be corrected.

Then we repeat the mantra, that if we do not take away from some of these other things, travel and so forth, the budget is not going to be balanced. What does that mean? That means that it does not conform to the Republican budget. The Democratic budget, which the President offered, it is still below that, and it is still in balance. They are going to contend, of course, that the President's balanced budget is phony and all that sort of stuff, so maybe it is. But it has been certified by the Congressional Budget Office as being in balance in 2002.

What is the difference? The President's budget, has been pointed out, is higher for both NASA and for the entire discretionary research and development account up to year 2000. It is substantially higher than the Republican budget over that same period of time by an amount of roughly \$2 billion per year. Then it takes a sharp

cut. That has been pointed out. It has been claimed, of course, that that is political manipulation, that the President is keeping the R&D budget artificially high, that the only true budget handed down from heaven itself is the Republican budget, which is roughly \$2 billion per year less than the President's budget.

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

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

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I noticed that when the President's budget came up on the floor of the House, it was overwhelmingly rejected, and only 10 of the 23 Democrats on the Committee on Science voted for the President's budget. The gentleman was one of them, I give him credit for consistency, but evidently the gentleman was less persuasive than than he is today.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for that pertinent comment. I have said many times that in the 7-year runout, I do not like either the Republican budget or the President's budget. I have also said that since the main differences occur in the year 2000, and nobody can predict what is going to happen in the year 2000, and that will be in the first administration of President GORE, I am going to let President GORE worry about that problem when we get to it.

In the meantime, I am going to support the budget, which is \$2 billion a year higher for R&D, and I urge my friends on that side to think carefully before rejecting it, because it will be an issue. I am spending most of my time trying to make the votes in support of a reasonable R&D program for this country an issue in this campaign.

The gentleman may think his position will stand up better than mine, and we will let the voters decide.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COSTELLO. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman very much for his kindness in yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, let me clear up several points. Let it be perfectly clear, as one of President used to say, that this side of the aisle is not against a balanced budget. We have voted time and time again, and as a freshman I can say I have voted for a balanced budget. The misnomer we have here is that we are against giving middle-income tax cuts.

That is not accurate. We are against bashing middle-income workers at the NASA centers around this Nation by borrowing from Peter to pay Paul, as the Weldon-Sensenbrenner amendment has. It may restore belatedly \$81.5 million, but it guts other programs, and we do not know if we are going to have any savings by cutting other programs and requiring NASA, that has already downsized, to not be able to communicate with its foreign space station

partners, to not be able to have space communications, and taking away from the science program.

I am not sure where they are trying to go, but I would solicit my colleagues to do the right thing and support the Jackson-Lee amendment that is a restoration, not an increase, a restoration of \$81.5 million, that gives to our NASA employees the ability to downsize appropriately, without safety factors being damaged, as well as putting them on a 2-week or more furlough where they cannot work and they cannot continue the mission of NASA, and cannot continue the mission of this Nation with respect to space exploration and science.

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

Mr. Chairman, this discussion here today on the two amendments really is no different than the discussion yesterday concerning the substitute offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] and the original bill sponsored by the chairman of the committee. I could say the same remarks about them, because basically what it is a question of funding programs that need to be funded, and still balancing the budget.

Mr. Chairman, the majority, which emphasizes balancing the budget, will lead us to believe that if we do not make these cuts in the TDRSS and other parts in order to fund back the personnel money for NASA, that we are not going to have a balanced budget. Mr. Chairman, it ain't so. It really ain't so. That amount of money, to begin with, is not going to make the difference in the next 7 years.

Second, under the coalition budget, which very few of their Members, the vast majority, did not support, this program for the personnel is fully funded, and so is the TDRSS and the research and development fully funded as is necessary, and we have a balanced budget by the year 2002.

As has been pointed out earlier today by the gentleman from California, our ranking minority member, it is a question of establishing priorities: What do we really want? There is no question in my mind that the radical right, under the leadership of the majority, does not want research and development. It is clear and simple. Why else are they cutting the program in this amendment, in the amendment of the gentleman from Florida? Why else?

I would also like to know from the gentleman from Florida, who offered the original amendment, what are they going to do about the TDRSS contract as presently existing, and we have a TDRSS contract to replace the present TDRSS that are in orbit, when we cut these funds? Where are we going to get the money? They are not going to get the money, so we are in violation of a contract. But so what? To them it does not mean anything. It is all in the name of balancing the budget.

That is a lot of baloney. It is not in the name of balancing the budget. It is

in the name of following, basically, what the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], feels is his straitjacket; and his straitjacket is that this is the only amount of money we are going to spend. I do not think it makes a difference to the gentleman from Pennsylvania whether we have the money there or not. If he does not want to spend it, he is not going to spend it.

□ 1445

It does not make any difference about balancing the budget. I will say it again and again. It has nothing to do with balancing the budget. It has all to do about the whims of the gentleman from Pennsylvania and how he feels about programs.

And, lo and behold, all the rest of the Members over there, they follow him down the road just like the rest of the body, the vast majority follows the Speaker right down the road. They just keep following him down that road, and I am sure that the American public is going to take a good look at the road that they are taking this country down: a road that leads to very little research and development, basic research, a road that makes mistakes now and then, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania made the mistake, why else are we having the original amendment? And later on we will have other amendments to clean up the bills that came out of committee.

It is not necessary to make those mistakes. The mistakes are basically made when they try to follow that straitjacket that is self-imposed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania on the actions of the committee.

As I said yesterday, I will say it again. As I have looked at this legislation, the original bill that came out of committee, in comparison to all the other ones we have had in the 20 years I have been here, it is the worst one and it is not necessary to be that way. It is only that way because of the dictates of the leadership of the Republican Party. It can be a good bill. It could be one that has positive features instead of negative features, but it is not going to be a good bill because they do not want it to be one.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER] has expired.

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

Mr. VOLKMER. They would like the American public to believe that somehow through the authorization process, not even the appropriation process but in this authorization process, they are going to lead us down, this Congress, down to a balanced budget. A lot of baloney. Nothing further from the truth.

Lo and behold, we will wait until we see what the appropriation process brings along. That is where the money is really spent in this whole area. This bill only authorizes. If the gentleman wants to really save money, I would

suggest, the gentleman from Florida, if he really wants to save money, that he can cut this program when we get to the appropriation bill.

He can cut back NASA if he wants to. There is no reason that he cannot. He can cut it back. We do not have to have a space station. He can vote against the space station. He can do that. He can vote against the operation of the shuttle. He can do that and save a lot of money. It is easy to do. Instead of cutting back on other things, why does he not cut back on those things that are important to his district? That really shows self-sacrifice. I would recommend the gentleman think about it.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Jackson-Lee amendment. The Brown substitute would have corrected this but we failed on that. We think this is a cut that should have never been made in the first place. We have talked about this in committee, we have talked about it on the floor earlier. I think to put it succinctly and to the point I need to quote Mr. Peterson, who is the NASA comptroller, who says:

To put it bluntly, the S&E reduction is impossible to achieve without drastic action. Unless a miracle occurs and we have both buyout legislation and a lot of takers, there is simply no way feasible to implement this reduction without resorting to furloughs. At \$81.5 million, we estimate a 10-to-12 day furlough would be necessary to make this number.

We do not want furloughs. I know no one on the other side wants furloughs. I believe that this comptroller knows what he is talking about, and submit this to Members for their consideration. I urge the adoption of the Jackson-Lee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SENSENBRENNER] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. WELDON].

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. WELDON], as amended.

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 2(c) of rule XXIII, the Chair may reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time for any vote by electronic device, if ordered, on the pending amendment.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 142, noes 271, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 202]

AYES—142

Abercrombie	Gejdenson	Owens
Barcia	Gephardt	Pallone
Becerra	Geren	Pastor
Beilenson	Gibbons	Payne (NJ)
Bentsen	Gonzalez	Pelosi
Berman	Gordon	Rahall
Bevill	Green (TX)	Rangel
Bishop	Gutierrez	Richardson
Bonior	Hall (OH)	Roemer
Boucher	Hall (TX)	Rose
Brewster	Harman	Roybal-Allard
Browder	Hastings (FL)	Rush
Brown (CA)	Hefner	Sabo
Brown (FL)	Hilliard	Sanders
Brown (OH)	Hinchee	Sawyer
Bryant (TX)	Hoke	Schroeder
Cardin	Hoyer	Schumer
Chapman	Jackson (IL)	Scott
Clay	Jackson-Lee (TX)	Serrano
Clayton	Johnson, E. B.	Skaggs
Clement	Johnston	Skelton
Clyburn	Kennedy (MA)	Slaughter
Coleman	LaFalce	Stark
Collins (IL)	Lantos	Stenholm
Collins (MI)	Levin	Stokes
Conyers	Lewis (GA)	Studds
Cramer	Lofgren	Stupak
Cummings	Lowey	Tanner
DeFazio	Maloney	Taylor (MS)
DeLauro	Manton	Tejeda
Dellums	Matsui	Thompson
Deutsch	McDermott	Thornton
Dicks	McHale	Thurman
Dingell	McKinney	Torres
Dixon	McNulty	Torricelli
Doggett	Meek	Towns
Dooley	Menendez	Trafficant
Durbin	Millender	Velazquez
Edwards	McDonald	Vento
Engel	Miller (CA)	Volkmer
Eshoo	Mink	Waters
Evans	Moakley	Watt (NC)
Farr	Nadler	Waxman
Fattah	Neal	Williams
Fazio	Olver	Wilson
Filner	Ortiz	Woolsey
Flake	Orton	Wynn
Frost		Yates

NOES—271

Allard	Coble	Furse
Andrews	Coburn	Galleghy
Archer	Collins (GA)	Ganske
Armey	Combust	Gekas
Bachus	Condit	Gilchrest
Baesler	Cooley	Gillmor
Baker (CA)	Costello	Gilman
Baker (LA)	Cox	Goodlatte
Baldacci	Coyne	Goodling
Ballenger	Crane	Goss
Barr	Crapo	Graham
Barrett (NE)	Creameans	Greene (UT)
Barrett (WI)	Cubin	Greenwood
Bartlett	Cunningham	Gunderson
Barton	Danner	Hamilton
Bass	Davis	Hancock
Bateman	Deal	Hansen
Bereuter	DeLay	Hastert
Bilbray	Diaz-Balart	Hastings (WA)
Bilirakis	Dickey	Hayworth
Bliley	Doolittle	Hefley
Blumenauer	Dornan	Heineman
Blute	Doyle	Herger
Boehlert	Dreier	Hilleary
Boehner	Duncan	Hobson
Bonilla	Dunn	Hoekstra
Bono	Ehlers	Holden
Borski	Ehrlich	Horn
Brownback	Emerson	Hostettler
Bryant (TN)	English	Hunter
Bunn	Ensign	Hutchinson
Bunning	Everett	Hyde
Burr	Ewing	Inglis
Burton	Fawell	Istook
Buyer	Fields (TX)	Jacobs
Callahan	Flanagan	Johnson (CT)
Calvert	Foley	Johnson (SD)
Camp	Forbes	Johnson, Sam
Campbell	Fowler	Jones
Canady	Fox	Kanjorski
Castle	Frank (MA)	Kaptur
Chambliss	Franks (CT)	Kasich
Chenoweth	Franks (NJ)	Kelly
Christensen	Frelinghuysen	Kennedy (RI)
Chrysler	Frisa	Kildee
Clinger	Funderburk	Kim

King
Kingston
Klecicka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lucas
Luther
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Martini
Mascara
McCarthy
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Meehan
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Minge
Montgomery
Moorhead
Morella

NOT VOTING—21

Ackerman
Chabot
de la Garza
Fields (LA)
Foglietta
Ford
Gutknecht

Hayes
Houghton
Jefferson
Kennelly
Lincoln
McDade
Molinari

Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Soudier
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Upton
Visclosky
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Ward
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

Mollohan
Moran
Murtha
Paxon
Peterson (FL)
Quinn
Wise

□ 1511

Messrs. HOLDEN, SMITH of Michigan, MASCARA, BORSKI, COYNE, and BLUMENAUER changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts and Mr. STUDDS changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. WELDON], as amended.

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SENSBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 354, noes 60, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 203]

AYES—354

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allard

Andrews
Archer
Arney

Bachus
Baesler
Baker (CA)

Baker (LA)
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Blute
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Green (TX)
Greene (UT)
Greenwood
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Klecicka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
LaHood
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fawell

Fazio
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Frost
Funderburk
Gallegly
Ganske
McKeon
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Blute
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Green (TX)
Greene (UT)
Greenwood
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Klecicka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
LaHood
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fawell

Smith (WA)
Solomon
Soudier
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Studds
Stump
Stupak
Talent
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)

NOES—60

Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Bonior
Brown (CA)
Clay
Clayton
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Coyne
Dellums
Dixon
Doggett
Engel
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Frank (MA)
Furse
Gibbons

NOT VOTING—20

Chabot
Conyers
de la Garza
Fields (LA)
Foglietta
Ford
Gutknecht

□ 1519

Mr. MCDERMOTT and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. SHAYS and Mr. BERMAN changed their vote from "no" to "aye." So the amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

VACATING PASSAGE OF GEKAS AMENDMENT NO. 3 AND AMENDMENT NO. 3, AS MODIFIED, OFFERED BY MR. GEKAS

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the committee proceedings of yesterday, wherein my amendment No. 3 was adopted, be vacated and a new amendment also titled No. 3 be inserted in its place in lieu of the amendment yesterday. We had the wrong language submitted.

Mr. Chairman, I checked with the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] and he indicated that he has no objection.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the modified amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 3, as modified, offered by Mr. GEKAS. Page 87, after line 21, insert the following new subsection:

(h) BI-AGENCY WORKING GROUP.—The National Weather Service is encouraged to follow through on the recommendation contained in the document entitled "Secretary's Report to Congress on Adequacy of NEXRAD Coverage and Degradation of Weather Services Under National Weather Service Modernization for 32 Areas of Concern", dated October 12, 1995, to initiate a dialogue with the Federal Aviation Administration to form

a bi-agency working group to further assess the potential for National Weather Service operational use of Federal Aviation Administration weather radar data, and to define engineering considerations that would be involved in implementing a data sharing link between the Federal Aviation Administration and the National Weather Service.

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

Mr. Chairman, I include for the RECORD communications and related articles on the subject of my amendment.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 23, 1995.
ELBERT W. FRIDAY, Jr.,
Assistant Administrator, National Weather Service, U.S. Department of Commerce, Silver Spring, MD.

DEAR MR. FRIDAY: Throughout the implementation process of the Next Generation Weather Radar (NEXRAD) system by the National Weather Service (NWS), serious concerns were raised regarding deficient coverage of the Harrisburg metropolitan area. Unfortunately, my concerns were repeatedly rebuffed by the NWS with claims that Harrisburg weather coverage was appropriate. Now that the NEXRAD system has been fully implemented it is clear that my earlier cautions and predictions have become reality.

While the NEXRAD radar beam projects a further distance than traditional radar, due to the earth's curvature coverage originating from 120 miles north of Harrisburg in State College creates a gap from the earth's surface to a level 16,000 feet above Harrisburg, completely missing the city. Physical limitations of the NEXRAD radar beam have left open an unmonitored area which is densely populated and prone to flooding.

At the time this concern was raised, I was told by the NWS that coverage would be adequate. I content that coverage of the area is not sufficient. A NWS employee submitted to me the enclosed sampling of documented cases illustrating severe weather conditions which went undetected by the NEXRAD system.

Unfortunately, while some areas of the country may enjoy improved radar services, Central Pennsylvania has been diminished service due to the lack of attention to this flaw in the NEXRAD coverage. I believe the most significant responsibility entrusted to the NWS is to ensure the public's safety. I urge you once again to reconsider this situation which the NWS has created and confirm that your job of ensuring public safety has been satisfied.

Thank you for your consideration; I look forward to your response.

Very truly yours,

GEORGE W. GEKAS,
Member of Congress.

CASE 1—APRIL 30, 1994

Attachment 1: Summary of Severe Weather Reports. The station log sheets from NWS Harrisburg were not available for this event. However widespread severe weather occurred over central Pennsylvania during the evening of April 30. As noted on Attachment 1, damage from a severe thunderstorm was reported in uptown Harrisburg at 10:46 pm. This damage was later determined by the National Weather Service to be caused by a tornado. Although forecasters in the State College office had called the Harrisburg office about severe weather appearing on their NEXRAD in other areas of the state prior to

that time, they made no mention of severe weather in the Harrisburg area at the time of the tornado. The Harrisburg Weather Service office issued a severe thunderstorm warning for this storm based on the radar at Harrisburg.

Substantial damage occurred in uptown Harrisburg and near the State Hospital that evening.

CASE 2—JULY 20, 1994

Attachment 2: Note from person on duty at Harrisburg describing a severe thunderstorm event in Huntingdon County. (The NEXRAD radar site is in Centre County; Huntingdon County is adjacent to Centre County). Harrisburg radar showed this storm to be severe, and the person on duty at Harrisburg issued a severe thunderstorm warning based on the Harrisburg radar (after being advised by State College personnel that their NEXRAD did not indicate any severe weather in Huntingdon County.)

Attachment 3: The severe thunderstorm warning issued by Harrisburg.

Attachment 4: Station log documenting the report of damage from the storm. The report was received by NWS Harrisburg from Emergency Management officials in Huntingdon County. EMA officials indicated 20 to 30 trees down and damage to homes.

Comments: The NEXRAD radar has the ability to archive paper copies of its radar display. I requested archive copies of the radar display for the time of the storm in Huntingdon County. Apparently the NEXRAD did not show anything alarming in Huntingdon County at that time, because State College personnel did not start to archive until 7:40 pm that day, the damage occurred at 6:50 pm.

The damage in Huntingdon County occurred less than 40 miles from State College. Harrisburg, York and Lancaster are more than twice that distance from State College.

BULLETIN—IMMEDIATE BROADCAST REQUESTED, SEVERE THUNDERSTORM WARNING, NATIONAL WEATHER SERVICE, HARRISBURG PA, 6:31 P.M. EDT WED, JULY 20, 1994

The National Weather Service in Harrisburg has issued a severe thunderstorm warning effective until 7:15 p.m. EDT for people in the following location:

In south central Pennsylvania: Huntingdon County.

At 6:30 p.m. Harrisburg radar showed a severe thunderstorm between the town of Huntingdon and the Mifflin County line. This storm was moving toward the northeast at 10 miles an hour.

This is a dangerous storm. If you are in its path you should prepare for damaging wind in excess of 55 mph, large hail, and deadly lightning. People outside should move to a shelter, preferably inside a strong building but stay away from windows.

EMERGENCY ACTION LOG

Date/Time, July, 20, 1994 Information Received, city/town/time of event, source/event. Action Taken, calls made, warnings, etc. Initials, DM.

6:05 p.m.—Bob Fenner called—quarter-size hail in State College, Warning issued 6:05 PM—DM.

6:10 p.m.—CTP called—dime-size hail at the office in State College—DM.

9:15 p.m.—Rich Moore (Huntingdon County) called—20 to 30 large trees blown down; trees blown onto houses causing an estimated \$2,000 damage; ½ mile by ½ mile patch of wind damage in Mill Creek at 6:50 p.m.; (DVIP 5 to 270 top 55,000 ft shown on WSR-74c radar just before warning issuance) (I also called CTP about the storm just before warning issuance. According to this the storm

was not showing severe characteristics)—DM.

CASE 3—AUGUST 4, 1994

Attachment 5: Entry from Harrisburg's station log book. At 5:28 pm, the weather observer at the Middletown International Airport issued a weather observation reporting a wind gust of 50 knots (58 mph). A wind gust of 50 knots warrants a severe thunderstorm warning according to the severe weather criteria used by the National Weather Service. The person on duty at Harrisburg sent State College a message through the NWS computer system pointing out the observation. The weather office in Mt. Holly, New Jersey sent a similar message to State College at approximately the same time.

At 5:55 pm, the person on duty at State College called the Harrisburg office to ask if the Harrisburg radar showed any severe weather in the vicinity of the airport (because their radar showed no strong storms in that area). By that time (25 minutes after the report), the Harrisburg radar showed the storm was well below severe warning criteria.

No warning was ever issued by the State College office for this event.

EMERGENCY LOG BOOK

July 29, 1994, 3 p.m.—Pit's 88D is down and 57 is up until sometime Saturday (7/30/94). They will be taking radar observations until then—GC.

July 29, 1994, 11 p.m.—Left HAR radar on overnight per request by Art Krause (PHL)—GC.

August 4, 1994—At 5:30 p.m. the observer (MDR) issued an observation reporting a windgust to 50 kts. I sent them a message pointing that out. At 5:55 p.m., State College called and ask if the Harrisburg radar showed a strong cell in that area. By that time (30 minutes after the report) the cell was down to 25,000; VIP 5 to 8,000. No warning was issued by State College.—GC.

August 4, 1994, 10:35 p.m.—Left the radar on overnight per request by PHL (Tony Gigi).

August 12, 1994, 10:35 p.m.—Art K. wanted radar left on—DPM.

August 13, 1994—Radar left on—DPM.

[From the Harrisburg (PA) Patriot-News,
May 14, 1996]

IT'S OFFICIAL: IT WAS A TORNADO
(By Mike Feeley)

National Weather Service investigators confirmed yesterday that a small tornado touched down Saturday at a truck-parts manufacturing shop along Cameron Street in Harrisburg and danced along the treetops for a half-mile before dissipating.

Relying mostly on witness accounts and damage to the Dayton Parts plant, weather service officials said the tornado—which never showed up on radar—lasted less than a minute.

But in that time, it reduced part of the Dayton plant at Cameron and Herr streets to rubble, ruptured a gas line, toppled trees and forced the evacuation of a city housing project.

The tornado was coupled with a thunderstorm that dumped an inch of rain on the area in less than 30 minutes.

Either the tornado or severe winds blew over a 16-ton caboose on the Conrail yards in Harrisburg, said Mayor Stephen R. Reed. In all, the storm caused \$5 million worth of damage in the city.

About 150 people in the Harrisburg and Camp Hill areas still were without phone service this morning, said Shirley Risoldi, spokeswoman for Bell Atlantic. Risoldi said service should be restored to all homes by the end of the day.

Saturday's twister followed a path roughly 200 yards from that of a tornado that hit in 1994, Reed said. These types of tornadoes are not uncommon for the region, investigators said.

Radar maps used by the weather service to declare weather warnings showed no signs of tornadoes in Dauphin County, said Bruce W. Budd, NWS meteorologist-in-charge in State College.

Dauphin County was under only a severe thunderstorm warning when the tornado hit. The radar maps showed the potential for a twister in Schuylkill County, however, and that county was under a tornado warning.

"The indicators show a strong outflow of wind [in Harrisburg]," said Budd, as he reviewed radar maps of the area. "What we don't have is any indication of a tornado. But this type of light tornado is not easily detected. Any severe thunderstorm can produce a brief tornado."

Budd and meteorologist Richard W. Winther came to Harrisburg yesterday to investigate the report of a tornado. Most of the damage indicated a "straight-line" storm—similar to that of a severe thunderstorm.

But witnesses—including a motorcyclist who was knocked off his bike by a piece of debris—told the investigators they saw a funnel cloud touch down at the Dayton plant. And wreckage at the plant was strewn in such a way as to indicate a tornado had struck, Budd said.

There's evidence the tornado spent much of its short life moving along 20 or 30 feet off the ground, doing damage to larger trees in its path but leaving the smaller trees relatively undamaged.

The tornado will be classified as an "F-1," or light tornado, capable of winds of between 73 and 112 mph. Saturday's winds were in excess of 100 mph, Winther said.

"It's amazing that there were about 30 kids around an ice-cream truck and with trees on both sides of the truck damaged, no one was hurt," he said.

RECENT TORNADES IN THE MIDSTATE

May 1996: A small tornado cuts through Cameron Street in Harrisburg, reduces part of a truck-parts manufacturing shop to rubble, ruptures a gas line and forces the evacuation of a housing project.

May 1995: A weak tornado touched down in Millersville, Lancaster County, destroying a barn, toppling trees and other structures.

July 1994: A tornado hits the Delwood Manor housing development in northern York County, tossing sheds and blowing off pieces of roofs.

April 1994: In uptown Harrisburg, a tornado rips parts of roofs off four row homes and shatters school windows.

August 1992: Winds of 80 to 90 mph swoop into Locust Grove Trailer Park on Route 22 in Lebanon County, displacing a mobile home and uprooting trees.

LOWER PAXTON TOWNSHIP, Harrisburg, PA, May 11, 1996.

Hon. GEORGE GEKAS,
Member of Congress, Rayburn HOB, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GEKAS: As I write this, the thunder is still rumbling in the distance from a severe storm that has just slammed Dauphin and Cumberland counties with no warning from the National Weather Service.

As a former weathercaster in the nation's tornado alley and through my own interest in meteorology, I can see no excuse for the lack of warning before this storm struck. There was not even a severe thunderstorm watch. All this despite the fact that an hour before the storm hit, radar was showing a line of intensifying storms west of Harrisburg.

Storm warnings had been posted for Juniata and Franklin counties, then there was nothing until the storms had already passed through Dauphin County and were entering Lebanon County. At that time a warning was issued for Lebanon and Lancaster counties.

My police and fire radio is alive with communications regarding severe damage to private homes, apartment buildings, even a school . . . several of the incidents involving possible injury or entrapment.

It appears Lower Paxton Township has escaped the brunt of the storm. The city of Harrisburg seems to have experienced serious damage.

This is another glaring example that the realignment of the National Weather Service, especially in closing its Harrisburg office, is not providing adequate coverage of this meteorologically dynamic area. As competent and well-equipped as the meteorologists at the Weather Service Office in State College might be, standing barefoot on my front steps in Lower Paxton Township I could tell there was a severe storm imminent.

How many more times must the safety of the residents of my township and all other communities in this region be compromised before something is done to end this threat to public safety?

I urge you to employ whatever avenues available to rectify this situation. If I may be of any assistance, I would welcome contact from your office.

Respectfully,

JAY PURDY,

Supervisor, Lower Paxton Township.

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

There was no objection.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment, as modified, offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS].

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there other amendments to title II?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SCOTT

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

The CHAIRMAN. The clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SCOTT: Page 27, line 14, strike "\$823,400,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$857,800,000".

Page 27, line 19, strike "\$152,800,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$187,200,000".

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I am offering an amendment to restore funding for NASA's Advanced Subsonic Aeronautic Research Program to the level contained in the President's budget. H.R. 3322 cuts the advanced subsonic program by 34.4 million, money that is vitally important to maintaining NASA's longstanding leadership in subsonic research.

For those not familiar with subsonic research, let me briefly outline the kinds of activities being affected. Activities such as research and development to address aging aircraft, safety concerns, and aging aircraft are the

kinds of aircraft popular with the newer economy airlines and the aging airframes used by the United States military.

Subsonic research in jeopardy also includes cooperative activities with the FAA to improve safety and efficiency in the Nation's air traffic management system so we do not lose control of the increasing volume of commercial and military air traffic.

Also in jeopardy is R&D on advanced technologies that could result in quieter, more fuel efficient aircraft and an understanding of how aircraft operations affect the environment.

Mr. Chairman, I acknowledge and support the need to cut Government spending where appropriate in order to meet our budget responsibilities. However, a cut in NASA's aeronautic authorization program is extremely counterproductive to our shared goals of increasingly stronger economy and a stronger America.

Mr. Chairman, the American aeronautics industry has an annual sales of over \$60 billion and is responsible for this country's greatest positive balance of trade.

Without the research and support of NASA, the U.S. aeronautics industry would not be competitive in the global marketplace. This was in fact the purpose for which Congress created NASA in the first place. It is important to remember that in 1917 Congress created NASA's predecessor for the express purpose of regaining America's competitiveness in aviation at a time when dominance in this area had been lost to the Europeans.

Now at a time when the Europeans are in high gear, supporting the research and development of the Airbus, we are poised to shoot ourselves in the foot again by cutting the very programs that kept the United States aeronautics program competitive. This amendment will enable these subsonic programs to continue at a reasonable level.

Mr. Chairman, recently I had the chance to see firsthand how this program works and the results of this program because I had the opportunity to participate in celebrations commemorating the production of the new Boeing 777, and also another program commemorating the McDonnell Douglas C-17. Both programs use the wing design and composite materials developed more than a decade ago by NASA. These aircraft, one commercial, one military, are now on the cutting edge of aircraft technology and greatly advance the competitive position of the United States in the world marketplace. Without the research under the advanced subsonic program, we are in jeopardy of losing our competitive edge 5, 10, and 15 years from now.

Mr. Chairman, we should not contribute to any effort which might lead to the loss of U.S. preeminence in aeronautics. I urge Members on both sides of the aisle to support this amendment and therefore support this country's economy.

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

Mr. Chairman, in fiscal year 1994, this program was funded at \$106 million. The bill before us has a funding level for this program at \$152.8 million for fiscal year 1997. Now, that is an increase of about 45 percent over a 3-fiscal-year period.

I believe that that increase is generous enough in light of the extreme fiscal situation that we are facing and the bipartisan drive to try to balance the budget.

Also, the amendment that has been offered by the gentleman from Virginia, while well-intentioned, is an add-on without corresponding offsets. We went through that entire issue in the last amendment, and the House voted very strongly in favor of, where we do have add-on, to have a corresponding offset so that the bill will maintain its fiscal neutrality.

This amendment does not maintain fiscal neutrality. It ends up increasing the authorization by \$34 million-plus, and that means \$34 million-plus of deficit spending should the Committee on Appropriations match the authorization level.

In summation, I do not think that we need this additional money. I think that it is important that there be on offset, not an add-on. I believe that this program has been given generous increases over the last 3 fiscal years under both Democratic and Republican-controlled Congresses and the amount that is in the bill unamended is enough.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I intend to support this amendment. I think it is a vitally necessary amendment. Of course, my criteria is whether or not it was in my substitute, and it was in my substitute; or it must be a very good amendment.

I am not quite sure how to deal with the arguments on the other side. Of course, part of the argument is maybe that this is corporate welfare and we do not fund corporate welfare. If it benefits corporations, we do not do it. So they want to keep the program considerably below the level that is being recommended by the administration.

□ 1530

Well, maybe it is just that they do not want to do anything the administration wants, no matter how good it is. Of course, they are raising again the subject of the budget; it does not have any offsets in it. Now, that was the same argument that we heard on the previous amendment and on various other amendments.

It is quite obvious that on the majority side, they have a great deal of wisdom, shared by almost every one of them, as evidenced by the fact that they all, in that wisdom, decided to vote against the prior amendment. So, I do not want the belabor these things too much.

It is my contention, of course, that this is one of the crucial programs in NASA's portfolio. It is doing something that specifically helps a major U.S. industry, which is faced with intense competition from around the world, specifically from Europe and the Airbus consortium. If we cannot do something to provide an adequate level of support for U.S. industry engaged in this competition, we are going to lose to the Europeans where the Airbus is a government-funded consortium.

We can argue that we want to be pristine in this. If there is a healthy aircraft industry, they ought to be taking up the whole cost for this. That has not been the case for the last 75 years. They know it, and part of their revolution is to change things that have been going on for the last 75 years, even though it was this program of working cooperatively with the industry that made us the preeminent supplier of aircraft to the world, preeminent because we were the best.

Mr. Chairman, now we have decided that we no longer need to continue that path for subsonic aircraft research. Now, I do not see a similar attitude toward the hypersonic aircraft research. It appears that this is not quite as much corporate welfare, although it is the same basic type of research. Maybe the reason is that we know that there will not be a commercial market for hypersonic planes. Even though this is applied research, the hypersonic, on behalf of American corporations, and this normally is the criteria for corporate welfare, in this case we will not call it corporate welfare for some reason or another.

I have not quite figured that out, but the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] will have a good explanation which he will give you shortly, I am sure.

Now, it is my view, and I take delight in pointing this out, that the position taken by the majority in these situations is full of contradictions. They, for example, have language in their report which provides certain direction to NASA with regard to applied research. It says the committee encourages NASA to review funding levels for polymer matrix composite programs to achieve a balance between composite and metallic technologies. Aluminum has been the material of choice for all significant commercial aircraft structures and continues to offer opportunities for cost-effective improvements in aircraft structural performance.

Now, this sounds to me an awful lot like a recommendation to pursue a particular line of advanced subsonic research because it has a more direct application to existing commercial aircraft design. Is that a good idea? Possibly. Or is this an example of corporate welfare, telling the government how to spend its money in support of certain technologies which are already well developed and have a large base in industry?

Apparently, if they like the program, it is not corporate welfare. If they do

not, it is corporate welfare. I urge support for the Scott amendment.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment of the gentleman from Virginia. I think that clearly again I emphasize the creation of work for the 21st century, and I think we are doing a disservice by eliminating those dollars for that direction. So I rise to support the Scott amendment.

I would also like to add a comment regarding the amendment that I would offered, Mission to Planet Earth, and would ask if I could enter into a colloquy with the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN].

As the gentleman knows, I had considered offering this amendment and had raised this with the committee on NASA's Mission to Planet Earth Program. But instead I would like to take the time to ask a few questions about the National Research Council's review of the Earth Observing System and how the Brown recommendation is compared to the actions taken in this bill. It is true that last year the chairman of the Committee on Science asked the well-respected National Research Council to undertake a review of NASA's Mission to Planet Earth Program and the Earth Observing System? In fact, I believe we discussed that in committee.

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman is absolutely correct in her statement.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. If the gentleman will continue to yield, is it also true that the National Research Council panel validated the scientific goals of Mission to Planet Earth and recommended, and I quote: NASA should implement most of the near-term components of Mission to Planet Earth/Earth Observing System, including Landsat 7, AM-1, PM-1 and the Tropical Rainfall Measuring Mission without delay in reduction in overall observing capability, and the Chemistry-1 mission should not be delayed?

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, if the gentlewoman would continue to yield, she is absolutely correct in the citation that she has made. In addition, the National Research Council went on to conclude, and I quote: Based on a series of reviews, a series of reviews, the program has evolved from its original plans to a reshaped program that is more responsive to the science, more resilient, more open to the introduction of new technologies. There has been a shift from a fixed series of large vehicle missions to a mixed fleet exploiting small- to medium-class spacecraft. However, any further structural changes to the near-term EOS missions would cause severe

program dislocations. Further budgetary reductions or imposed constraints on technical options would require the elimination of key sensors, slips in schedule, loss of data continuity and the elimination of all advanced technology development that could enhance future research and lower cost, end of quotation.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I would take from that statement that that was nothing but a clear and strong message from the National Research Council, I might add, an independent council, that assessed the Mission to Planet Earth and the Mission to Planet Earth directives in H.R. 3322 consistent with the recommendations of that National Research Council's independent review, a review that was in fact, as we understand it, requested by the chairman of the Committee on Science?

Mr. BROWN of California. If the gentlewoman will continue to yield, the gentlewoman is correct. That review was requested by the chairman of the Committee on Science. The legislation before us would actually cancel the PM-1 and Chemistry-1 spacecraft, cut the funding available for the Mission to Planet Earth Program by 27 percent and would fundamentally unravel the integrated scientific program that has been put in place.

The actions taken in H.R. 3322 fly in the face of the conclusions and recommendations of the National Research Council's review. I might point out that the chairman of the committee, when he asked for advice from the scientific body, has a tendency to ignore it unless it conforms with his own preestablished conclusions. I noted that the gentleman referred favorably to the AAAS report when he thought it substantiated his conclusions. Normally he does not agree with the report that they make each year with regard to R&D funding and the budget.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Reclaiming my time, it is interesting as we discuss this, and that is why I think the amendment would have been appropriate, but I wonder if the gentleman shares the view of at least one of our Republican colleagues that indicated that money spend on global change research is money down a rat hole.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, is this the same Member who says it is liberal claptrap also?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, sounds familiar. Very much so.

Mr. BROWN of California. I do not share that view. In my opinion, such research is imperative if we are to truly understand the planet on which we live including the complex interactions that determine our climate and develop the policy options that offer the most benefit to all our citizens.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN], and I would certainly agree with him. I hope that we will be able to pursue this

through conference and be able to ensure that what we do have is the reasoned response to the National Research Council's review and be able to comply with that most timely study. I thank the gentleman and I yield back my time.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Scott amendment to restore \$34.4 million in funds to NASA's Advanced Subsonic Program. This increase would bring funding back to the requested level and reinvest vitally needed resources in maintaining NASA's longstanding global leadership in aeronautics research.

While advanced subsonic technology may seem like science fiction to some, this research does in fact help address safety, fuel efficiency, and environmental impact concerns for today's and the next generation of commercial aircraft. For anyone who has ever expressed concern about the aging aircraft used by some domestic airlines and the U.S. military, subsonic research is not just a smart investment, it is peace of mind.

And, although I fully recognize the need to cut the budget deficit, aeronautics research and technology spending has a tremendous net beneficial impact on our national economy and international balance of trade. The aeronautics industry has annual sales of over \$60 billion and produces a positive balance of trade of \$25 billion. In Ohio alone, the aerospace industry is responsible for approximately 300,000 jobs and injects some \$13.5 billion into the State's economy.

While a \$34 million cut from the request level may not seem like a lot of money, it is about 20 percent of the program's funds. I believe such a deep cut in this important program is unwarranted and exacerbates the overall funding cuts suffered by the Agency since 1993.

Our trading partners throughout the world are increasing their investments in research and technology and are consequently snatching markets away from our domestic companies. Faced with intense competition in a growing global aerospace market, we should do all we can to promote our aerospace industry and maintain NASA's preeminence in aeronautics.

I urge Members to support this important amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SCOTT].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 157, noes 250, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 204]

AYES—157

Abercrombie	Blumenauer	Cardin
Baldacci	Bonior	Clay
Barcia	Borski	Clayton
Bateman	Boucher	Clement
Becerra	Brewster	Coleman
Beilenson	Browder	Collins (IL)
Bentsen	Brown (CA)	Collins (MI)
Berman	Brown (FL)	Conyers
Bevill	Brown (OH)	Coyne
Bishop	Bryant (TX)	Cramer

Cummings	Kennedy (MA)	Regula
Deal	Klink	Richardson
DeFazio	LaFalce	Rivers
DeLauro	Lantos	Roemer
Dellums	LaTourette	Rose
Deutsch	Levin	Rush
Dicks	Lewis (GA)	Sabo
Dingell	Lofgren	Sawyer
Dixon	Lowey	Schroeder
Doggett	Maloney	Schumer
Dooley	Manton	Scott
Durbin	Markey	Serrano
Edwards	Martinez	Siskisky
Engel	Matsui	Skaggs
Eshoo	McCarthy	Skelton
Evans	McDermott	Slaughter
Farr	McHale	Spratt
Fattah	McKinney	Stark
Fazio	McNulty	Stenholm
Filner	Meek	Stockman
Flake	Menendez	Stokes
Frank (MA)	Millender-	Studds
Frost	McDonald	Stupak
Furse	Miller (CA)	Tanner
Gejdenson	Mink	Taylor (MS)
Gephardt	Moakley	Tejeda
Gonzalez	Moran	Thompson
Green (TX)	Nadler	Thornton
Hall (TX)	Neal	Thurman
Harman	Oberstar	Torres
Hastings (FL)	Obey	Torricelli
Hefner	Olver	Towns
Hilliard	Ortiz	Trafficant
Hinchey	Owens	Velazquez
Hoke	Pallone	Visclosky
Horn	Pastor	Volkmer
Hoyer	Payne (NJ)	Ward
Jackson (IL)	Payne (VA)	Waters
Jackson-Lee	Pelosi	Watt (NC)
(TX)	Petri	Waxman
Johnson (SD)	Pickett	Wilson
Johnson, E. B.	Rahall	Woolsey
Johnston	Rangel	Yates

NOES—250

Allard	Cunningham	Heineman
Andrews	Danner	Herger
Archer	Davis	Hilleary
Armey	DeLay	Hobson
Bachus	Diaz-Balart	Hoekstra
Baesler	Dickey	Holden
Baker (CA)	Doolittle	Hostettler
Baker (LA)	Dornan	Hunter
Ballenger	Doyle	Hutchinson
Barr	Dreier	Hyde
Barrett (NE)	Duncan	Inglis
Barrett (WI)	Dunn	Istook
Bartlett	Ehlers	Jacobs
Barton	Ehrlich	Johnson (CT)
Bass	Emerson	Johnson, Sam
Bereuter	English	Jones
Bilbray	Ensign	Kanjorski
Bilirakis	Everett	Kaptur
Bliley	Ewing	Kasich
Blute	Fawell	Kelly
Boehlert	Fields (TX)	Kennedy (RI)
Boehner	Flanagan	Kildee
Bonilla	Foley	Kim
Bono	Forbes	King
Brownback	Fowler	Kingston
Bryant (TN)	Fox	Kleczka
Bunn	Franks (CT)	Klug
Bunning	Franks (NJ)	Knollenberg
Burr	Frelinghuysen	Kolbe
Burton	Frisa	LaHood
Buyer	Funderburk	Largent
Callahan	Gallegly	Latham
Calvert	Ganske	Laughlin
Camp	Gekas	Lazio
Campbell	Geren	Leach
Canady	Gilchrest	Lewis (CA)
Castle	Gillmor	Lewis (KY)
Chambliss	Gilman	Lightfoot
Chenoweth	Goodlatte	Linder
Christensen	Goodling	Lipinski
Chrysler	Gordon	Livingston
Clinger	Goss	LoBiondo
Coble	Graham	Longley
Coburn	Greene (UT)	Lucas
Collins (GA)	Greenwood	Luther
Combest	Gunderson	Manzullo
Condit	Hall (OH)	Martini
Cooley	Hamilton	Mascara
Costello	Hancock	McCollum
Cox	Hansen	McCrery
Crane	Hastert	McHugh
Crapo	Hastings (WA)	McInnis
Cremeans	Hayworth	McIntosh
Cubin	Hefley	McKeon

Meehan	Reed	Stearns
Metcalf	Riggs	Stump
Meyers	Roberts	Talent
Mica	Rogers	Tate
Miller (FL)	Rohrabacher	Tauzin
Minge	Ros-Lehtinen	Taylor (NC)
Montgomery	Roth	Thomas
Moorhead	Roybal-Allard	Thornberry
Morella	Royce	Tiahrt
Myers	Salmon	Torkildsen
Myrick	Sanders	Upton
Nethercutt	Sanford	Vento
Neumann	Saxton	Vucanovich
Ney	Scarborough	Walker
Norwood	Schaefer	Walsh
Nussle	Schiff	Wamp
Orton	Seastrand	Watts (OK)
Oxley	Sensenbrenner	Weldon (FL)
Packard	Shadegg	Weldon (PA)
Parker	Shaw	Weller
Peterson (MN)	Shays	White
Pombo	Shuster	Whitfield
Pomeroy	Skeen	Wicker
Porter	Smith (MI)	Williams
Portman	Smith (NJ)	Wolf
Poshard	Smith (TX)	Young (FL)
Pryce	Smith (WA)	Zeliff
Quillen	Solomon	Zimmer
Radanovich	Souder	
Ramstad	Spence	

NOT VOTING—27

Ackerman	Gutierrez	Mollohan
Chabot	Gutknecht	Murtha
Chapman	Hayes	Paxon
Clyburn	Houghton	Peterson (FL)
de la Garza	Jefferson	Quinn
Fields (LA)	Kennelly	Roukema
Foglietta	Lincoln	Wise
Ford	McDade	Wynn
Gibbons	Molinari	Young (AK)

□ 1601

Mr. BEREUTER changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. SCHUMER and Mr. BEILENSON changed their vote from "no" to "aye." So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title II?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROEMER

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROEMER

Page 24, line 20, insert "and" after "Administration";

Page 24, lines 21 through 24, strike paragraph (2).

Page 25, line 1, redesignate paragraph (3) as paragraph (2).

Page 25, lines 13 and 15, and page 26, lines 4 and 6, redesignate paragraphs (2) through (5) as paragraphs (1) through (4), respectively.

Page 26, line 14, strike "\$498,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$230,700,000".

Page 27, line 4, strike "\$711,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$679,400,000".

Page 38, line 14, through page 43, line 6, strike subtitle C.

Page 43, line 7, redesignate subtitle D as subtitle C.

Amend the table of contents accordingly.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto be limited to 1 hour, with the time equally divided between the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] and myself.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SENSENBRENNER] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER].

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 6 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I guess I ask for the patience of this body, since we seem to go through this argument on eliminating the space station a couple of times a year. Certainly people on both sides could dust off their talk from 1992 or 1994 and virtually give almost the identical talk for cutting the space station or for supporting it.

I am not going to give the previous speech, because it seems that we on the opposing side of the space station continue to get more and more arguments in favor of cutting the space station, especially from the scientific community. So let me give some background as to why this is not good science. This is not in the interests of the scientific community or in the interests of taxpayers in America today.

Mr. Chairman, Scientific American, which is one of the most distinguished periodicals written in the United States today, the June issue, has a very interesting article on the space station this month. Let me quote from it: "Scientific panels, such as the National Research Council's Space Studies Board, have warned that, although some interesting research will be possible on the station, the expected returns cannot, cannot justify the facility's overall cost."

Another quote from this "Science in the Sky" article in the Scientific American, dated June 1996: "To date, no large companies are planning major research or manufacturing efforts on the Space Station."

We hear from a host of proponents of the space station that this is going to solve everything from cancer to AIDS, to making, manufacturing, and testing new crystals. This is absolutely not what Scientific American says. They go on to look at what is good in the space station and what, out of the eight original missions that the space station had, what are we going to do now, in 1996, from when it was first designed in 1984.

With regard to high-technology products, it says in Scientific American: "No larger companies are currently interested in manufacturing in space." Astronomy, remote sensing for different platforms put on the space station, those are certainly gone now since 1984, but there is no research currently planned from inside or outside or anywhere on the space station.

On biotechnology, it says that "NASA and its partners are planning some experiments, but the commercial interest is limited only to subsidized research." So these claims that there is all this private sector interest and

big manufacturing interests in the space station, and they are going to help the taxpayers pay for this, is just not accurate, not according to the latest article in Scientific American.

Members might say, as we approach some very, very difficult circumstances in reaching a balanced budget over the next 5 or 6 years, that we have to make some tough choices around this body. Based on science and merit, the space station is the most logical choice to eliminate.

When President Reagan first came up with the idea in 1984, he said the space station would cost us \$8 billion. Does anybody in this body have any idea about the projected cost today? It is not \$18 billion, it is not even \$58 billion, it is close to \$90 billion when we add in the costs of what we have spent, of what the space shuttle will cost us to put these different platforms up into the atmosphere, the cost of protecting it, the cost of maintaining it for the 10 or 12 years it is up there in space.

Mr. Chairman, we are talking about \$90 billion. Some may argue, well, Members of Congress, we have already spent about \$12 billion or \$13 billion, we might as well finish it. Do Members want to justify an expense of \$70 or \$75 billion more of the taxpayers' money because we have spent \$12 billion or \$13 billion bad dollars? I do not think that makes a whole heck of a lot of sense. That does not make sense to people who are working so hard for so long for their tax money to pay their bills and to try to insist on a fair cost here in Washington, DC, when we do expend a dollar.

Mr. Chairman, I have the utmost respect for people on the other side of this issue, including the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HALL] and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CRAMER], who was elected the same year and serves with me on the Committee on Science, and Members on the other side of the aisle. But we have to have the courage in this body to make some tough spending cuts to get to a balanced budget.

If Members look at science and look at merit, this space station just does not pass the test of what hardworking American families will ask in terms of return on their tax dollar. It is not going to return good science. It is surely not going to return any kind of good return for these high-tech objectivity measures that people do not even have interest in at the manufacturing level, according to Scientific American, and we definitely have to make some of these tough choices to get to a balanced budget.

Citizens Against Government Waste endorses this amendment offered by myself and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GANSKE] and a host of other groups do as well, too, that I will list in the next few minutes. I urge the body to support this elimination of the space station, in the interests of science and in the interest of balancing the budget.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, we are going through one of the annual rites of spring in Washington. The tulips bloom, the dogwoods become very beautiful, and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] introduces his amendment to kill the space station.

Let me say that I will match my record on spending issues against that of the gentleman from Indiana and anybody else in this House, and I support the space station. The Citizens Against Government Waste has given me their Taxpayer Hero Award consistently. The National Taxpayers Union has named me the tightwad of the decade in terms of my votes on taxes and spending, and I am proud of that, and I support the space station.

I am not going to belabor this point very much, but I do wish to make two points for the committee's consideration. The first is that the United States taxpayers have already put \$12 billion into designing the space station and building 50,000 pounds of hardware. If the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana is adopted, that \$12 billion investment will just evaporate. We just chalk that up to experience, and this vote is really a vote on whether or not to stiff the taxpayers the \$12 billion that they have invested in this.

The space station is on time, it is on budget. We have settled on a design. We are not redesigning it. We are building the hardware now and we are looking forward to the launches of the first elements sometime next year.

The second point is that America's credibility is on the line, because we are the leaders of an international consortium that includes Russia, the member nations of the Russian space agency, Canada, and Japan. Should the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana be adopted, the United States will unilaterally cancel the space station, and the investments that have been made by the taxpayers of all those other countries will similarly be waived. That is about 4 billion U.S. dollars.

So if we end up stiffing our international partners and our allies, we are going to make sure that they are not going to want to get together with the United States, either on scientific endeavors or on any other endeavor, for fear that the Congress will change its mind and pull the rug out from underneath them.

Let us stay the course. Let us vote against the Roemer amendment. Let us build the space station, and then let us operate the space station and benefit from the scientific research that goes on.

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

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GANSKE], co-author of this bipartisan amendment.

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Chairman, I rise, not surprisingly, since I have cospon-

sored this amendment, in support of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this should not be an annual rite of spring. We should eliminate this funding. James van Allen, a respected scientist at the University of Iowa, and many other scientists have said that we will get much more bang for our buck by funding unmanned scientific explorations. The space station's spending is already \$43 million over budget, or, as NASA would say, the expenses have experienced cost growth.

Despite these higher expenditures, NASA has fallen behind in the construction schedule. According to the GAO, we will sink \$94 billion into this orbiting erector set before it is over, if NASA does not go any further over budget.

Our share of the price tag is not the only problem. The space station is supposed to be international, so let me speak to comments made by my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin. The memoranda of understanding between NASA and the space agencies of our partners has not been finalized. We have no definitive agreements with any of our partners, whose contributions are necessary for the completion of this space station.

NASA insists that Russia has made commitments to the project. However, none of these agreements are in writing. NASA must know something that Russia does not know. For example, NASA states that an American will always be in command of the space station. The Russians, however, say that question has not been settled.

The fact that we have no written agreement with Russia I think is particularly problematic. Russian Presidential elections will be held this June, and it is uncertain who the successor to Yeltsin will be.

□ 1615

Should Mr. Yeltsin lose, it is likely that Mr. Zyuganov will be the President of Russia. As most Members know, he hates the West, and I would doubt that we would see any cooperation with the space station.

Another ally, Canada, will not decide whether they will pay for completion of the robotic arm until 1997. What if they decide not to? I suppose NASA will be back here in Congress asking for another chunk of change.

While NASA's overall budget has been declining and will continue to decline, the space station seems to be immune to scrutiny. NASA has consolidated control of the entire space station budget with the program manager, giving him an additional \$300 million per year. These funds were previously controlled by various research offices responsible for scientific experiments to be conducted on the space station. This consolidation has made it possible for funds allocated for research to be used for construction of the space station.

What good will building the space station do if we spend all of the re-

search money building the space station? Mr. Chairman, I am afraid that well-intentioned but misguided efforts to complete this project will not give us what we want. These concessions cost millions of dollars. We have the delay of completion of scientific projects in other areas. This is a black hole. The money goes in, nothing comes out.

For example, our offer to launch Russia's science power platform will upset the station construction schedule by causing a 5-month delay in launching Japan's science module and an 8-month delay in launching the centrifuge which some say is essential for life sciences research. I think we just should not throw more good money after bad. It is time to cut our losses. I believe that we should face reality, we should stop the money vacuum known as the space station now. Vote "yes" on this amendment.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HALL].

Mr. HALL of Texas. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I, of course, like all the other Members who will speak and who have spoken, have the highest regard for the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] and those who support him. We just differ with him. We just think he is still wrong and probably will be wrong in the next Congress and in the Congress after that and the one after that. Because he is a fine young man, he will be reelected, and he will be here when I am in the corner room of the Rockwall Nursing Home, but I will still be calling out to save the space station for us old folks.

As I mentioned to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] at the recent full committee markup of the bill, the space station amendment, as the gentleman has said, is one of the endearing traditions here. I respect his convictions.

Mr. Chairman, the value of research today is already demonstrated in a lot of ways, but in a limited way by experiments that are being conducted on the space shuttle. In previous sessions, we have held hearings and we have held a number of hearings where we heard from some of the leading medical researchers of our day.

Dr. Michael DeBakey walked these halls 3 days, going in to visit with Members to tell them of the value of the space station and the hope that the space station holds out; in his early 80's, Dr. Mickey LeMaistre, head of M.D. Anderson, who knows the attacks that cancer makes on the citizenry, and all of us have someone in a cancer ward.

I think there is one word that the space station holds out and that one word is so important to people that are wasting away in the cancer wards. It is so important that we are even talking about revolutionizing the FDA because of that one word, and that one word for people is hope. They have hope that

there is medication for them. They have hope that there is a breakthrough. We have not found that here in this environment. We hope and they hope that we will find it in the weightless environment of space.

Yes, it is a large expenditure of money, but the American people have cried out that they want this station, and if you really want to hear a hue and cry all across the universities of this country, from children in the first grade on up to the senior colleges, do something to the space station.

We almost lost the space station several sessions ago but we have never lost it. This body has always said yes, that this gives that one thing called hope. And when we talk about Russia and whether or not they are going to stay hitched, it has been certainly my finding in Russia itself that they seem not to have money for other things, but for educational pursuits and for the space station they seem to allocate and have money to set aside for it.

Both sides requested that AL GORE give us some assurance as to what their intentions were and what they thought the Russian intentions were. I read to you a letter from AL GORE addressed to us dated May 9. It says:

As you are aware, I recently wrote to Prime Minister Chornomyrdin regarding the status of funding for the Russian Space Agency's cooperative activities with NASA on the international Space Station program. In response, the Prime Minister has firmly pledged that Russia will meet its commitments to the ISS program in full.

It goes on to say other things. Members all have copies of this letter. I invite them to read it. But its assurance to us that the leaders of this country, the leaders of that country, certainly the investment that Japan and other countries have made ought to cry out to us: Save this space station and give these people hope.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I would just say to the distinguished Member from Texas that he certainly will probably never be in a nursing home. As talented and as fired up as he is, he will probably be on the space station if it is built some day.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the hardworking gentlewoman from New York [Ms. VELÁZQUEZ].

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Roemer amendment to eliminate funding for the space station.

Just 3 weeks ago, we debated a bill that drastically cut housing aid to lower income Americans. In the name of deficit reduction, this body eliminated housing assistance for hundreds of thousands of Americans. The argument we heard was that, as a nation, we simply could not afford it.

But today, many in this Chamber are singing a different tune. This bill is definitely not about reducing spending. This bill continues the foolish proposal to spend billions of dollars for an orbiting public housing project, for just a few astronauts.

How can we tell millions of homeless people that there isn't enough money to put a safe roof over their heads, and then, continue to fund the space station? It is unconscionable to pour billions of dollars into this science fiction experiment, when we cannot afford to take care of our own citizens.

My colleagues, the real question before us today is whether millions of Americans will be forced to go without the most fundamental of needs—housing—in favor of an expensive space toy. Spending cuts to balance the budget must be applied to all domains, not just to the social programs. It is wrong to place this burden on the backs of the defenseless poor, without asking others to pay as well.

Let us not pour any more of our scarce funds into building a luxury hotel in the sky—especially after we just demolished public housing for the needy down here on Earth.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the Roemer amendment to cancel funding for the space station.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds just to rebut the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. VELÁZQUEZ].

There is a cut in the NASA budget. It is a pretty significant cut. We went through all of that in terms of the debate on the personnel. But just to set the record straight, from fiscal year 1996 to fiscal year 1997 this bill cuts the total NASA budget by \$325 million.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. WELDON].

Mr. WELDON of Florida. I thank the subcommittee chairman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to take part in this traditional rite of spring, to oppose the Roemer amendment and speak out in support of the future, in support of our children, in support of the space station. I would like to address several of the arguments that have been made by the people who would favor killing our space station.

One of them is that they bring out articles and quotations from bench researchers that say, no, do not spend the money on space station, spend the money on my research. I have done bench research. I have done life sciences research. I can tell my colleagues they could go into any university anywhere in the United States and say, "Would you rather we spend \$17 billion on the station or on more bench research?" And they would gladly say, "Give us the money for more bench research." The question before us is, is that the more appropriate use of our resources?

Another point that is being made by the opponents of the space station is this \$90 billion figure. The space station is costing \$17 billion to construct. The \$90 billion figure comes from a GAO study where they added in the cost of running the shuttle program for those 7 years and the cost of all the research on the space station.

This would be equivalent, in my opinion, to saying to go out to dinner with your wife and see a movie does not cost \$30, you have to factor in the cost of paving the roads to get back and forth from the restaurant and the cost of heating or cooling your house while you are in the restaurant. This kind of accounting is very, very deceptive.

The truth is the space station is on time and on budget, and there are very, very few programs run by this Federal Government that can make that claim. The space station program has been through downsizing. NASA has been through downsizing, and they have learned to be able to be lean, mean and efficient. This program is on time and it is on budget.

What this program is about is about the future. When we look at the cost of the space station and compare it to what we are going to spend over the next 7 years on defense, on health care, on roads and highways, this comes out to be less than 0.1 percent. I think it is about 0.01 percent of what we as a Nation are going to spend. The American people have said over and over again over the past 5, 6, 7 years, yes, we want to make this investment in the future, because that is what this is all about, the future.

I am told by teachers in my district that there is nothing that we can get children more excited about in the area of math and science than talking about space and manned space and the future. Support the station, vote "no" on the Roemer amendment.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER], who used to serve on the Committee on Science and was a strong supporter and coauthor of this amendment in the past.

Mr. ZIMMER. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, 5 years ago when the gentleman from Indiana and I were freshmen and both rookie members of what was then the Science, Space and Technology Committee, we took the well of this House to warn that the space station was going to be an orbiting white elephant, that it was going to be a black hole in space that would suck up billions of tax dollars and radically expand the deficit, and we said that it simply was not worth the money.

Now, 5 years later, I wish I could say that we were wrong, but every day provides us with new evidence that we were right. In a period of declining NASA budgets, the space station, which is now estimated by the GAO to cost more than \$94 billion, has already begun to cannibalize more valuable programs in space.

Bill Clinton's proposed NASA budget drops from \$13.8 billion next year to \$11.6 billion in the year 2000, and when inflation is factored in, the cut is even deeper. The Republican budget provides somewhat more money for NASA, but even so, the amount of available funds

is drastically less than we thought it would be just a few years ago. There is simply not enough money to build the space station and to meet the Nation's more pressing needs for scientific research in space and on Earth.

According to this month's Scientific American, NASA's research and development outlay, bloated by the space station, represents almost 40 percent of the Nation's total nonhealth, nonmilitary research and development budget. The huge annual costs of the space station are sucking the life out of more cost effective programs of NASA, such as our magnificent orbiting observatories, unmanned interplanetary missions, the mission to planet Earth, as well as the development of cheaper launch systems which will make it possible for us someday to have an affordable space station.

This spring NASA has already used reserve funds to cover \$144 million in cost growth of the space station program, \$100 million is attributable to the program being behind schedule, and \$44 million is due to the cost growth in some of the contracts. The Congressional Research Service reports that NASA officials are worried because these increases are occurring so early in the construction phase of the program.

□ 1630

There is one aspect that I think deserves particular attention this spring, and that is our relationship with Russia as a partner in the space station. When Bill Clinton and AL GORE proposed the Russian partnership, it generated greater support in this body because it seemed like a diplomatic coup. A symbol of the cold war was becoming a symbol of international cooperation.

But, unfortunately, it looks like our partnership with Russia is turning out to be a colossal mistake. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. HALL], says Russia always comes up with money when it is needed for space, and he refers us to a letter from the Vice President and promises from the Prime Minister of Russia. But the Russian Government has already delayed funding for its service module, a critical component of the space station, and work on the service module has fallen 5 months behind because the prime contractor has received only \$10 million of the \$55 million that has been requested.

The Russian Government still has not approved a timetable for making these payments. The Russian service module is scheduled for launch in 1998. If it is not delivered on time, it could devastate the schedule and the budget of the space station. NASA Administrator Dan Goldin has said, "If we do not have the service module, we cannot complete construction of the space station."

If Russia withdraws from the station, NASA estimates that assembly would be delayed by 18 months and would cost the United States an additional \$2 billion. Additionally, the United States

and our remaining international partners would have to develop and fund a new escape vehicle.

Now, regardless of who wins the upcoming elections for President in Russia, it is clear we will be dealing with a nation that is characterized by internal political strife, by ultranationalism, authoritarianism, and perhaps insurgent imperialism as well as tremendous corruption. While we should, obviously, support Russia's struggle to become a democratic, capitalist nation, we cannot afford to gamble \$94 billion on it.

We just can not be certain that there is going to be a happy ending to the Russian melodrama. It is not too late to cut our losses on this space station. We should support the Roemer-Ganske amendment.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CRAMER].

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague and chairman of the Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics, and I again rise in opposition, strong opposition, to the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER].

This is, in fact, getting to be an annual ritual, I say to my colleague. I feel like one of those toys kids buy for Christmas, where you pull the back of the toy and the conversation comes out "Save Space Station", "Save Space Station", "Kill Space Station", "Kill Space Station."

There have been 10 votes on the floor of the House since 1991 over this issue. As I count it, there have been 32 total votes both in the committee and on the floor on this very issue. I think we have had a fair fight and I think, I say to my colleague, it is time for us to get off of NASA's back.

There is not an agency that has been under more scrutiny than NASA has been over the space station project. They have redesigned it since 1991, they have cut the budget, they have cut their personnel, they have come to Congress, they have dealt with us in an open, direct way, and yet we keep saying every year now is the time to turn our back on it.

We have invested billions of dollars. Our international partners have their partnership with us at stake in this project. They have invested billions of dollars. Now is not the time to turn our back on it.

I want to echo some of the comments that my colleague from Florida, Mr. WELDON, made about children and mathematics and science. We happen to have the international space camp there at the Marshall Space Flight Center, there in Huntsville in my district, and I get to go out there two or three times a year and see all these young people come in from all over the world with their parents, young people that are inspired by NASA and by the space program, young people that want to commit their careers to mathematics and science, young people that are using NASA as their image of what

they want to do with their education and their careers. Let us not tell those young people that we are the kind of country that can in fact turn our back on this kind of investment, that can turn our back on the space station program.

Space station is the centerpiece of what NASA is all about. We have, in fact, many scientific projects that our doctors are planning to conduct on the space station. In my first year here I sat down with my colleague from Texas and a number of Texas doctors that were here that had joined with doctors from all over the world, and again they said the advances we had made in NASA technology that has given them benefits of robotics and surgery benefits and valves for artificial hearts, that we would lose our ability to complete those technologies if we, in fact, turn our back on the space station.

So I say we have had a fair fight. It is the irresponsible thing to do to turn your back on this project at this particular point. Let us kill this killing amendment and let us also kill the amendment that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] will offer next, which intends to maim the NASA space station program. Let us stop this and let us get on with it.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. STOCKMAN].

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have only been here a few short months, but I already feel like I know the gentleman from Indiana like a brother. We voted on this so many times now that I am being called an old bull in the Committee on Science.

This is something that we apparently do around here as a ritual, but let me tell my colleagues what this is really all about. When I was a child I looked at the TV and I watched us go up in Apollo to the Moon. I believed and saw and realized America was about something greater than I could ever imagine; that was America has a vision for the future.

America is a country and a nation seeking out new places. We were founded by a man that had that vision, and we continued throughout, as we looked to the West to develop, to search and look for new solutions, and to go, as they say in "Star Trek," boldly where no one else has ever gone.

What we are saying here is if we eliminate space station, we eliminate the vision for America. We will not hear anybody coming up here and saying we will have a new solution. This is what we are going to do.

Mr. Chairman, of all the money we spend in Government research, I submit this is the most important thing we do: Create new cures for illnesses and develop new processes to which we can feed the world.

We are obligated. We do not have a choice in this. We have to build the space station, because up there in the skies are the solutions to here on

Earth. Mr. Chairman, there is no other purpose for the United States in this greatest quest.

Right now we look at the movies and the different things across the country and we know that Americans want a space station. We voted on this many times, and I submit to my friends that it is the wisest use of money. In fact, it has been researched that for every dollar we spend in space we get \$7 back. That is not an expense, that is an investment.

As an accountant, I look and see things differently, and if my wife and I have trouble with our budget, we do not say, "Honey, let us cut the bonds"; "Honey, let us cut the investment." No, we say let us cut the expense, but do not cut the investments.

Space station is an investment in our future. It is an investment in the next generation for work. If we cut research and development, tomorrow's jobs will be in Japan and in Germany because they are continuing their space program. I submit we have to support this not for us, but for the next generation.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, may I ask how much time is remaining on both sides?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] has 13 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SENSENBRENNER] has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 minutes to just reply to some of the questions and comments that have been made.

Mr. Chairman, certainly this vote is a tough one. It is a tough one to eliminate the space station because people think that they do not want to make any votes in this body to move toward a balanced budget. There are some Democrats here in the House of Representatives that do not want to vote to cut anything. There are some Republicans in this body that will vote to cut everything but defense and the space station. We here, a bipartisan group, have come together and tried to put together an amendment based upon science and merit and the taxpayers' interests.

Now, this question is asked over and over and over, why do we keep doing this? Why do we keep making us go through this ritual every year of voting on the space station? It is because groups like the National Taxpayers Union support this amendment; Citizens Against Government Waste support this amendment; Citizens for a Sound Economy support this amendment; Taxpayers for Common Sense; the Concord Coalition. A bipartisan group of people dedicated to balancing the budget support this amendment.

This is not a bunch of Members of Congress running around trying to devise some way of balancing the budget on their own and taking away a vital project to the United States' research interests. These are grass roots organizations that feel that we should not be building this.

Now, again, I hear over and over from my colleagues this is great science. Again, I refer to Scientific American. High-tech products: Who is going to build them? Who is the company? According to this article, no large companies are currently interested in manufacturing in space. Where are they? How much money are they putting up? I want to know. That is a fair question.

Astronomy: No research currently planned, according to this article. Subsidies are required in biotechnology. They are not going to do it on their own. More taxpayers' money.

And when we talk about more taxpayers' money, we are coming back to the American taxpayer over and over and over again, with this budget going from \$8 billion to \$90 billion, whereas our taxpayers are sending the Russians \$100 million of our hard-earned money, yet that is not going down. On the same hand, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SENSENBRENNER] said we are cutting NASA. Well, we are cutting NASA in all the wrong places to protect the space station.

The space station is cannibalizing, it is eating up these other programs, like Mission to Planet Earth, like new construction, like shuttle upgrades. These programs are being cut back and displaced. That is not in the best interest of good science.

So we have the space station within the science and the NASA project that is eating up more and more of our available good dollars to do good programs when NASA is doing some good things in areas like the Clementine project and the Hubble and the Galileo that went to Jupiter. We are doing some marvelous things in NASA, but we will not be doing anything in NASA before long if the space station continues to gobble up all these moneys.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues that we are not going to be disappointing the American taxpayer when we say that \$14 billion already spent is going to be chased by another \$70 billion before this is over. Let us save the taxpayer that \$70 billion now.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, this is the key vote on the space station this year. I would hope that the committee will stay the course. I ask the membership to vote no on the Roemer amendment.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 127, noes 286, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 205]

AYES—127

Ackerman	Jacobs	Owens
Barrett (WI)	Johnson (SD)	Pallone
Bass	Kanjorski	Payne (NJ)
Bereuter	Kaptur	Payne (VA)
Blute	Kennedy (MA)	Pelosi
Brown (OH)	Kildee	Peterson (MN)
Camp	Kingston	Pomeroy
Christensen	Kleczka	Porter
Coble	Klink	Portman
Collins (IL)	Klug	Poshard
Collins (MI)	LaFalce	Ramstad
Conyers	Lantos	Rangel
Costello	Largent	Reed
Coyne	Latham	Rivers
Cummings	Lazio	Roemer
Danner	Leach	Roukema
DeFazio	Levin	Rush
Dellums	Lipinski	Sabo
Dickey	LoBiondo	Sanders
Dingell	Longley	Sanford
Dixon	Lowe	Schroeder
Doyle	Luther	Schumer
Duncan	Maloney	Shays
Durbin	Manzullo	Shuster
Ensign	Markey	Slaughter
Eshoo	Martini	Smith (MI)
Evans	McCarthy	Solomon
Fattah	McHugh	Stark
Frank (MA)	McKinney	Studds
Franks (NJ)	McNulty	Stupak
Furse	Meehan	Towns
Ganske	Menendez	Upton
Gibbons	Miller (CA)	Velazquez
Goodlatte	Minge	Vento
Gunderson	Mink	Visclosky
Gutierrez	Moakley	Wamp
Hamilton	Myrick	Waxman
Herger	Nadler	Wilson
Hilleary	Neumann	Woolsey
Hoekstra	Nussle	Yates
Holden	Oberstar	Zimmer
Hutchinson	Obey	
Inglis	Olver	

NOES—286

Abercrombie	Castle	Fowler
Allard	Chambliss	Fox
Andrews	Chapman	Franks (CT)
Archer	Chenoweth	Frelinghuysen
Armey	Chrysler	Frisa
Bachus	Clay	Frost
Baesler	Clayton	Funderburk
Baker (CA)	Clement	Galleghy
Baker (LA)	Clinger	Gejdenson
Baldacci	Clyburn	Gekas
Ballenger	Coburn	Gephardt
Barcia	Coleman	Geren
Barr	Collins (GA)	Gilchrest
Barrett (NE)	Combest	Gillmor
Bartlett	Condit	Gilman
Barton	Cooley	Gonzalez
Bateman	Cox	Goodling
Becerra	Cramer	Gordon
Beilenson	Crane	Goss
Bentsen	Crapo	Graham
Berman	Creameans	Green (TX)
Bevill	Cubin	Greene (UT)
Bilbray	Cunningham	Greenwood
Bilirakis	Davis	Hall (OH)
Bishop	Deal	Hall (TX)
Bliley	DeLauro	Hancock
Blumenauer	DeLay	Hansen
Boehlert	Deutsch	Harman
Boehner	Diaz-Balart	Hastert
Bonilla	Dicks	Hastings (FL)
Bonior	Doggett	Hastings (WA)
Bono	Dooley	Hayworth
Borski	Dornan	Hefley
Boucher	Dreier	Hefner
Brewster	Dunn	Heineman
Browder	Edwards	Hilliard
Brown (CA)	Ehlers	Hinchee
Brown (FL)	Ehrlich	Hobson
Brownback	Emerson	Hoke
Bryant (TN)	Engel	Horn
Bryant (TX)	English	Hostettler
Bunn	Everett	Hoyer
Bunning	Ewing	Hunter
Burr	Farr	Hyde
Burton	Fawell	Istook
Buyer	Fazio	Jackson (IL)
Callahan	Filner	Jackson-Lee
Calvert	Flake	(TX)
Campbell	Flanagan	Johnson (CT)
Canady	Foley	Johnson, E. B.
Cardin	Forbes	Johnson, Sam

Johnston	Nethercutt	Souder
Jones	Ney	Spence
Kasich	Norwood	Spratt
Kelly	Ortiz	Stearns
Kennedy (RI)	Orton	Stenholm
Kennelly	Oxley	Stockman
Kim	Packard	Stokes
King	Parker	Stump
Knollenberg	Petri	Talent
Kolbe	Pickett	Tanner
LaHood	Pombo	Tate
LaTourette	Pryce	Tauzin
Laughlin	Quillen	Taylor (MS)
Lewis (CA)	Radanovich	Taylor (NC)
Lewis (GA)	Rahall	Tejeda
Lewis (KY)	Regula	Thomas
Lightfoot	Richardson	Thompson
Linder	Riggs	Thornberry
Livingston	Roberts	Thornton
Lofgren	Rogers	Thurman
Lucas	Rohrabacher	Tiaht
Manton	Ros-Lehtinen	Torkildsen
Martinez	Rose	Torres
Mascara	Roth	Torricelli
Matsui	Roybal-Allard	Traficant
McCollum	Royce	Volkmer
McCrery	Salmon	Vucanovich
McDermott	Sawyer	Walker
McHale	Saxton	Walsh
McInnis	Scarborough	Ward
McIntosh	Schaefer	Waters
McKeon	Schiff	Watt (NC)
Meek	Scott	Watts (OK)
Metcalf	Seastrand	Weldon (FL)
Meyers	Sensenbrenner	Weldon (PA)
Mica	Serrano	Weller
Millender-	Shadegg	White
McDonald	Shaw	Whitfield
Miller (FL)	Sisisky	Wicker
Montgomery	Skaggs	Williams
Moorhead	Skeen	Wolf
Moran	Skelton	Wynn
Morella	Smith (NJ)	Young (AK)
Myers	Smith (TX)	Young (FL)
Neal	Smith (WA)	Zeliff

NOT VOTING—21

Chabot	Gutknecht	Mollohan
de la Garza	Hayes	Murtha
Doolittle	Houghton	Pastor
Fields (LA)	Jefferson	Paxon
Fields (TX)	Lincoln	Peterson (FL)
Foglietta	McDade	Quinn
Ford	Molinari	Wise

□ 1704

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Chabot for, with Mr. Gutknecht against.

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chairman, on recorded vote No. 205, I was incorrectly recorded as voting "aye." Please let the RECORD show it was my intention to vote "no." I have been and continue to be a strong supporter of the space station.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title II?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROEMER

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROEMER: Page 25, line 12, strike "\$1,840,200,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,765,200,000".

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, with the agreement of the gen-

tleman from Indiana, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto be limited to 10 minutes equally divided between the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] and myself.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] will be recognized for 5 minutes, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SENSENBRENNER] will be recognized for 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER].

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

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the House has spoken on eliminating the space station in that last amendment. They do not think that we should eliminate the space station. This amendment that I offer now for the consideration of this House is not the elimination of the space station. It is very, very different than eliminating the space station. All this amendment offered by myself and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GANSKE] does is to cut \$75 million out of a \$2.1 billion allocation for the space station every single year. They get \$2.1 billion. We are just saying in this year's budget cut 3 percent, \$75 million out of \$2.1 billion.

Now, when everything else is being cut around here, when we argued about a cut in Head Start for a month and a half, when we argued about cuts in Medicare, when we have been arguing about cuts, some of the safety nets for some of our senior citizens and some of our schoolchildren, certainly a space station that gets \$2.1 billion each year should be a part of balancing the budget.

Now, the other side, Mr. Chairman, is going to say this is a killer amendment, this is going to kill the space station. A 3-percent cut? Three percent, \$75 million out of \$2.1 billion, is not going to cut this space station. It is not going to eliminate the space station. This is just a way of saying what is fair is fair in terms of getting to a balanced budget.

So in conclusion, before I yield a few seconds to the gentlewoman from Texas, I urge Members to consider voting not for an elimination of the space station but for a 3-percent cut in a \$2.1 billion budget. This is what would be fair to the American people.

This is the fairest way to get to a balanced budget in the next 6 years. This is fair to NASA when they are cutting the shuttle, when they are cutting new construction and a host of other important programs. Do not let the space station continue to cannibalize the other programs in NASA.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] who is going to argue against me.

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank my good friend from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER]. There is not a person on the Committee on Science that I do not have the greatest respect for, like the gentleman and his integrity on this issue. But just like I disagreed with the gentleman on the previous vote and the previous effort to eliminate the space station, let me argue vigorously against the decrease because I would simply say that we cannot do any more.

The space station has already done as much cutting back through a series of restructuring and redesigns. We do not have any more slack in the program. What we have done is we have got a \$2.1 billion program that will see us launch in about a year and a half. We have got a privatization program going on that efficiently uses both the civilian employees as well as our private sector employees or our civil service employees.

I will simply say to the gentleman from Indiana that we know that there are priorities, and those priorities have to be that we share with the American people. But I do believe that the space station creates jobs for the 21st century. I would ask my colleagues to vote against the gentleman from Indiana and support the space station.

Mr. Chairman, I have the utmost in respect for my fellow committee member and Democratic colleague, Mr. ROEMER, but I happen to believe that his position with regard to the space station is patently wrong. The Nation has always expanded its horizons and explored all its frontiers and the international space station *Alpha* continues in the tradition of American know-how and fortitude. *Alpha* has had a long and tortuous history, and finally, after many years, several redesigns, numerous congressional votes and several administrations, this Nation, along with its international partners are on the cusp of beginning the constant human presence in space; our final frontier. With the first momentous launch of *Alpha* hardware almost upon us, hardware is being cut, tested, and assembled even as we speak.

Alpha will allow us to do research that cannot be done here on mother Earth. The station will provide opportunities for research in the areas of materials, life sciences, physics, astronomy, and many other sciences. In addition, the very effort of designing and building the space station has created new building and engineering techniques, light-weight materials, and many new technologies.

NASA has accepted the funding cap Congress has held it to and has testified and pledged that barring unforeseen acts of God, they will complete the project on time and on budget. Period. Our international partners have promised their full economic and operational support, and NASA has a strong record of working with them to solve problems that arise as the program progresses.

I have always supported the space station, and I continue to do so, as evidenced by my vote today. I support the project, its goals, and its efforts. I also support the motivated and hard working employees of NASA, its many contractors, and all those involved in putting this project together. Let's honor them and

their efforts by voting against the Roemer amendments, one to eliminate the space station and the alternative to reduce its funds.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very deceptive amendment because it says that, if we just take a little bit of money out of a \$2.1 billion program, we will be able to save some money and nothing is going to happen to it. That conclusion is absolutely false.

One of the reasons why NASA brought itself into disrepute in the last decade is that both NASA and Congress decided to reduce costs in many of the accounts. The reduced costs saved money in the next fiscal year, but it ended up resulting in projects not being completed and projects were completed late and cost overruns. All of the engineers stayed on the payroll to complete the project when the meter is ticking.

NASA Administrator Dan Goldin, who I believe has done a marvelous job in making NASA faster, better and cheaper, has written me a letter. I want to quote it in part. It says, simply put, an arbitrary reduction of \$49 to \$100 million means a slowdown of work. A slowdown of work means a schedule slip, and schedule slip means increased cost. Analytically, the impact to the station schedule is up to 3 months, referring to the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER], and the increased cost as much as \$200 million, or at least twice the amount saved by the proposed amendment.

This is an unacceptable risk to our careful balance of hardware elements and payroll deployment. What the gentleman from Indiana is doing here today in the name of saving money is to set this House and NASA up for a complaint that the station experiences cost overruns because of the stretch-out and the schedule slip that is caused by the gentleman from Indiana's amendment. Then he will be back next year when the dogwood bloom and the tulips sprout saying NASA has not been able to hold to its schedule; there has been a cost overrun; let us kill the Space Station.

Well, the way to prevent the gentleman from making that argument is by rejection of his amendment today because the \$75 million he proposes to save now will cost the taxpayers \$200 million according to the NASA Administrator, who says he works for the President of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS].

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, heaven is not reached by a single bound. But we build the ladder by which we rise.

Mr. Chairman, the international space station has, and will continue, to provide Americans with substantial benefits in areas includ-

ing medicine, the environment, transportation, and even communications. And the benefits don't just stop there. Since the inception of the U.S. space program, the secondary applications of space technology have yielded \$9 to the economy for every tax dollar spent. The returns are clearly well worth the investment.

The partnerships created through the space station serve as an exceptional model for future international ventures. The partners of this program have already contributed billions of dollars to the space station, demonstrating their commitment to completing the largest cooperative science program in history.

The international space station will be a world-class orbiting laboratory, which will serve as a test-bed for hundreds of science and technology experiments that could not be conducted on this planet. We will learn new research techniques for growing tissue samples outside of the human body, for use in cancer research and bone injuries. There will be new understandings of the aging process, with subsequent developments in counteracting the effects of aging.

Imagine the possibilities of academic involvement in the space station's activities. Through the cooperative efforts of NASA and academic institutions throughout the world, the space station will launch future generations into a brand new dimension of learning about space science.

Author J.G. Holland said, "Heaven is not reached by a single bound. But we build the ladder by which we rise." We are currently building that ladder, in a series of bounds. What we find at the top of this ladder will inspire future generations to imagine, explore, and actually see, first-hand, the unprecedented advances that the space station will provide. We must retain funding for the space station. I urge a "no" vote on the Roemer-Ganske amendment.

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

□ 1715

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were ayes 146, noes 269, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 206]

AYES—146

Ackerman
Allard
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Bass
Bereuter
Blumenauer
Blute
Brown (OH)
Camp
Christensen
Clay
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)

Costello
Coyne
Cummings
Danner
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Dickey
Dingell
Dixon
Doyle
Duncan
Durbin
Ehrlich
Ensign
Evans
Fattah

Ford
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Furse
Ganske
Gibbons
Gillmor
Goodlatte
Gordon
Gundersen
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Hefley
Herger
Hilleary
Hinchev

Hoekstra
Holden
Hutchinson
Inglis
Jacobs
Johnson (SD)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kingston
Klecicka
Klink
Klug
LaFalce
LaHood
Largent
Latham
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lowe
Luther
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey
Martini
McCarthy
McHugh

McInnis
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Menendez
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Montgomery
Myrick
Nadler
Neumann
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Rivers
Roemer

NOES—269

Abercrombie
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Billirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Boniior
Bono
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Campbell
Canady
Cardin
Castle
Chambliss
Chapman
Chenoweth
Chrysler
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coleman
Combust
Condit
Cooley
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crapo

Creameans
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis
Deal
DeLay
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fawell
Fazio
Filner
Flake
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Frost
Funderburk
Gallegly
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gilchrest
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Green (TX)
Greene (UT)
Greenwood
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefner
Heineman
Hilliard
Hobson
Hoke

Roukema
Rush
Sanders
Sanford
Schaefer
Schroeder
Schumer
Serrano
Shays
Shuster
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Spratt
Stark
Studds
Stupak
Tauzin
Thompson
Torkildsen
Towns
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Wamp
Waters
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Williams
Woolsey
Yates
Horn
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hunter
Hyde
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (RI)
Kim
King
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Lantos
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
Lofgren
Longley
Lucas
Manton
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCollum
McCreery
McDermott
McHale
McIntosh
McKeon
Meek
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Millender-
McDonald
Miller (FL)
Moorhead
Morella
Myers
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Norwood
Ortiz
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Pastor
Petri
Pickett

Pombo	Shaw	Tiaht
Pryce	Sisisky	Torres
Quillen	Skaggs	Torrice
Radanovich	Skeen	Trafficant
Rahall	Skelton	Volkmer
Regula	Smith (NJ)	Vucanovich
Richardson	Smith (TX)	Walker
Riggs	Smith (WA)	Walsh
Roberts	Solomon	Ward
Rogers	Souder	Watt (NC)
Rohrabacher	Spence	Weldon (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen	Stearns	Weldon (PA)
Rose	Stenholm	Weller
Roth	Stockman	White
Roybal-Allard	Stokes	Whitfield
Royce	Stump	Wicker
Sabo	Talent	Wilson
Salmon	Tanner	Wise
Sawyer	Tate	Wolf
Saxton	Taylor (MS)	Wynn
Scarborough	Taylor (NC)	Young (AK)
Schiff	Tejeda	Young (FL)
Scott	Thomas	Zeliff
Seastrand	Thornberry	Zimmer
Sensenbrenner	Thornton	
Shadegg	Thurman	

NOT VOTING—19

Chabot	Hayes	Moran
Conyers	Houghton	Murtha
de la Garza	Jefferson	Paxon
Fields (LA)	Lincoln	Peterson (FL)
Fields (TX)	McDade	Quinn
Foglietta	Molinari	
Gutknecht	Mollohan	

1733

Mr. SAWYER changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Ms. DELAURO and Mr. MARKEY changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title II?

If not, the Clerk will designate title III.

The text of title III is as follows.

TITLE III—UNITED STATES FIRE ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 301. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the "Fire Administration Authorization Act of 1996".

SEC. 302. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 17(g)(1) of the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 (15 U.S.C. 2216(a)(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking "and" at the end of subparagraph (E);

(2) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (F) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and"; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

"(G) \$27,560,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997."

SEC. 303. FIRE SAFETY SYSTEMS IN ARMY HOUSING.

Section 31(c)(1)(A)(ii)(II) is amended by inserting ", or in the case of housing under the control of the Department of the Army, 6 years after such date of enactment" after "date of enactment".

SEC. 304. SUCCESSOR FIRE SAFETY STANDARDS.

The Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 is amended—

(1) in section 29(a)(1), by inserting ", or any successor standard thereto," after "Association Standard 74";

(2) in section 29(a)(2), by inserting "or any successor standards thereto," after "which-ever is appropriate,";

(3) in section 29(b)(2), by inserting ", or any successor standards thereto," after "Association Standard 13 or 13-R";

(4) in section 31(c)(2)(B)(i), by inserting "or any successor standard thereto," after "Life Safety Code,"; and

(5) in section 31(c)(2)(B)(ii), by inserting "or any successor standards thereto," after "Association Standard 101,".

SEC. 305. TERMINATION OR PRIVATIZATION OF FUNCTIONS.

The Administrator of the United States Fire Administration shall transmit to Congress a report providing notice at least 60 days in advance of the termination or transfer to a private sector entity of any significant function of the United States Fire Administration.

SEC. 306. REPORT ON BUDGETARY REDUCTION.

The Administrator of the United States Fire Administration shall transmit to Congress, within three months after the date of the enactment of this Act, a report setting forth the manner in which the United States Fire Administration intends to implement the budgetary reduction represented by the difference between the amount appropriated to the United States Fire Administration for fiscal year 1997 and the amount requested in the President's budget request for such fiscal year. Such report shall be prepared in consultation with the Alliance for Fire and Emergency Management, the International Association of Fire Chiefs, the International Association of Fire Fighters, the National Fire Protection Association, the National Volunteer Fire Council, the National Association of State Fire Marshals, and the International Association of Arson Investigators.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to title III?

If not, the Clerk will designate title IV.

The text of title IV is as follows:

TITLE IV—NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 401. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the "National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Authorization Act of 1996".

SEC. 402. DEFINITIONS.

For the purposes of this title, the term—

(1) "Act of 1890" means the Act entitled "An Act to increase the efficiency and reduce the expenses of the Signal Corps of the Army, and to transfer the Weather Bureau to the Department of Agriculture", approved October 1, 1890 (26 Stat. 653);

(2) "Act of 1947" means the Act entitled "An Act to define the functions and duties of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for other purposes", approved August 6, 1947 (33 U.S.C. 883a et seq.);

(3) "Act of 1970" means the Act entitled "An Act to clarify the status and benefits of commissioned officers of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and for other purposes", approved December 31, 1970 (33 U.S.C. 857-1 et seq.);

(4) "Administrator" means the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration; and

(5) "Secretary" means the Secretary of Commerce.

Subtitle A—Atmospheric, Weather, and Satellite Programs

SEC. 411. NATIONAL WEATHER SERVICE.

(a) OPERATIONS AND RESEARCH.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to enable the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to carry out the operations and research duties of the National Weather Service, \$445,668,000 for fiscal year 1997. Such duties include meteorological, hydrological, and oceanographic public warnings and forecasts, as well as applied research in support of such warnings and forecasts.

(b) SYSTEMS ACQUISITION.—(1) There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary

to enable the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to carry out the public warning and forecast systems duties of the National Weather Service, \$64,991,000 for fiscal year 1997. Such duties include the development, acquisition, and implementation of major public warning and forecast systems, including the upgrade of computer facilities. None of the funds authorized under this subsection shall be used for the purposes for which funds are authorized under subsection (e). None of the funds authorized under this subsection shall be used for the purposes for which funds are authorized under section 102(b) of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Authorization Act of 1992 (Public Law 102-567). None of the funds authorized by such section 102(b) shall be expended for a particular NEXRAD installation unless—

(A) it is identified as a National Weather Service NEXRAD installation in the National Implementation Plan for modernization of the National Weather Service, required under section 703 of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Authorization Act of 1992 (Public Law 102-567); or

(B) it is to be used only for spare parts, not as an installation at a particular site.

(2) Of the amounts authorized under paragraph (1), \$42,935,000 shall be for NEXRAD program management, operations, and maintenance.

(c) NEW NEXRAD INSTALLATIONS.—No funds may be obligated for NEXRAD installations not identified in the National Implementation Plan for 1996, unless the Secretary certifies that such NEXRAD installations can be acquired within the authorization of NEXRAD contained in section 102(b) of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Authorization Act of 1992.

(d) ASOS PROGRAM AUTHORIZATION.—Of the sums authorized in subsection (b)(1), \$10,056,000 for fiscal year 1997 are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary, for the acquisition and deployment of—

(1) the Automated Surface Observing System and related systems, including multi-sensor and backup arrays for National Weather Service sites at airports; and

(2) Automated Meteorological Observing System and Remote Automated Meteorological Observing System replacement units.

and to cover all associated activities, including program management and operations and maintenance.

(e) AWIPS COMPLETE PROGRAM AUTHORIZATION.—(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), there are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary for all fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1996, an aggregate of \$271,166,000, to remain available until expended, to complete the acquisition and deployment of the Advanced Weather Interactive Processing System and NOAA Port and to cover all associated activities, including program management and operations and maintenance through September 30, 1999.

(2) No funds are authorized to be appropriated for any fiscal year under paragraph (1) unless, within 60 days after the submission of the President's budget request for such fiscal year, the Secretary—

(A) certifies to the Congress that—

(i) the systems meet the technical performance specifications included in the system contract as in effect on August 11, 1995;

(ii) the systems can be fully deployed, sited, and operational without requiring further appropriations beyond amounts authorized under paragraph (1); and

(iii) the Secretary does not foresee any delays in the systems deployment and operations schedule; or

(B) submits to the Congress a report which describes—

(i) the circumstances which prevent a certification under subparagraph (A);

(ii) remedial actions undertaken or to be undertaken with respect to such circumstances;

(iii) the effects of such circumstances on the systems deployment and operations schedule and systems coverage; and

(iv) a justification for proceeding with the program, if appropriate.

(f) CONSTRUCTION OF WEATHER FORECAST OFFICES.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to enable the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to carry out construction, repair, and modification activities relating to new and existing weather forecast offices, \$11,000,000 for fiscal year 1997. Such activities include planning, design, and land acquisition related to such offices.

(g) STREAMLINING WEATHER SERVICE MODERNIZATION.—

(1) REPEALS.—Sections 706 and 707 of the Weather Service Modernization Act (15 U.S.C. 313 note) are repealed.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—The Weather Service Modernization Act (15 U.S.C. 313 note) is amended—

(A) in section 702, by striking paragraph (3) and redesignating paragraphs (4) through (10) as paragraphs (3) through (9), respectively; and

(B) in section 703—

(i) by striking “(a) NATIONAL IMPLEMENTATION PLAN.—”;

(ii) by striking paragraph (3) and redesignating paragraphs (4), (5), and (6) as paragraphs (3), (4), and (5), respectively; and

(iii) by striking subsections (b) and (c).

SEC. 412. ATMOSPHERIC RESEARCH.

(a) CLIMATE AND AIR QUALITY RESEARCH.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to enable the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to carry out its climate and air quality research duties, \$99,272,000 for fiscal year 1997. Such duties include internannual and seasonal climate research and long-term climate and air quality research.

(b) ATMOSPHERIC PROGRAMS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to enable the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to carry out its atmospheric research duties, \$43,182,000 for fiscal year 1997. Such duties include research for developing improved prediction capabilities for atmospheric processes, as well as solar-terrestrial research and services.

SEC. 413. NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL SATELLITE, DATA, AND INFORMATION SERVICE.

(a) SATELLITE OBSERVING SYSTEMS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to enable the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to carry out its satellite observing systems duties, \$308,473,000 for fiscal year 1997, to remain available until expended. Such duties include spacecraft procurement, launch, and associated ground station systems involving polar orbiting and geostationary environmental satellites, as well as the operation of such satellites. None of the funds authorized under this subsection shall be used for the purposes for which funds are authorized under section 105(d) of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Authorization Act of 1992 (Public Law 102-567).

(b) POES PROGRAM AUTHORIZATION.—Of the sums authorized in subsection (a), there are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary \$147,664,000 for fiscal year 1997, to remain available until expended, for the procurement and launch of, and supporting ground systems for, Polar Orbiting Environmental Satellites, K, L, M, N, and N¹.

(c) GEOSTATIONARY OPERATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL SATELLITES.—Of the sums authorized

in subsection (a), there are authorized to be appropriated to the Administrator \$70,757,000 for fiscal year 1997, to remain available until expended to procure up to three additional Geostationary Operational Environmental NEXT Satellites (GOES I-M clones), instruments, and supporting ground systems.

(d) NATIONAL POLAR-ORBITING OPERATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL SATELLITE SYSTEM PROGRAM AUTHORIZATION.—Of the sums authorized in subsection (a), there are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary, for fiscal year 1997, \$39,500,000, to remain available until expended, for the procurement of the National Polar-Orbiting Operational Environmental Satellite System, and the procurement of the launching and supporting ground systems of such satellites.

(e) ENVIRONMENTAL DATA AND INFORMATION SERVICES.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to enable the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to carry out its environmental data and information services duties, \$44,898,000 for fiscal year 1997. Such duties include climate data services, geophysical data services, and environmental assessment and information services.

Subtitle B—Marine Research

SEC. 421. NATIONAL OCEAN SERVICE.

(a) MAPPING AND CHARTING.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary, to enable the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to carry out mapping and charting activities under the Act of 1947 and any other law involving those activities, \$36,500,000 for fiscal year 1997.

(b) GEODESY.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary, to enable the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to carry out geodesy activities under the Act of 1947 and any other law involving those activities, \$20,163,000 for fiscal year 1997.

(c) OBSERVATION AND PREDICTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary, to enable the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to carry out observation and prediction activities under the Act of 1947 and any other law involving those activities, \$11,000,000 for fiscal year 1997.

(2) OCEAN AND EARTH SCIENCES.—In addition to amounts authorized under paragraph (1), there are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary, to enable the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to carry out ocean and earth science activities, \$3,000,000 for fiscal year 1997.

(d) ESTUARINE AND COASTAL ASSESSMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary, to enable the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to support estuarine and coastal assessment activities under the Act of 1947 and any other law involving those activities, \$2,674,000 for fiscal year 1997.

(2) OCEAN ASSESSMENT.—In addition to amounts authorized under paragraph (1), there are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary, to enable the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to carry out the National Status and Trends Program, the Strategic Environmental Assessment Program, and the Hazardous Materials Response Program, \$21,925,000 for fiscal year 1997.

(3) DAMAGE ASSESSMENT PROGRAM.—In addition to amounts authorized under paragraph (1), there are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary, to enable the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to carry out the Damage Assessment Program, \$1,200,000 for fiscal year 1997.

SEC. 422. OCEAN AND GREAT LAKES RESEARCH.

(a) MARINE PREDICTION RESEARCH.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Sec-

retary, to enable the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to carry out marine prediction research activities under the Act of 1947, the Act of 1890, and any other law involving those activities, \$14,808,000 for fiscal year 1997.

(b) NATIONAL SEA GRANT COLLEGE PROGRAM.—(1) Section 212(a) of the National Sea Grant College Program Act (33 U.S.C. 1131(a)) is amended to read as follows:

“(a) GRANTS AND CONTRACTS; FELLOWSHIPS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out sections 205 and 208, \$34,500,000 for fiscal year 1997.”

(2) Section 212(b)(1) of the National Sea Grant College Program Act (33 U.S.C. 1131(b)(1)) is amended by striking “an amount” and all that follows through “not to exceed \$2,900,000” and inserting in lieu thereof “\$1,500,000 for fiscal year 1997”.

(3) Section 203(4) of the National Sea Grant College Program Act (33 U.S.C. 1122(4)) is amended by striking “discipline or field” and all that follows through “public administration” and inserting in lieu thereof “field or discipline involving scientific research”.

(c) COASTAL OCEAN PROGRAM.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary, to enable the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to carry out the Coastal Ocean Program, \$17,300,000 for fiscal year 1997.

Subtitle C—Program Support

SEC. 431. PROGRAM SUPPORT.

(a) EXECUTIVE DIRECTION AND ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIVITIES.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary, to enable the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to carry out executive direction and administrative activities under the Act of 1970 and any other law involving those activities, \$20,000,000 for fiscal year 1997.

(b) CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary, to enable the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to carry out central administrative support activities under the Act of 1970 and any other law involving those activities, \$33,000,000 for fiscal year 1997.

(c) RETIRED PAY.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary, for retired pay for retired commissioned officers of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration under the Act of 1970, \$7,706,000 for fiscal year 1997.

(d) MARINE SERVICES.—

(1) SERVICE CONTRACTS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law and subject to the availability of appropriations, the Secretary shall enter into contracts, including multiyear contracts, subject to paragraph (3), for the use of vessels to conduct oceanographic research and fisheries research, monitoring, enforcement, and management, and to acquire other data necessary to carry out the missions of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. The Secretary shall enter into these contracts unless—

(A) the cost of the contract is more than the cost (including the cost of vessel operation, maintenance, and all personnel) to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration of obtaining those services on vessels of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration;

(B) the contract is for more than 7 years; or

(C) the data is acquired through a vessel agreement pursuant to paragraph (4).

(2) VESSELS.—The Secretary may not enter into any contract for the construction, lease-purchase, upgrade, or service life extension of any vessel.

(3) MULTIYEAR CONTRACTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraphs (B) and (C), and notwithstanding section 1341

of title 31, United States Code, and section 11 of title 41, United States Code, the Secretary may acquire data under multiyear contracts.

(B) **REQUIRED FINDINGS.**—The Secretary may not enter into a contract pursuant to this paragraph unless the Secretary finds with respect to that contract that there is a reasonable expectation that throughout the contemplated contract period the Secretary will request from Congress funding for the contract at the level required to avoid contract termination.

(C) **REQUIRED PROVISIONS.**—The Secretary may not enter into a contract pursuant to this paragraph unless the contract includes—

(i) a provision under which the obligation of the United States to make payments under the contract for any fiscal year is subject to the availability of appropriations provided in advance for those payments;

(ii) a provision that specifies the term of effectiveness of the contract; and

(iii) appropriate provisions under which, in case of any termination of the contract before the end of the term specified pursuant to clause (ii), the United States shall only be liable for the lesser of—

(I) an amount specified in the contract for such a termination; or

(II) amounts that were appropriated before the date of the termination for the performance of the contract or for procurement of the type of acquisition covered by the contract and are unobligated on the date of the termination.

(4) **VESSEL AGREEMENTS.**—The Secretary shall use excess capacity of University National Oceanographic Laboratory System vessels where appropriate and may enter into memoranda of agreement with the operators of these vessels to carry out this requirement.

(5) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary, to enable the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to carry out marine services activities, \$56,292,000 for fiscal year 1997.

(e) **AIRCRAFT SERVICES.**—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary, to enable the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to carry out aircraft services activities (including aircraft operations, maintenance, and support) under the Act of 1970 and any other law involving those activities, \$9,153,000 for fiscal year 1997.

(f) **FACILITIES REPAIRS AND RENOVATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary, to enable the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to carry out facilities repairs and renovations, \$7,546,000 for fiscal year 1997.

Subtitle D—Streamlining of Operations

SEC. 441. PROGRAMS.

(a) **PROGRAMS.**—No funds are authorized to be appropriated for the following programs and accounts:

(1) The National Undersea Research Program.

(2) The Fleet Modernization, Shipbuilding, and Construction Account.

(3) The Charleston, South Carolina, Special Management Plan.

(4) Chesapeake Bay Observation Buoys.

(5) Federal/State Weather Modification Grants.

(6) The Southeast Storm Research Account.

(7) National Institute for Environmental Renewal.

(8) The Lake Champlain Study.

(9) The Maine Marine Research Center.

(10) The South Carolina Cooperative Geodetic Survey Account.

(11) Pacific Island Technical Assistance.

(12) VENTS program.

(13) National Weather Service non-Federal, non-wildfire Fire Weather Service.

(14) National Weather Service Regional Climate Centers.

(15) National Weather Service Samoa Weather Forecast Office Repair and Upgrade Account.

(16) Dissemination of Weather Charts (Marine Facsimile Service).

(17) The Southeast United States Caribbean Fisheries Oceanographic Coordinated Investigations Program.

(18) National Coastal Research and Development Institute Account.

(19) Global Learning and Observations to Benefit the Environment program.

(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Science of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report certifying that all the programs listed in subsection (a) will be terminated no later than September 30, 1996.

(c) **REPEAL OF SEA GRANT PROGRAMS.**—

(1) **REPEALS.**—(A) Section 208(b) of the National Sea Grant College Program Act (33 U.S.C. 1127(b)) is repealed.

(B) Section 3 of the Sea Grant Program Improvement Act of 1976 (33 U.S.C. 1124a) is repealed.

(2) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Section 209 of the National Sea Grant College Program Act (33 U.S.C. 1128(b)(1)) is amended by striking “and section 3 of the Sea Grant Program Improvement Act of 1976”.

(d) **ADDITIONAL REPEAL.**—The NOAA Fleet Modernization Act (33 U.S.C. 851 note) is repealed.

SEC. 442. LIMITATIONS ON APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) **MAXIMUM AMOUNT.**—No more than \$1,765,359,000 are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary for fiscal year 1997, by this Act and any other Act, to enable the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to carry out all activities associated with Operations, Research, and Facilities.

(b) **REDUCTION IN TRAVEL BUDGET.**—Of the sums appropriated under this Act for Operations, Research, and Facilities, no more than \$20,000,000 may be used for reimbursement of travel and related expenses for National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration personnel.

SEC. 443. TERMINATION OF THE CORPS OF COMMISSIONED OFFICERS.

(a) **NUMBER OF OFFICERS.**—Notwithstanding section 8 of the Act of June 3, 1948 (33 U.S.C. 853g), no commissioned officers are authorized for any fiscal year after fiscal year 1996.

(b) **SEVERANCE PAY.**—Commissioned officers may be separated from the active list of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. In lieu of separation pay, officers so separated shall be eligible only for severance pay in accordance with the terms and conditions of section 5595 of title 5, United States Code, and only to the extent provided in advance in appropriations Acts.

(c) **TRANSFER.**—(1) Subject to the approval of the Secretary of Defense and under terms and conditions specified by the Secretary, commissioned officers subject to subsection (a) may transfer to the armed services under section 716 of title 10, United States Code.

(2) Subject to the approval of the Secretary of Transportation and under terms and conditions specified by the Secretary, commissioned officers subject to subsection (a) may transfer to the United States Coast Guard under section 716 of title 10, United States Code.

(3) Subject to the approval of the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and under terms and conditions specified by that Administrator, a commissioned officer subject to subsection (a) may be employed by the National Oce-

anic and Atmospheric Administration as a member of the civil service, if the Administrator considers that individual to be the best available candidate for the position. No new civil service position may be created pursuant to this paragraph.

(4) The Administrator shall, before December 1, 1996, transmit to the Committee on Science of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report listing all officers employed by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration under paragraph (3), a description of their responsibilities as members of the NOAA Corps, and a description of their responsibilities as civil service employees of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

(d) **REPEALS.**—(1) The following provisions of law are repealed:

(A) The Coast and Geodetic Survey Commissioned Officers' Act of 1948 (33 U.S.C. 853a-853o, 853p-853u).

(B) The Act of February 16, 1929 (Chapter 221, section 5; 45 Stat. 1187; 33 U.S.C. 852a).

(C) The Act of January 19, 1942 (Chapter 6; 56 Stat. 6).

(D) Section 9 of Public Law 87-649 (76 Stat. 495).

(E) The Act of May 22, 1917 (Chapter 20, section 16; 40 Stat. 87; 33 U.S.C. 854 et seq.).

(F) The Act of December 3, 1942 (Chapter 670; 56 Stat. 1038).

(G) Sections 1 through 5 of Public Law 91-621 (84 Stat. 1863; 33 U.S.C. 857-1 et seq.).

(H) The Act of August 10, 1956 (Chapter 1041, section 3; 70A Stat. 619; 33 U.S.C. 857a).

(I) The Act of May 18, 1920 (Chapter 190, section 11; 41 Stat. 603; 33 U.S.C. 864).

(J) The Act of July 22, 1947 (Chapter 286; 61 Stat. 400; 33 U.S.C. 873, 874).

(K) The Act of August 3, 1956 (Chapter 932; 70 Stat. 988; 33 U.S.C. 875, 876).

(L) All other Acts inconsistent with this subsection.

Following the repeal of provisions under this paragraph, all retirement benefits for the NOAA Corps which are in existence on September 30, 1996, shall continue to apply to eligible NOAA Corps officers and retirees.

(2) The effective date of the repeals under paragraph (1) shall be October 1, 1996.

(e) **ABOLITION.**—The Office of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Corps of Operations and the Commissioned Personnel Center are abolished effective September 30, 1996.

Subtitle E—Miscellaneous

SEC. 451. WEATHER DATA BUOYS.

(a) **PROHIBITION.**—It shall be unlawful for any unauthorized person to remove, change the location of, obstruct, willfully damage, make fast to, or interfere with any weather data buoy established, installed, operated, or maintained by the National Data Buoy Center.

(b) **CIVIL PENALTIES.**—The Administrator is authorized to assess a civil penalty against any person who violates any provision of this section in an amount of not more than \$10,000 for each violation. Each day during which such violation continues shall be considered a new offense. Such penalties shall be assessed after notice and opportunity for a hearing.

(c) **REWARDS.**—The Administrator may offer and pay rewards for the apprehension and conviction, or for information helpful therein, of persons found interfering, in violation of law, with data buoys maintained by the National Data Buoy Center; or for information leading to the discovery of missing National Weather Service property or the recovery thereof.

SEC. 452. DUTIES OF THE NATIONAL WEATHER SERVICE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—To protect life and property and enhance the national economy, the

Secretary, through the National Weather Service, except as outlined in subsection (b), shall be responsible for—

(1) forecasts and shall serve as the sole official source of weather warnings;

(2) the issue of storm warnings;

(3) the collection, exchange, and distribution of meteorological, hydrological, climatic, and oceanographic data and information; and

(4) the preparation of hydrometeorological guidance and core forecast information.

(b) **COMPETITION WITH PRIVATE SECTOR.**—The National Weather Service shall not compete, or assist other entities to compete, with the private sector when a service is currently provided or can be provided by commercial enterprise, unless—

(1) the Secretary finds that the private sector is unwilling or unable to provide the services; and

(2) the service provides vital weather warnings and forecasts for the protection of lives and property of the general public.

(c) **AMENDMENTS.**—The Act of 1890 is amended—

(1) by striking section 3 (15 U.S.C. 313); and

(2) in section 9 (15 U.S.C. 317), by striking all after "Department of Agriculture" and inserting in lieu thereof a period.

(d) **REPORT.**—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Science of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report detailing all National Weather Service activities which do not conform to the requirements of this section and outlining a timetable for their termination.

SEC. 453. NATIONAL OCEANOGRAPHIC PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM.

(a) **PROGRAM REQUIRED.**—(1) Subtitle C of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding after chapter 663 the following new chapter:

"CHAPTER 665—NATIONAL OCEANOGRAPHIC PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM

"Sec.

"7901. National Oceanographic Partnership Program.

"7902. National Ocean Research Leadership Council.

"7903. Ocean Research Partnership Coordinating Group.

"7904. Ocean Research Advisory Panel.

"§ 7901. National Oceanographic Partnership Program

"(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—The Secretary of the Navy shall establish a program to be known as the 'National Oceanographic Partnership Program'.

"(b) **PURPOSES.**—The purposes of the program are as follows:

"(1) To promote the national goals of assuring national security, protecting quality of life, and strengthening science and education through improved knowledge of the ocean.

"(2) To coordinate and strengthen oceanographic efforts in support of those goals by—

"(A) identifying and carrying out partnerships among Federal agencies, academia, industry, and other members of the oceanographic scientific community in the areas of data, resources, and education; and

"(B) reporting annually to Congress on the program.

"§ 7902. National Ocean Research Leadership Council

"(a) **COUNCIL.**—There is established a National Ocean Research Leadership Council (hereinafter in this chapter referred to as the "Council").

"(b) **MEMBERSHIP.**—The Council is composed of the following members:

"(1) The Secretary of the Navy, who shall be the chairman of the Council.

"(2) The Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, who shall be the vice chairman of the Council.

"(3) The Director of the National Science Foundation.

"(4) The Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

"(5) The Deputy Secretary of Energy.

"(6) The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

"(7) The Commandant of the Coast Guard.

"(8) The Director of the Geological Survey of the Department of the Interior.

"(9) The Director of the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency.

"(10) The Director of the Minerals Management Service of the Department of the Interior.

"(11) The President of the National Academy of Sciences, the President of the National Academy of Engineering, and the President of the Institute of Medicine.

"(12) The Director of the Office of Science and Technology.

"(13) The Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

"(14) One member appointed by the Chairman from among individuals who will represent the views of ocean industries.

"(15) One member appointed by the Chairman from among individuals who will represent the views of State governments.

"(16) One member appointed by the Chairman from among individuals who will represent the views of academia.

"(17) One member appointed by the Chairman from among individuals who will represent such other views as the Chairman considers appropriate.

"(c) **TERM OF OFFICE.**—The term of office of a member of the Council appointed under paragraph (14), (15), (16), or (17) of subsection (b) shall be two years, except that any person appointed to fill a vacancy occurring before the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term.

"(d) **RESPONSIBILITIES.**—The Council shall have the following responsibilities:

"(1) To establish the Ocean Research Partnership Coordinating Group as provided in section 7903.

"(2) To establish the Ocean Research Advisory Panel as provided in section 7904.

"(3) To submit to Congress an annual report pursuant to subsection (e).

"(e) **ANNUAL REPORT.**—Not later than March 1 of each year, the Council shall submit to Congress a report on the National Oceanographic Partnership Program. The report shall contain the following:

"(1) A description of activities of the program carried out during the fiscal year before the fiscal year in which the report is prepared. The description also shall include a list of the members of the Ocean Research Partnership Coordinating Group, the Ocean Research Advisory Panel, and any working groups in existence during the fiscal year covered.

"(2) A general outline of the activities planned for the program during the fiscal year in which the report is prepared.

"(3) A summary of projects continued from the fiscal year before the fiscal year in which the report is prepared and projects expected to be started during the fiscal year in which the report is prepared and during the following fiscal year.

"(4) A description of the involvement of the program with Federal interagency coordinating entities.

"(5) The amounts requested, in the budget submitted to Congress pursuant to section 1105(a) of title 31 for the fiscal year following

the fiscal year in which the report is prepared, for the programs, projects, and activities of the program and the estimated expenditures under such programs, projects, and activities during such following fiscal year.

"§ 7903. Ocean Research Partnership Coordinating Group

"(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—The Council shall establish an entity to be known as the 'Ocean Research Partnership Coordinating Group' (hereinafter in this chapter referred to as the 'Coordinating Group').

"(b) **MEMBERSHIP.**—The Coordinating Group shall consist of members appointed by the Council, with one member appointed from each Federal department or agency having an oceanographic research or development program.

"(c) **CHAIRMAN.**—The Council shall appoint the Chairman of the Coordinating Group.

"(d) **RESPONSIBILITIES.**—Subject to the authority, direction, and control of the Council, the Coordinating Group shall have the following responsibilities:

"(1) To prescribe policies and procedures to implement the National Oceanographic Partnership Program.

"(2) To review, select, and identify and allocate funds for partnership projects for implementation under the program, based on the following criteria:

"(A) Whether the project addresses critical research objectives or operational goals, such as data accessibility and quality assurance, sharing of resources, or education.

"(B) Whether the project has broad participation within the oceanographic community.

"(C) Whether the partners have a long-term commitment to the objectives of the project.

"(D) Whether the resources supporting the project are shared among the partners.

"(E) Whether the project has been subjected to adequate peer review.

"(3) To promote participation in partnership projects by each Federal department and agency involved with oceanographic research and by prescribing guidelines for participation in the program.

"(4) To submit to the Council an annual report pursuant to subsection (i).

"(e) **PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM OFFICE.**—The Coordinating Group shall establish, using competitive procedures, and oversee a partnership program office to carry out such duties as the Chairman of the Coordinating Group considers appropriate to implement the National Oceanographic Partnership Program, including the following:

"(1) To establish and oversee working groups to propose partnership projects to the Coordinating Group and advise the Group on such projects.

"(2) To manage peer review of partnership projects proposed to the Coordinating Group and competitions for projects selected by the Group.

"(3) To submit to the Coordinating Group an annual report on the status of all partnership projects and activities of the office.

"(f) **CONTRACT AND GRANT AUTHORITY.**—The Coordinating Group may authorize one or more of the departments or agencies represented in the Group to enter into contracts and make grants, using funds appropriated pursuant to an authorization for the National Oceanographic Partnership Program, for the purpose of implementing the program and carrying out the Coordinating Group's responsibilities.

"(g) **FORMS OF PARTNERSHIP PROJECTS.**—Partnership projects selected by the Coordinating Group may be in any form that the Coordinating Group considers appropriate, including memoranda of understanding, cooperative research and development agreements, and similar instruments.

“(h) ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than February 1 of each year, the Coordinating Group shall submit to the Council a report on the National Oceanographic Partnership Program. The report shall contain, at a minimum, copies of any recommendations or reports to the Coordinating Group by the Ocean Research Advisory Panel.

“§ 7904. Ocean Research Advisory Panel

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Council shall appoint an Ocean Research Advisory Panel (hereinafter in this chapter referred to as the ‘Advisory Panel’) consisting of not less than 10 and not more than 18 members.

“(b) MEMBERSHIP.—Members of the Advisory Panel shall be appointed from among persons who are eminent in the field of marine science, or related fields, and who are representative, at a minimum, of the interests of government, academia, and industry.

“(c) RESPONSIBILITIES.—(1) The Coordinating Group shall refer to the Advisory Panel, and the Advisory Panel shall review, each proposed partnership project estimated to cost more than \$500,000. The Advisory Panel shall make any recommendations to the Coordinating Group that the Advisory Panel considers appropriate regarding such projects.

“(2) The Advisory Panel shall make any recommendations to the Coordinating Group regarding activities that should be addressed by the National Oceanographic Partnership Program that the Advisory Panel considers appropriate.”

(2) The table of chapters at the beginning of subtitle C of title 10, United States Code, and at the beginning of part IV of such subtitle, are each amended by inserting after the item relating to chapter 663 the following:

“665. National Oceanographic Partnership Program 7901”.

(b) INITIAL APPOINTMENTS OF COUNCIL MEMBERS.—The Secretary of the Navy shall make the appointments required by section 7902(b) of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a)(1), not later than December 1, 1996.

(c) INITIAL APPOINTMENTS OF ADVISORY PANEL MEMBERS.—The National Ocean Research Leadership Council established by section 7902 of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a)(1), shall make the appointments required by section 7904 of such title not later than January 1, 1997.

(d) FIRST ANNUAL REPORT OF NATIONAL OCEAN RESEARCH LEADERSHIP COUNCIL.—The first annual report required by section 7902(e) of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a)(1), shall be submitted to Congress not later than March 1, 1997. The first report shall include, in addition to the information required by such section, information about the terms of office, procedures, and responsibilities of the Ocean Research Advisory Panel established by the Council.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—No funds are authorized to be appropriated by this Act for the National Oceanographic Partnership Program for fiscal year 1997.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to title IV?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WAMP

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WAMP: Page 83, line 1, strike “\$445,668,000” and insert in lieu thereof “\$450,668,000”.

Page 83, line 10, strike “\$64,991,000” and insert in lieu thereof “68,984,000”.

Page 85, line 10, insert “of which up to \$116,483,000 may be available for fiscal year 1997,” after “available until expended.”

Page 88, line 18, strike “\$308,473,000” and insert in lieu thereof “\$287,997,000”.

Page 89, line 22, strike “\$39,500,000” and insert in lieu thereof “\$19,024,000”.

Mr. WAMP (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 Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Chairman, as we move into this title, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, my amendment would add \$20.5 million to the National Weather Service budget. Specifically, it increases the local warnings and forecast budget by \$5 million. It increases the computer facility upgrades budget by \$4 million. It increases the advanced weather interactive processing system budget by \$11.5 million, for a total of \$20.5 million.

The entire increase is offset by a reduction of \$20.5 million in the polar convergent satellite program, which is a cost-shared program with the Defense Department. Since the defense authorization bill recently passed by this body only authorized \$19 million for this program, yet the Committee on Science's mark still continued \$39.5 million, we are reducing that amount to offset this increase, so that this increase is fully accounted for by spending reductions in other areas.

Why would we do this? The importance of the National Weather Service's modernization effort. We know great work has been accomplished through the Department of Commerce upgrading our National Weather Service system, implementing the NEXRAD radar system, in next generation radar nationwide.

Many outstanding Members of this body, like my friend, the gentleman from Huntsville, AL [Mr. CRAMER], have been very active in this effort. We are installing new, more powerful Doppler radars and state-of-the-art satellite across the Nation.

However, there are some areas that have been identified as being deficient, where the service is degraded because of soft spots in the system, and the Department of Commerce actually recognized that three of those areas exist in southeast Tennessee and northeast Alabama, one area, actually two congressional districts, the gentleman from Alabama, Mr. CRAMER's, and mine, but one area; plus Indiana and Arkansas.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SOUDER] and the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HUTCHINSON] are affected as well, and we have Doppler radar needs that the Department of Commerce has certified to build these radars in our region, because the radars that are part of the NEXRAD system are too far from our area and are too high up in the air to cover the storms that blow through our region.

Specifically, this last weekend, again, tornadoes touched down in Brad-

ley County, TN that were not detected from Morristown, TN because the radar is too high, so new Dopplers that are programmed in the system for these three areas have been approved and certified by the Department of Commerce.

Mr. Chairman, one of the best non-partisan things we do here is the health and safety of the citizens of this country, and local weather forecasting is as close to the ground as it gets. It is important that we come together in a bipartisan way. I did not just want to increase spending, so we offset it. We worked with the chairman of the Committee on Science. We hope that the committee, the full committee here will support this reasonable increase in funding, since it is offset with another program that obviously does not need the money, based on our latest defense authorization bill.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF CALIFORNIA AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WAMP

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as a substitute for the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROWN of California as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. WAMP: Page 83, line 1, strike “\$445,668,000” and insert in lieu thereof “\$471,672,000.”

Mr. BROWN of California (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment 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.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment to the amendment in order to fully restore funding for the critical personnel of the National Weather Service. H.R. 3322 proposes a \$26 million reduction from this account which I believe will seriously jeopardize the safety and well being of every American.

We have been informed by the National Weather Service that in order to implement this reduction, they would have to consider elimination of midnight shift personnel in every weather forecast office and eliminate rush hour forecast products nationally. In addition they would have to close planned warning and forecast offices and would have to defer the opening of any additional NEXRAD sites that were recently identified as necessary by the National Research Council. There is no question that the proposed cuts in H.R. 3322 would endanger public safety.

As reflected in the President's request, the National Weather Service is already committed to permanent reductions of over \$25 million in base operations. They need, however, to make the transition to the modernized weather office system in order to realize these savings. Without the necessary operational infrastructure and personnel in place, the National Weather Service will not be able to utilize the full operational capabilities envisioned by the modernization plan.

My amendment does not attempt to numerically offset this increase with any reduction

elsewhere in the bill. I want to point out that the bill we are considering today already seriously underfunds NOAA and the National Weather Service. The bill already reduces NOAA's programs in our jurisdiction by \$155 million and will lead to great difficulty in carrying out critical satellite, weather forecasting, and research activities. To propose an offset would only legitimize this ill conceived plan to distort our national priorities.

I also point out that yesterday on this same bill, Mr. SCHIFF offered an amendment to raise funding for the National Science Foundation by \$40 million with no offset. This had the full backing of the Republicans and passed easily. I make this point to illustrate the fiction we are being asked to participate in by pretending there is some magic number that in some way limits us in this authorization. This fiction seems to be only enforced when it is convenient.

I will close by reminding my colleagues that the serious nature of this problem we are trying to address here has been clear since this bill was first brought before the committee. I have tried on several occasions now to offer a substitute that addresses this and a number of other problems in the bill. These attempts have failed along party lines.

I commend the gentleman from Tennessee for his attempt at this late date to fix this problem. However, my fear is that his amendment does not fully address the problem. If his amendment passes in its current form, the National Weather Service will still face the necessity to reduce service to the public. In addition, the gentleman may only be compounding the problem by cutting elsewhere in the bill. I urge my colleagues to support my substitute to his amendment. Lets fully fund the Weather Service Operations.

Mr. Chairman, at the risk of appearing to be cynical, let me try and interpret what has been happening in connection with this legislation.

The bill before us, which was reported out of the full committee with little or no change from the chairman's recommendations, contained a number of problems. I sought to offer a substitute in the full committee, which was rejected on basically a party line vote, which corrected all of the problems that have been brought up here, and which we are now acting on.

Yesterday the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SCHIFF] found a little problem in the National Science Foundation budget, and he offered a \$40 million add-on which we had offered in the full committee and it had been rejected. He did not have an offset to it, but he admitted that we really did not need an offset, so we proceeded to adopt that.

The gentleman from Florida [Mr. WELDON] offered this morning an amendment to add \$81.5 million back for NASA personnel, when they finally discovered that the President's budget provided the funding that was needed, and if they cut \$81 million out of it, it would result in layoffs and furloughs, which would be bad for a lot of people's health.

The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. WAMP] now has discovered that the \$26 million which I recommended be put

back in the full committee really is necessary to protect the health and welfare of the citizens of our districts and our constituents. Part of the game here is both sides are trying to protect vulnerable Members by allowing them to offer amendments which will be popular in their districts. Of course, on our side, we do the same thing. We try and put the other side in the position of voting for something that will be very bad for them in their district.

After finally weighing the situation, we have decided that there are at least three or four instances in which the Republicans really cannot stand the heat from the mistakes in this bill, that is, from the political mistakes in this bill, so they are going to try and put the money back in to take care of the situation.

They are going to argue in front of God and everybody that this is based upon some sudden new insight, but what it really amounts to is they have decided that they do not want to take the political heat that they are going to get from, say, cutting back on weather service facilities and personnel in a district highly dependent on it, or cutting back on personnel for a major NASA lab in a district in which the economy depends on it, or a major energy lab. That is the way politics works, and we might as well be frank and admit it.

When we on our side try to point out that we had corrected all of these in our substitute, they say you did not do it the right way, or something like that. Of course, they are using the fact that our figures do not conform to their budget, as if this was holy writ, and therefore, anything that we do is obscene, until they find out that it is pretty nice to have something close to our budget in order to elect one of their Members.

Mr. Chairman, I hate to say this, because it makes me look so cynical and self-serving, but I thought that we ought to have that on the record. My substitute is very simple. It provides for the same additions that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. WAMP] has, or it fully funds the restoration of the personnel that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. WAMP] only partially funds and which was in the President's budget.

It does not attempt to offset this with a numerical increase to offset it from another portion of the bill. It does, however, have in it the provision that the gentleman from Tennessee makes reference to. There is no offset. We have decided to be honest and not have an offset. The gentleman from Tennessee found an offset in a program, polar orbiting satellites, which the agency had decided not to do anything about for the next 2 years anyway, so he is going to reduce the budget by that amount, which is a sort of a subterfuge, but if he can get away with it, fine.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the Members to be honest and to accept my substitute,

which provides the same benefit that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. WAMP] does, and does not go through the motions of trying to offset this with some more or less specious offset, which is unnecessary, even if it was a real offset.

□ 1745

I know that since a part of the majority's position is going to be to wave the flag and claim that they have to have these offsets in order to balance the budget, which we pointed out means to increase the budget where they want and cut it where we want, I urge that Members support my substitute, recognizing that I probably will not win.

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

The gentleman from California does not need to be cynical about the process. The fact is what he is watching is the legislative process at work. Members do have a right under an open rule to come out here and offer amendments. We have to decide whether or not to accept some of those amendments or to fight some of those amendments.

It is not anything different than what goes on in Congress. In fact, it is the essence of the process to make some of these decisions as a Congress, and some of them change my bill, some of them enhance the bill. They in fact are an important part of how we do legislation. I do not resent the fact that the bill gets changed a little bit along the way. It is the way the process works. I have even happily accepted some amendments along the way because I thought they were the right things to do.

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

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

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to have the gentleman acknowledge this. I am not trying to present this as some perverse or evil process. I just wonder why it is when I offered the same amendments in committee the Chair did not have the perspicacity to realize that they might be necessary.

Mr. WALKER. When the gentleman offered them in committee, in some cases we did not have the full information available to us to evaluate it. In other cases he offered them as a part of a substitute that contained many, many other items. In a number of the cases when the gentleman referred to the fact that he had offered them in committee, he did not offer separate amendments on the subject matters. What he offered was a substitute that covered a whole variety of items, and we rejected his substitute as going the wrong direction.

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

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

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Chairman, I just want to point out that at the full committee level I was on record, and I

think our chairman will remember, stating that I wanted to address this on the House floor and I would be looking actively for an offset so that we could do the responsible thing. But I specifically stated at the markup I wanted this addressed and detailed what I wanted addressed on the House floor.

So it was not like it mysteriously appeared, Mr. BROWN, and in all fairness Mr. CRAMER and I think it worked in about the most bipartisan way here. Let us not bring partisanship into this issue of NEXRAD radar system, please. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. WALKER. The gentleman is correct. He did reserve his rights for the floor. I am pleased that we were able to work something out. I am glad to modify the bill to do that.

It seems to me, though, that we do not want to do the Brown substitute. As the gentleman from California himself has said, this is not offset. It will increase the National Weather Service local warning and forecast budget by \$26 million. That means that we are not dealing in the same manner that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. WAMP] has done, in the responsible way of assuring that we do this with an offset.

Unlike the Wamp amendment, which adds money for both modernization and local warnings and forecasts, the Brown amendment eliminates all the reductions that the Committee on Science made to the National Weather Service headquarters and specialized weather programs, and does not include any money for the modernization program. That strikes me as being an odd set of priorities. What you are doing is plusing up the account for the headquarters staff and overhead while not putting the money into the modernization program that the Weather Service regards as its most important priority. So the Wamp amendment in fact moves us toward a much stronger content level on it.

Why reduce the headquarters staff? Why do we think that is important? We are going along there with the inspector general. This is not some ideological kick. The inspector general said in his most recent report that the National Weather Service headquarters staff could be identified as having over \$32 million in potential savings, and those reductions can be made in headquarters staff.

Why is that the case? Because as they modernize the Weather Service, the fact is that they are able to utilize some equipment to replace people, and so the modernization program is actually resulting in the ability to reduce headquarters staff. That is what is reflected in what we have done in the bill, what is reflected in the Wamp amendment, and we think that it makes sense to go along with what the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. WAMP] wants to do here.

We believe that, in the case of the Brown substitute, that it puts the money that is not offset into a bu-

reaucracy. We think that the money should go into some things with regard to headquarters, but there also ought to be money for modernization, and I thank the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. WAMP] for what he has done.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to do something carefully here. I want to speak on behalf of the Brown substitute and on behalf of the Wamp amendment as well. I support the Brown substitute now because I supported the Brown substitute for the entire bill. If that fails, then of course I will support the Wamp proposal as well. I am concerned about the budget impact on the National Weather Service.

I want to reaffirm what the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. WAMP] has said. We are neighbors there, from north Alabama, northeast Alabama, up there into Tennessee. We have struggled hard to make sure our very vulnerable area of the country is in fact included in the National Weather Service's modernization plan. Budget has impact on the service that the Weather Service can offer to our area so we are concerned not only about the placement of a new NEXRAD, one placement that will accommodate two congressional districts and we have worked hard together to make sure that we not have to cause a budget item that would reflect for two NEXRAD's but that we join together and accomplish that with one placement of NEXRAD and I think we have in fact worked in a model bipartisan way toward that and will accomplish that.

What I am concerned about that causes me to support the Brown substitute as well, and, if that fails, as well as what the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. WAMP] is proposing here today is that beyond just the NEXRAD's, we have got a personnel issue that if we deny the National Weather Service this kind of budget item, then we are saying to them that they will have to direct the consequences down to the level of midnight forecasts, they will have to absorb this impact somewhere outside of headquarters, somewhere in the field as well. So I think both of these approaches will accomplish what I want to see accomplished. I think the Brown substitute does it in a much more complete way than what the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. WAMP] is proposing, but I am concerned enough about the impact of what we do to stand up here and to say support the Brown substitute first and, if that fails, support the Wamp amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, yesterday I referred to the Committee on Science as a do-little committee that was, through this piece of legislation, offering a do-little agenda for this country when it comes

to job creation through invigorating our science and technology policy, going absolutely the wrong direction if our goal is to have more high-paying jobs in this country based on science and technology.

I think the Wamp amendment today provides another example of the do-little legacy of this committee, because it is attempting to repair changes in our science policy that should never have been made in the first place. In any case, I was not here on the floor a little earlier this afternoon when the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], the chairman of the committee, asserted that my comments of yesterday were inaccurate. He particularly took umbrage at my claim that the committee had just one committee report to its credit for all of 1995. Take note he did not disagree with my comment that the committee had absolutely zero, that is, a big goose egg when it comes to legislation signed into law through its work last year but he did quarrel with the fact that they had only one committee report. He said they had 16. In fact, I have the Committee on Science calendar for last year, and it confirms that there was only one committee report for all of last year. This is distinguished, of course, as my remarks did, from those reports associated with the filing of more and more of these bills to fulfill the Gingrich ideological agenda.

A committee report, for those who do not understand the difference, is a matter of oversight, that we in Congress have a responsibility to exercise oversight over NOAA, over all of these various bureaucracies to see that they are doing their job. But this committee, unlike the time when my good friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN], chaired the committee and had 13 oversight reports of committees, has not kept pace with its work.

True, the chairman of the Committee on Science has been very involved in oversight of the Clinton administration, looking for any political examples it can find that might be useful in this year's elections. Perhaps that provides some of the reason why just merely pursuing good science has gotten second shift when it comes to oversight.

So I stand by my comments of yesterday regarding the lack of productivity of a committee that ought to be central to a jobs policy for this country. But I would cite this Wamp amendment as an example of more of the problem that when you pursue political rhetoric and political ideology over good science, you make mistakes like this. I believe that it is fair to say that there were not but a handful, if that, of our colleagues on the Republican side who had the slightest idea what was being done in committee when these cuts to NOAA were made and now that probably one or two people in the body have the slightest idea whether the restoration level that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. WAMP]

is proposing is the appropriate level or whether the offset that he would propose will guarantee the integrity of NOAA services. And, of course, since the Committee on Science rarely meets, it goes 4 or 5 months without even convening, there is no committee record of any type. There has not been bringing in any expert or any citizen concerned with this to look at the NOAA issues. So we have no evidence or record upon which to support this amendment.

I would say that what we have had in the Committee on Science is amply demonstrated by this, not legislation that could be passed on a bipartisan basis as occurred under both Republicans and Democrats in previous administrations, not committee reports exercising the oversight policy; rather, we have just had an example that the main kind of science coming out of this committee is political science and we have had more excellence in pursuit of error.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. WAMP]].

The amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. WAMP].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title IV?

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to engage in a colloquy with the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, the chairman of the Committee on Science.

Mr. Chairman, I am greatly concerned that the replacement of the Erie Weather Service Office at Erie, PA, with radar service from Pittsburgh, Cleveland, and Buffalo would increase weather-related accidents on Pennsylvania's north coastal region. Reports issued by both the General Accounting Office and the National Research Council support this conclusion by identifying radar coverage gaps and other shortcomings with the new nationwide NEXRAD coverage system. After the terrible consequences of unforeseen tornadoes in 1985 that devastated a number of communities in our region and the ever-present danger of unpredictable lake-effect weather on Lake Erie, the communities of northwest Pennsylvania in my view must have weather service they can depend upon.

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

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I want to assure the gentleman that the National Weather Service is studying a

potential impact that a removal of the Erie weather station would have on local forecasting. In the meantime, Erie will continue to receive its current radar coverage until January 1998 when the National Weather Service will complete its study. At that point the National Weather Service will recommend whatever arrangement is best to guarantee the continued safety of the local communities in northwestern Pennsylvania.

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. I appreciate receiving those assurances from the distinguished chairman of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title IV?

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

Mr. Chairman, there are many problems with this legislation. One of the most significant is the lack of title dealing with the Department of Energy's R&D programs. Why not? I believe the explanation is that a bipartisan majority of the committee, and probably the House, would fund them at a much higher level than the chairman would like.

These members recognize the role energy plays in preserving our economic well-being and national security. What Mr. WALKER purports to be the relevant House action in this area guts funding for almost every sector of energy research: conservation, solar and renewable, nuclear—including fusion—as well as important fossil R&D efforts to reduce the environmental impacts of what will continue to be the source of over 85 percent of energy production.

If we were to follow the Walker budget, we would be practically zeroing out conservation, solar and renewables, and fossil energy.

When we marked up this bill in committee, we were promised a subcommittee markup on an energy authorization in the ensuing weeks. This did not happen.

Then, when H.R. 3322 was originally scheduled for floor action, we were told that there would be a subcommittee markup the following week.

It would be cynical to suggest that this announcement was made merely to allay the concerns of numerous members of the majority who are concerned over the chairman's vision of energy R&D.

However, it is interesting to note that once H.R. 3322 was pulled from the floor schedule the energy markup was canceled.

It is also interesting to point out that it has been 3 weeks since the Energy and Environment Subcommittee has met for any reason, so it is not as if we have been overwhelmed by the schedule. Perhaps someone who is setting the committee's schedule could tell us when energy policy is going to be a high enough priority for us to act.

When we began the debate on this bill, the committee chairman claimed that we handled the energy accounts on the floor last year. He refers us back to H.R. 2405, which the House passed last October. Let me remind Members that the genesis of this so-called vision of our energy future—a vision that calls for a \$500 million reduction in energy research—not from the request, but from fiscal year 1996—was based on an amendment that the gentleman from Pennsylvania brought to the floor on his own and did not reflect the will of the committee.

Let me quote Mr. WALKER from the debate over the inclusion of fiscal year 1997 authorization in the Walker amendment, Science Committee Chairman WALKER stated, "I never contended that I brought this matter before the Committee. I brought it to the floor as my own amendment."—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, October 11, 1995—H9847.

The claim of the gentleman from Pennsylvania that, because he wrote a fiscal year 1997 energy R&D budget on the floor last October, there is no need to review these accounts is incredible. This is an absolute contradiction to our treatment of the National Science Foundation budget, which like the DOE accounts received 2 year authorization in last year's science authorization, but unlike DOE, which is apparently not worthy of our consideration, the NSF budget was included in H.R. 3322.

What is the reason for doing so? I imagine it may have something to do with the lack of support for the chairman's vision of our future energy research needs.

I had considered offering an amendment on energy R&D, but have decided not to, as it has become apparent that it is a waste of the Members' time to in any way improve upon this meaningless and irrelevant legislation.

Instead, I will submit for the RECORD, at the proper place and time, a letter to Appropriations Chairman LIVINGSTON from members of the Science Committee, Republicans and Democrats, expressing our concern over energy R&D authorization levels and the continued irrelevance of the back-of-an-envelope budget the committee chairman has endorsed.

In closing, I want to reemphasize that this is in no way an "Omnibus" bill. Semi-omnibus would be a more accurate description, and in many instances, what is contained in the bill is not worthy of our support.

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

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 7, 1996.

Hon. BOB LIVINGSTON,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As Members of the House Science Committee, we are writing to express our concern over House-passed authorization levels contained in H.R. 2405 for civilian research and development activities for the Department of Energy.

Even if there is no further action by the Science Committee on its DOE accounts, your Committee needs to understand that the Science Committee provided for flexibility in the setting of FY 1997 funding levels in H.R. 2405. This is due to the continued relevance of the Davis amendment to these authorizations. The Davis amendment clarifies that authorization for these programs should be reconsidered if in the budget and appropriations process, more funds become available.

Last October, when the House considered H.R. 2405, an amendment offered by Chairman Walker was adopted which raised authorization levels for FY 1996 to meet the previously appropriated level, but also set FY 1997 levels. While the action taken regarding FY 1996 levels was in keeping with the Davis Amendment adopted during Science Committee mark-up, the Committee had not considered DOE funding for FY 1997 at all.

In the debate over the inclusion of FY 1997 authorization in the Walker amendment, Science Committee Chairman Walker stated, "I never contended that I brought this matter before the Committee. I brought it to the

floor as my own amendment." (Congressional Record, October 11, 1995—H9847)

Since the House acted on H.R. 2405, there have been several developments which warrant reconsideration of these numbers. For example, the Congressional Budget Office has revised its economic assumptions, resulting in greater flexibility in making discretionary spending decisions. Also, the Energy & Environment Subcommittee has held a series of hearings on energy research and development, which have proven to be very helpful in our ability to judge the value of the various programs in question.

We are very grateful to Energy & Environment Subcommittee Chairman Rohrabacher for scheduling these hearings. However, they will be for naught if the Committee is unable to act on this hearing record in a timely manner.

The need to revisit DOE R&D funding is apparently shared by Chairman Walker and Subcommittee Chairman Rohrabacher, who have publicly pledged their willingness to move a FY 1997 DOE R&D authorization bill. While we support this action, we are concerned that the mark-up of this legislation will occur too late to influence your Committee's consideration of these accounts.

We recommend that your Committee not consider itself bound in any way by the FY 1997 levels passed in HR 2405. Energy policy is too important to our national security and economic strength to be based on last year's information. Thus, Congress should not act presumptively to drastically reduce these vital accounts.

Sincerely,

Mike Doyle; Sherwood Boehlert; John Tanner; John W. Olver; Steve Largent; George E. Brown, Jr.; Tim Roemer; Eddie Bernice Johnson; Paul McHale; Zach Wamp; Lynn N. Rivers; Zoe Lofgren; Bart Gordon; Jane Harman; Tim Holden; Mike Ward; Robert E. Cramer, Jr.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title IV?

If not, the Clerk will designate title V.

The text of title V is as follows:

TITLE V—ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

SEC. 501. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the "Environmental Research, Development, and Demonstration Authorization Act of 1996".

SEC. 502. DEFINITIONS.

For the purposes of this title, the term—

(1) "Administrator" means the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency;

(2) "Agency" means the Environmental Protection Agency; and

(3) "Assistant Administrator" means the Assistant Administrator for Research and Development of the Agency.

SEC. 503. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Administrator \$487,126,600 for fiscal year 1997 for Science and Technology activities, including program management and support, in the areas specified in subsection (b).

(b) SPECIFIC PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES.—Of the amount authorized in subsection (a), there are authorized to be appropriated the following:

- (1) For air related research, \$74, 119,900.
- (2) For global change research, \$1,400,000.
- (3) For water quality related research, \$26,294,000.
- (4) For drinking water related research, \$26,593,700.
- (5) For toxic substances related research, \$12,341,500.

- (6) For lab and field expenses, \$73,031,600.
- (7) For headquarters expenses of the Office of Research and Development, \$9,254,800.
- (8) For multimedia related research expenses, \$174,060,100, of which \$5,000,000 shall be for graduate student fellowships.
- (9) For program management expenses, \$6,399,000.
- (10) For pesticide related research, \$20,632,000.
- (11) For research related to hazardous waste, \$12,000,000.
- (12) For environmental research laboratories, \$51,000,000.

(c) ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Administrator for fiscal year 1997—

- (1) for oil pollution related research, \$2,076,900; and
- (2) for research related to leaking underground storage tanks, \$769,000.

(d) LIMITATIONS.—No funds are authorized to be appropriated by this title for—

- (1) the Environmental Technology Initiative;
- (2) the Climate Change Action Plan;
- (3) Indoor Air Research;
- (4) North Dakota Center for Air Toxic Metals Research;
- (5) drinking water research conducted by the American Water Works Association Research Foundation, other than amounts awarded through a competitive process;
- (6) the Water Environmental Research Foundation;
- (7) the National Urban Air Toxic Research Center;
- (8) the Gulf Coast Hazardous Substances Research Center;
- (9) urban waste management research at the University of New Orleans, other than amounts awarded through a competitive process;
- (10) the Resources and Agricultural Policy Systems Program at Iowa State University or
- (11) the Oil Spill Remediation Research Center.

SEC. 504. SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH REVIEW.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall assign to the Assistant Administrator the duties of—

- (1) development a strategic plan for scientific and technical research activities throughout the Agency;
- (2) integrating that strategic plan into ongoing Agency planning activities; and
- (3) reviewing all Agency research to ensure the research—

(A) is of high quality; and

(B) does not duplicate any other research being conducted by the Agency.

(b) REPORT.—The Assistant Administrator shall transmit annually to the Administrator and to the Committee on Science of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environmental and Public Works of the Senate a report detailing—

- (1) all Agency research the Assistant Administrator finds is not of sufficiently high quality; and
- (2) all Agency research the Assistant Administrator finds duplicates other Agency research.

SEC. 505. GRADUATE STUDENT FELLOWSHIPS.

In carrying out the graduate student fellowship program for which funds are authorized to be appropriated by this title, the Administrator shall ensure that any fellowship awarded to a student selected after the date of the enactment of this Act is used only to support scientific research that would further missions of the Office of Research and Development in fields in which there exists or is projected to exist a shortage in the number of scientists.

SEC. 506. SCIENCE ADVISORY BOARD.

(a) ANNUAL REPORT.—The Science Advisory Board shall submit to Congress and to the

Administrator an annual report that contains the views of the Science Advisory Board on proposed research programs as described in the President's budget for research, development, and demonstration activities at the Environmental Protection Agency. Such report shall be submitted to Congress as soon as practicable after the submission of the President's budget to Congress. The Administrator shall cooperate with the Director of the Science Advisory Board, particularly with respect to the timely provision of budget information to the Science Advisory Board, to allow the Science Advisory Board to carry out its duties under this subsection.

(b) EVALUATION.—The Science Advisory Board shall conduct periodic evaluations of selected areas of the current and planned research development, and demonstration activities of the Environmental Protection Agency. The areas of evaluation shall be selected by the Science Advisory Board in consultation with the Administrator, the Office of Research and Development, other Agency programs and appropriate committees of the Congress. Reports containing the Science Advisory Board's evaluations and recommendations shall be filed with such committees and the Administrator. The Administrator shall provide to such committees a written response to the Science Advisory Board's evaluation and recommendations within 60 days after the Science Advisory Board's report has been submitted.

(c) REVIEW OF CERTAIN RESEARCH ACTIVITIES.—The Science Advisory Board shall annually review the research activities of the Environmental Protection Agency and shall include the results of such review in the annual report required by subsection (a).

(d) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—The Administrator shall submit to the Congress any report required by law to be submitted to the Administrator by the Science Advisory Board. The Administrator shall make any such submission not later than 60 days after the Administrator receives the report from the Science Advisory Board.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to title V?

□ 1800

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. LOFGREN

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. LOFGREN: Page 118, line 17, strike paragraph (2).

Page 118, line 18, through page 119, line 12, redesignate paragraphs (3) through (11) as paragraphs (2) through (10), respectively.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to one of the most egregious research bans in this bill. The very thought of Congress banning areas of scientific research should be offensive to all of us and to all American citizens.

H.R. 3322 attempts to restrict the EPA from spending money on the climate change action plan, a research program designed to identify cost effective ways of limiting carbon emissions in the future. The genesis of this program was the international concern expressed at the Rio Convention that increased emissions of greenhouse gases will lead to an increase in global temperatures or climate change.

The Committee on Science has held several hearings on the issue of climate change, and I believe this has been a reasonably productive exercise. We have heard from the world's experts, who represent the vast majority of scientists on climate change, and we have also heard from some skeptics who have participated in the public debate.

It is fair to say most Members on both sides of the issue have come away from these hearings better informed, whether or not they were swayed by the arguments. One of the few points of agreement, however, has been that the potential for climate change is plausible and we must continue to carry out the research to understand how much and how soon.

At the same time, we must understand how to achieve a reduction in our consumption of fossil fuels and emissions of greenhouse gases. This has relevance far beyond the obvious environmental concerns. It is simply good economics. Whether we do only the most cost effective things that are justified, regardless of whether there is climate change or whether we go beyond the so-called no regrets policy to do the more difficult things, it makes good sense to examine the issue. This is what the climate action plan does.

The climate action plan is based on an array of voluntary programs that, if successful, will save almost \$2 billion annually by the year 2000. These include programs such as the Green Lights Program, the Energy Star Computer, Natural Gas Star, and other voluntary efforts that are strongly supported by industry.

Mr. Chairman, I personally believe that the evidence is mounting that human actions have had an impact on the Earth's climate and will have an increasing influence. I recognize, however, that other well-meaning Members may disagree. We should all agree, however, that we have a responsibility to more fully understand this issue. We should also agree that we should move toward a more energy efficient future beginning with voluntary programs such as those in the climate action plan.

This is hardly money down a rat hole, as was stated in our Committee on Science markup. The climate action plan will have far-reaching economic benefits as well as potentially important environmental benefits. I hope Members will join me in striking the prohibition on this program. Let us leave science to the scientists, not to the politicians.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is intended to reverse what I consider one of the more egregious portions of this bill, which is found on page 118, line 14, under the title of limitations. And it says that no funds are authorized to be appropriated by this title for, and in this case paragraph 2, the climate change action plan.

Now, there are a total of five prohibitions here that prohibits funds from being spent for any of these five, and I expect amendments to eliminate some of these other prohibitions as well, but what I consider to be the most egregious is all of these are important programs already in place by this administration. They fall within that category of research and development which the distinguished gentleman from southern California [Mr. ROHRBACHER] came up yesterday and acknowledged that he considered to be liberal claptrap, and as a result of that categorization, which apparently is accepted by everybody on the Republican side, they propose to just categorically not fund any research within these various areas.

Now, this particular kind of research, actually it is not research as much as it is a program to act on the potential impact of certain new research findings, what these amendments do is preclude us from using scientific knowledge no matter where it comes from, the Federal Government, universities, or the private sector. If this research indicates that a certain program of action is necessary to alleviate the prospective damage revealed by this research, we are prohibited from developing a program to do that, an action plan to accomplish that.

Mr. Chairman, I do not care what the field is, I think that is the wrong way to approach any kind of public policy activity. We cannot just blindly prohibit certain kinds of things from taking place. This reminds me of the kind of thing that would get done in an autocratic dictatorship or a theocracy or something of that sort.

If the results of scientific research indicate that action is necessary, we should not prohibit that activity. The amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California [Ms. LOFGREN] would strike that language from the bill and, in my opinion, improve it considerably.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the gentle lady's amendment to strike the prohibition on EPA's climate action plan. The goal of the climate action plan has been to identify actions that could be undertaken to return U.S. greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels by the year 2000. This is essentially the nonbinding target which the U.S. agreed to as part of the Framework Convention on Climate Change which came out of the 1992 Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.

The action plan consists of 44 separate activities directed toward all sectors of the economy. The programs and activities are voluntary. A number of them also derive from the Energy Policy Act because of the dual nature of the problem—that is, building a sustainable future based on cost effective, environmentally safe energy sources.

In addition to Federal funding, a substantial amount of private capital has been committed to this problem. This will achieve energy savings valued at \$61.2 billion out to the year 2000. Eighteen of the forty-four activities are designed to increase energy efficiency in the residential, commercial, and industrial sectors of the economy. EPA's part of this plan also

focuses on technologies for methane recovery from coal mines, land fills, and natural gas systems.

The administration estimates that without the action plan, greenhouse gas missions would grow from 1,462 million metric tons in 1990 to 1,674 million metric tons by 2000. The program thus far has been very successful although we have a long way to go to achieve the targets suggested by the Rio treaty.

It is important to point out that this issue has involved two administrations and virtually all the other nations of the world. Building a sustainable future is not a partisan issue but it is a serious issue. Simply prohibiting funds from being spent to explore our options is irresponsible.

I urge the adoption of the Lofgren amendment.

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

I think we ought to get to the facts about what this amendment does. What this amendment does is sets off an area of research within EPA, which means that the money that would be spent for this research would come from all other environmental research, and the money that would thereby be given to other environmental research of equal standing, and perhaps more important priorities, would actually be given now to global climate change.

Now, the reason why we have this particular language in the bill right now, which the Lofgren amendment eliminates the termination of EPA's global climate change research program, is because we had good reason to decide that this was not high priority. First, the Office of Research and Development, which is authorized in this title, is intended to support the Environmental Protection Agency with good science. Currently we do not regulate CO₂ emissions. EPA does not regulate CFC's, and in this bill we have authorized EPA's stratospheric ozone research above the level requested by the President.

In other words, where EPA has real jurisdiction we have decided to actually increase the amounts of money going into that research. Now, if we adopt this particular amendment, what we will do is run the risk that we will take money away from places where we are increasing the money and give it to global climate change.

Second, the agency has been using its research to do impact assessment of global warming not improving the models it will tell us if and by how much the world may warm. That, in my mind, is not exactly the priority that most of us would choose.

Now, we are currently spending almost \$2 billion across the Federal Government on global climate change research. It is important we prioritize that research. This is not a case of cutting out all the money for global change. I happen to think that global change research is a very, very appropriate thing to be funded. I think \$2 billion being spent by the Federal Government is a lot of money, being spent for a lot of programs. What we ought to

do is make certain it is being spent wisely and well.

The administration has spread climate change research through 12 agencies right now, including the Department of Defense, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Energy, the Department of Interior, NASA, NSF, and NOAA. EPA has a relatively small piece of that climate change budget, roughly about \$20 million. We do not need 12 agencies doing essentially the same kind of research.

EPA, in this particular office, is not the place to conduct global climate change research. The research they are conducting is of a lesser value than that done by their agencies and should be terminated in favor of better research elsewhere.

The bottom line is if we choose to spend this \$20 million in this place on climate change impact assessment out of the EPA budget, the hire priority research, such as maybe endocrine disrupter research, that we approved yesterday, drinking water research, clean air research, a lot of the other things are going to suffer. This money comes out of other high priority regulatory type matters in order to go into this account where we are already in other agencies spending \$2 billion.

If that is what people want to do in the name of environment, then perhaps they will vote for this particular amendment. But we had exactly this same amendment on the floor last year and this exact same amendment was turned down last year. It seems to be that the Congress wisely understood last year that there are very important environmental matters to be researched at EPA. This is not one of the ones that should be done there. It should be done elsewhere, where they do a better job than what is being done at EPA. Vote against the Lofgren amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment offered by my colleague from California. It is no secret by now that this committee is committed to gutting the global climate research program. H.R. 3322 provides 27-percent fewer resources than the administration requested in the fiscal year 1997 budget in some of the strictest fiscal discipline applied to any of the programs under the bill.

The ban on using funds for the global climate change action plan is based on ideology, not information. Before I came to the Congress of the United States, I started two of the most successful energy conservation companies in the United States. They are still, today, two of the largest energy conservation companies in this country, and I can tell Members that energy conservation simply makes sense.

We now have a growing body of information about the carbon dioxide gases which are choking off the overall environment of this world. For us to wait

until we have a critical situation which requires mandates, I think, is just plain silly.

When we look at the rising trade deficits that occur in the United States month after month after month, literally 50 percent of our annual trade deficit goes for one product, and that is importing foreign oil. Why not get behind a program which voluntarily asks industry to participate in ways of creating energy conservation instead of sending off our petroleum dollars to the OPEC'ers overseas? Why not keep the jobs here? Why not do it in a voluntary way? Why not support the amendment by my colleague from California, Ms. LOFGREN, in a way that will make sense for people in this country and that will create jobs for the people of the United States?

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

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman may not be aware that earlier in the Congress, over the objections of many in the minority, we passed a bill to concentrate attention on hydrogen research. It is something we have pushed very, very heavily because we think that what the gentleman says is absolutely correct, that one of the ways in which we can achieve energy independence is to develop a new kind of energy regime. That bill is now in the Senate. We hope it will come back.

I would hope the gentleman would support us and what this committee is attempting to do in terms of transitioning to a new hydrogen economy as a way of addressing those kinds of issues.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I appreciate the gentleman's concern. There is a question about whether or not hydrogen energy is the best methodology that we ought to be using in the future, and it seems to me, if that is nothing more than corporate welfare for the nuclear power industry, it is something we should take up.

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

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman that, in fact, we are trying to move the research away from any association with the nuclear side of it in the bill, and we are attempting to address exactly that issue, and hydrogen, the gentleman must admit, is an absolutely clean energy source, in fact, if we can utilize it.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I appreciate the gentleman's concern, and I do not have a problem with trying to develop other resources, but I do have a problem when we try to use those arguments to oppose the basic fundamental requirement of this legislation,

which was to just ask industry to voluntarily find ways of keeping our levels of carbon dioxide emissions down to the 1990 levels.

□ 1815

It seems to me that this is not requiring any kind of mandate. It is not in any way suggesting that we have to enforce those levels on industry. All it is saying is if we voluntarily get these industries to participate in this program, we can keep jobs here in the United States, we can cut down on our balance of trade deficit, and we can essentially strengthen the economy of America.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, that is not what this particular program does. In fact, what the gentleman is talking about is a \$20 million expenditure that largely is going right now to impact assessments of global warming. It is not going to the voluntary programs.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I appreciate the gentleman's comments, but the fact is that I have been assured that the purpose of this amendment is in fact to do just what I have suggested, which is to make a 27-percent cut in the Climate Change Action Plan, which the amendment of the gentleman from California [Ms. LOFGREN] essentially restores the budget cuts for.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, in other sections of EPA, the gentleman is absolutely right. But this is the research account. In the research account, that Action Plan is not a part of what is being done here. The \$20 million is not being spent on the Action Plan, it is being spent on impact assessments and things of that kind.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I yield to the gentleman from California [Ms. LOFGREN] for a clarification of whether or not this is a restoration of the 20 percent cut or whether some other account is being affected.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Massachusetts will yield, basically if the gentleman looks at page 188 of the bill, line 18, there is a prohibition on the utilization of funds already appropriated for the Climate Change Action Plan. And I would add, in addition to line 17.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] has expired.

(On request of Mr. WALKER, and by unanimous consent, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from California [Ms. LOFGREN].

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would read further on page 118, extending on to page 119, there are also prohibitions on research in the area of indoor air, drinking water research conducted by the American Waterworks Association, as well as a

number of other prohibitions on scientific research activities.

Mr. Chairman, it is my view that it is a tremendous error for Members of Congress, most of whom are not scientists, I think we have three or four scientists among our 435, to substitute our judgment for those of scientists.

This is clearly an area that we know, as you referenced earlier, is of significant impact not only to the United States but to the world. My children are 11 and 14. I do not want them to be adults and live in a world where climate change is too late to impact, as the climate change action plan attempts to do on a voluntary basis before it is too late.

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

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, the climate change action plan, if I understand properly, is a small portion of the overall Global Warming Program, which is the subject of a 27-percent cut here. In the case of the climate change action plan, there is a 100-percent cut in this particular portion, but that is part of the overall 27 percent cut.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I appreciate the clarification. If I might respond, let me read what the bill currently says.

No funds are authorized to be appropriated by this title for, No. 1, the Environmental Technology Initiative; No. 2, the climate change action plan; No. 4, indoor air research, which I know we are going to come back to in a few minutes so I will be very kind about this; and, four, the Center for Air Toxics. In any event, the appropriate portion of this is that the climate change action plan will not receive any funds under this legislation.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, the action plan is not tied to the research program. The two Members on that side have quoted absolutely accurately, but the only thing we have in our program relates to the Office of Research. The Office of Research does not do the action plan.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, as I understand, the ORD portion does take up some significant technology aspects that are included in the cut that has been taken up by this bill. Some of the new technologies are in, in fact, cut under the portion of this bill which is granted coverage under the limitations which I just cited.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, there is practically no impact here because the action plan that the gentleman referred to earlier of doing business hookups is, in fact, not in the Office of Research, and that is all I am trying to say to the gentleman; to portray what is being done here is eliminating that program is inaccurate. That is not the

case. What we are doing is simply trying to deal with global change research on a priority basis.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am rising today in support of the amendment which the gentlewoman from California [Ms. LOFGREN] has offered on this underlying bill which allows the EPA to continue their work on the climate change action plan.

But I would like to just comment for a moment on the comments by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], who is arguing here in his previous set of comments that all they are really doing is eliminating the consideration of the global climate change action plan from any involvement in EPA, that there are at least 11 other places in the budget where global climate change is covered in some way by research.

But it seems to me that the one perhaps most significant and most coherent locus of that research is right here under the EPA, which has a responsibility given to it by the Congress to deal with global climate change in the climate change action plan.

So for that reason at least, if we were going to be doing anything, we ought to be concentrating in this area where the Environmental Protection Agency has the responsibility given to it by Congress to deal with the climate change action plan.

Now, the amendment of the gentlewoman from California corrects what I think is a serious wrong-headedness of the Republican budget ax. Her amendment allows the EPA, the Environmental Protection Agency, to meet the responsibilities which have been rightfully assigned to it by the Congress.

Climate research has far-reaching implications for environmental protection, and this Congress has a responsibility to recognize the need for such research into our local as well as our global environment.

But once again the majority has demonstrated their carelessness and insensitivity where broad issues of environmental protection are concerned.

Mr. Chairman, in the wake of what has been a record-breaking winter and then the current crowd that, if sustained, could create a sand dune desert the size of the great State of Texas covering much of the southern high plains of this country, it seems to me it is preposterous for this Congress to turn its back on understanding climate change.

During the 104th Congress I have heard much about cost-benefit analysis. Apparently, some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have a problem with the analysis part of that cost-benefit analysis. But you do have to have data in order to do analysis. Whether you agree or disagree with the concept of global warming, let us at least be willing to gather the data so

that our debate in this body grows from knowledge rather than from ignorance.

Sound policy requires us to incorporate sound scientific research and reasoning in order to have any kind of semblance of sound policy. It seems to me the truth is out there and we should not be running from it, we should be, if anything, concentrating our global climate change action in the EPA, which is charged with environmental protection, because it is a matter of greatest possible significance to us in climate change for what our environment is going to be in the future.

So I would hope that we would adopt the amendment by the gentlewoman from California and strike that little clause in paragraph 2, the words climate change action plan.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLVER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to continue the dialog I had with the gentleman from Pennsylvania on the global climate change action plan, and the implications that this has for technology.

My understanding in checking with the staff is that, in fact, when you say that no funds are authorized to be appropriated for this title for the climate change action plan that you are, in fact, cutting \$6.2 million that would go for the research on these new technologies and their impact. So I would just like to understand exactly what the gentleman's point is.

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

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is correct on the \$6.2 million, but if he will look further, he will find that we transferred that money to plus up the account on the stratospheric ozone research, and the attempt here is to be sure that we are doing work in real areas in the EPA. It is a tradeoff. We happen to think that in terms of the immediate priorities the stratospheric ozone question is more important to address.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. OLVER] has expired.

(On request of Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, and by unanimous consent, Mr. OLVER was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. OLVER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I would just point out that there was some confusion in the last interchange that I had with the gentleman from Pennsylvania, because I thought he was trying to suggest the last time around that, in fact, there was not a cut.

Now I am understanding in this present exchange that there is, in fact, a cut, but he has just taken the money and used it for some other purpose. I

understand that he is taking the money and using it for some other purpose, but the truth of the matter is that he cut the program and the gentlewoman from California [Ms. LOFGREN] is attempting to put the money back in the program, which I think has finally been clarified.

There is an attempt in this bill to gut the Global Climate Change Action Plan which will, in fact, hurt the technologies. The gentleman is going to use the money for some other purposes, which I am sure are very, very good and helpful and strong, but we still want some money put into this program.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, as a matter of fact, it is not that we are specifically putting money back into the program, but merely removing the language that requires that no money be authorized for the Global Climate Change Action Plan. I would hope that the amendment by the gentlewoman from California would be adopted.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am trying to work my way through all of this. I started out this morning worrying about the Climate Change Action Plan because I think it is a significant, though not the overall major, part of this plan to study global warming, to study global climate change, which I happen to be a firm believer we need the exact scientific data to produce.

So I have been working my way through trying to figure out where the cuts are coming from, and I was happy to hear that we are not cutting \$20 million out of the Global Climate Action Plan, but it is actually \$6 million, but it is in an area of research so that the chairman of the subcommittee places the money in this area of research to stratospheric ozone research, which I think is appropriate.

I understand, though, in the EPA's budget in the area of the environmental programs and management, there is tens of millions of dollars for the Climate Change Action Plan.

Now, I want to stand here and agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts and the gentlewoman from California in that we need a significant role to play as far as the Government is concerned to produce more energy-efficient cars, lighting, using fuel. And a number of the Fortune 500 companies in the United States are part of this green light program and a part of many other programs which significantly reduce the costs of their production and at the same time significantly reducing the amount of hydrogen fuels going into the atmosphere which produce global climate change.

But in this particular amendment I urge my colleagues to vote "no." Basically, the \$6 million coming out of the action plan is going into solid research so that we can understand the nature of the atmosphere and the nature of

how it is changing as a result of human input and how we can further deal with this climate change that is, understandably from all the scientific data that we read, inevitable.

So, the research portion of this \$6 million, I think, is being well spent.

Now, the climate action plan is a program that I fully endorse, and while it has taken a bit of a cut here, there still is probably, I am not sure what the exact amount is, but it is probably close to \$100 million. And I think we should continue to pursue that climate action plan. It is a solid program that meshes government and the private sector together.

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

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the points that the gentleman has made. The fact is that we get accused all the time of being opposed to the Global Climate Change Program. I am sure there are some, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRBACHER], for example, is not particularly enthusiastic.

Mr. Chairman, I happen to support the research. I think it does good things too. I think it should be properly prioritized. I thought that when we were dealing with some of the ozone issues, that was also a part of the general pattern here of trying to understand the atmospheric conditions that produce some of the changes that are potential problems for us.

□ 1830

So, in transferring the money around, it is important to realize that we are setting priorities. For instance, only NOAA and EPA, to my knowledge, do stratospheric ozone research. We have 12 different agencies doing the global climate change research. It seems to be the right kind of priority, to me, for us to do it in the way we have done it here. And I would agree with the gentleman. I think he has every reason to be supportive of some of the programs at EPA that move some of these programs forward and does recognize, I am pleased, that what we have done here is simply attempted to utilize research dollars a little bit better.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. LOFGREN].

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to make a point, because I do think that to fail to enact the amendment I proposed would run contrary to the goals that my colleague is espousing that I share. I do not oppose research in stratosphere ozone research. However, we do have much research going on pursuant to our international treaty on ozone. As a matter of fact, we found a number of things already. As my colleagues are well aware, the Nobel Prize was awarded for some of the significant findings in that arena.

But the action plan, the climate change action plan is where we bring

together the various components that are all important into our plan. It is not, that function, so far as I can tell as a member of the committee, is not provided for elsewhere in the budget.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, there are still large dollars in the climate action plan.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California [Ms. LOFGREN].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California [Ms. LOFGREN] will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, it is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KENNEDY OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts: Page 118, line 18, strike paragraph (3).

Page 118, line 19, through page 119, line 12, redesignate paragraphs (4) through (11) as paragraphs (3) through (10), respectively.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, the truth is that Americans spend about 90 percent of their lives indoors. While we spend 90 percent of our lives indoors, we spend billions and billions of dollars cleaning up outdoor air. Indoor air happens to be about 1,000 times more polluted than outdoor air. So we have a kind of a crazy situation where, despite the fact that we are living inside buildings, we are working inside buildings, we are living and working in areas that are much, much more polluted than the areas where we end up spending the vast majority of our dollars to clean up.

Now, I just believe that it makes sense for us to get a better handle on exactly the kinds of indoor air pollutants that are potentially causing great harm to the American people and people throughout the world. I know that my friend from Pennsylvania, Mr. WALKER, agrees that this is an important issue and one that we should work together to try and understand, both the causes as well as some of the solutions.

Mr. Chairman, in this very building, if we take a deep breath, we will be breathing in more fungus and bacteria and molds than we want to shake a stick at. So I would not suggest that all of my friends on the other side of

the aisle stop breathing, although from time to time it seemed like a good idea. Nevertheless, I do think that trying to find out some better research and some better understandings about how we can deal with the serious issue of indoor air problems is an area where I hope we can both agree.

Mr. Chairman, if my friend from Pennsylvania has some thoughts on this, I would be happy to yield.

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

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I have talked to the gentleman about his amendment. Also, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DAVIS], on our side of the aisle, has talked to me some about this particular amendment. On behalf of Mr. DAVIS, I am prepared to accept the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I very much appreciate and I want to pay particular thanks to the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] who has been a great supporter of research on indoor air quality for every year that I have offered this amendment for the last 10 years. I appreciate it once again.

We will let him smoke his cigar wherever he wants, but I do appreciate his help.

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

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from California.

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

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding.

I do want to rise in support of the gentleman's amendment. I appreciate the willingness of our friends on the other side to accept that effort to move the proceedings along here, which I know is of interest to all of us.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my colleague from Massachusetts. Here we go again. It seems just a short time ago, 7 months ago actually, that we were having this same discussion. Unfortunately, the majority continues to believe that indoor air quality is an area where sound science is no science.

This belief is not based upon any testimony that we received, since we have never held hearings on this program. Ironically, one of our most extensive discussions of indoor air in committee occurred during the markup of H.R. 3322 when a unanimous-consent request was made that committee members refrain from smoking in the committee room during the markup.

In H.R. 3322, the majority is making a request that EPA refrain from gathering information about indoor air contaminants. I object to that request.

Indoor air pollution continues to be identified as a significant health risk and an area worthy of study by EPA's Science Advisory Panel. We all spend significant amounts of time indoors these days, and we all recognize that

there have been health problems associated with faulty air-conditioning and ventilation systems. Individuals who suffer respiratory problems as a result of contaminants present in their homes and workplaces would like to know what the contaminants are and how they can be controlled.

The committee will try to tell us that this research program is really part of a plot to regulate the air in people's homes. This is ridiculous. This program's purpose is to empower citizens to make informed choices about products and services available to them to improve air quality in their homes. For nearly 10 years this program has generated information that has been used to disseminate information to State indoor air programs and to building owners and managers on how to avoid and mitigate indoor air quality problems.

The Indoor Air Research Program is an excellent example of how science can be used to achieve environmental quality goals without regulation.

The question is do we want to have the facts about indoor air quality or not? Do we want people to have information to make informed decisions about how they can improve their home and work environments or not? I urge my colleagues to support knowledge over ignorance by supporting the Kennedy amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, poor indoor air causes flu, pneumonia, tuberculosis, and dozens of other diseases.

Air we breath indoors can contain dangerous levels of radon, asbestos, carbon monoxide, lead, and chlorine.

Americans spend an average 90 percent of their time indoors, yet air in homes, schools, workplaces, airplanes, can be 1,000 times more toxic.

This bill would eliminate EPA's nonregulatory indoor air research program—ending important research that would fuel future discoveries enabling us to prevent illnesses related to indoor air contamination.

In 103d Congress, we passed a bill that I have introduced every year, the Indoor Air Quality Act, with bipartisan support. We adjourned before the bill could be signed into law, but support for increased indoor air research was clearly validated by this Chamber.

The Science Committee report that accompanies this bill claims that EPA should not do indoor fair research, but that the research arm of OSHA, NIOSH [National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health], should.

But this seems odd, considering the fact that in the 1997 budget resolution, NIOSH is scheduled to be terminated—the very agency the committee claims should conduct this research.

Who, then, will do indoor air research? The bill, as written, prohibits the EPA from doing the research. And with NIOSH scheduled to be terminated, we end up with a situation where nobody is able to do indoor air research.

At any moment, 21.2 million Americans are working in 1.4 million offices, schools, factories, and other structures where indoor air quality may be a problem. How can we ignore these numbers?

The cost of indoor air pollution is staggering as well. Americans spend an extra \$1.5 billion each year in medical bills, and the loss in productivity for businesses translates into tens of billions of dollars more.

We have had plenty of indoor air quality problems in my State.

A statewide 1995 survey by the U.S. General Accounting Office estimated that more than 30 percent of Massachusetts' 1,794 public schools suffer from poor air quality and that about 42 percent of them have ventilation problems.

In February, 26 students at Peabody Veterans Memorial High School in Boston were pulled out of school by parents concerned about the quality of air in the building. Their children had severe headaches, dizziness, sleepiness, and some developed rashes.

My district has had other sick building syndromes recently that stretch from the Boston Registry of Motor Vehicles, to a county courthouse, and to Bringham & Woman's Hospital.

But problems with indoor air quality are not unique to my district. Just yesterday, the Department of Transportation headquarters evacuated 5,500 workers because of the discovery of a toxic airborne mold in the building. The problem of poor indoor air quality is not going to go away on its own.

EPA's Science Advisory Board has ranked indoor air pollution as one of the highest health risks meriting EPA attention. While there is considerable information about some indoor pollutants, scientists know little about the relative magnitudes of the potential risks associated with different indoor environments and exposure levels.

All evidence points to the fact that we need more research on indoor air contamination, not less.

Fortunately, though, my friend from Pennsylvania, the chairman of the Science Committee, Mr. WALKER, has agreed to accept my amendment.

By accepting this change to the underlying bill, we are sending a positive message that we are going to continue supporting the type of research that consumers, homeowners, and builders need to make informed decisions about safeguarding their health.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, it is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 by the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas: Page 118, line 16, strike paragraph (1).

Page 118, line 17, through page 119, line 12, redesignate paragraphs (2) through (11) as paragraphs (1) through (10), respectively.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I solicit Chairman WALKER to accept this one as well because I think it tracks certainly our mutual concern on fiscal responsibility and the combination of commitment to the environment along with an effective partnership with business.

Beyond the science authorization bill, there is language which specifically prohibits any money from being

appropriated for the Environmental Technology Initiative, or the ETI Program, of the Environmental Protection Agency.

Let me emphasize that my amendment is revenue neutral. It simply says that the administrator, if they see fit to implement this program, they must find ways to fund it and offset it by utilization of funds from a particular location and offset it from that location. My amendment would simply strike this language.

Though I cannot speak as to the reasons for the chairman's desire to zero out the program, I can tell how this program has benefited our country and its citizens. As recently demonstrated by speeches and votes on the floor of the House, many of us in Congress are deeply concerned about the environment and what can be done to harmonize human existence within it.

Mr. Chairman, as I am sure my colleagues are aware, many people have voiced their opinions about the EPA and its regulations. As an example, many businesses leaders have said that complying with EPA regulations is expensive.

Here lies the basis of support of the ETI. The goal of the Environmental Technology Initiative is to promote improved levels of health and environmental protection by accelerating the development and use of innovative environmental technologies. Most of these technologies may be put under the better, cheaper label and benefit industry by both being cheaper and exceeding current standards.

Environmental technologies prevent pollution, control and treat air and water pollution, remediate contaminated soil and groundwater, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, assess and monitor exposure levels and manage environmental information.

It is the private sector's job to promote innovation, but it is the Government's job to create a climate where technology innovation is rewarded, not penalized, so that the private sector can function free of government interference. However, there are many barriers, both internal and external to the EPA, that limit private sector investment and innovative environmental technologies.

These barriers include: statutes, regulations, policies and procedures, like permitting and enforcement that favor the use of conventional technologies and then essentially lock these technologies into place; insufficient resources at the State level to provide credibility to vendors by verifying the performance and cost of promising new technologies; and lack of established networks and sources of information that provides users access to better, cleaner, safer, lower cost technologies.

Mr. Chairman, many of the 274 ETI-funded projects are beginning to show results, and EPA is disinvesting from direct technology development projects. What more can we ask for?

Mr. Chairman, let me add a note. In the Republican-based task force on the

environment, we are told that we must replace the outdated approaches of the past with common sense, flexible, and effective approaches that build on consensus, private property ownership, free enterprise, local control, sound scientific evidence, and the latest technology. Here lies the Environmental Technology Institute.

I would suggest that by disinvesting from direct technology projects except in specific areas where private sector research and development is not available and focusing on reducing policy and regulatory barriers, this is the way for the EPA to go.

ETI funding is an integral part of EPA's research efforts to streamline its regulatory and permitting processes to ensure that new rules and policies do not inhibit the use of better, more effective technology. With my amendment I seek to ensure that the Environmental Technology Initiative continues to direct an appropriate way to ensure an effective partnership between Government and the private sector and to allow the EPA to do its job.

I simply ask that in a bipartisan manner we allow the EPA to do its job with current and new technologies, and that is to support the reinclusion of allowing the Environmental Technology Initiative to continue forward and to allow it not to be stricken and for the Administrator to be able to determine how best to utilize it and to fund it.

This is revenue neutral. I ask for bipartisan support on the amendment.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I include a statement for the RECORD:

Mr. Chairman, with her amendment, my colleague from Texas seeks to remove another of the majority's ill-considered bans on research conducted at the Environmental Protection Agency. Our Republican colleagues, in this bill, deny EPA the authority to continue the Environmental Technologies Initiative. Rather than contest the merits of the program, the majority simply does away with it. This theory of Republican policymaking reminds me of Mencken's famous line: "There is always a well-known solution to every human problem—neat, plausible, and wrong."

The environmental technologies initiative has as its goal increasing the speed with which new and better technologies become available to protect public health and environmental quality. The initiative seeks to prevent pollution, or to reduce the cost and increase the speed at which hazards are removed from the environment.

It is passing strange that at the same time the majority complains bitterly about EPA's impact on the private sector, it would here prevent the Agency from learning new ways to reduce the burden of environmental compliance. Republicans complain that EPA does not weigh the costs and benefits of pollution control strategies before issuing regulations, but let the Agency act to gain real-world experience with the costs and benefits of new technologies and the majority cannot interfere quickly enough. The majority once complained about congressional micromanagement of agencies during the Reagan and Bush years.

We were harangued again and again about hamstringing the executive branch. But with Republicans in the majority, we find that micromanagement is in the eye of the beholder.

The Environmental Technologies initiative is precisely the sort of action that should be taken to achieve what the majority claims is its intent—to reduce the EPA's impact on business while maintaining environmental protections. EPA is working with business to find new ways to accomplish what the law demands. Rather than encouraging Administrator Browner for her leadership, the Republicans stop her cold. Am I alone in finding something wrong with this picture?

EPA is not alone in supporting the environmental technologies initiative. The Departments of Defense and Energy are searching for faster and more affordable methods of dealing with the overflowing waste pits at military bases around the country and at the Nation's nuclear weapons production facilities. The Government can offer access to facilities such as the National Laboratories and help for small businesses hoping to improve their technologies; in return the Government gets proven techniques for addressing its own problems.

Mr. Chairman, no idea is so dangerous that we can't even talk about it—except in this Republican Congress. We held no hearings on the merits of the environmental technologies initiative, probably because the results would contradict the policy the majority wanted to impose anyway. Banning research on cleanup technologies is hardly a smart move, and so I urge support for the Jackson-Lee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] will be postponed.

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed in the following order:

Amendment No. 15 offered by the gentlewoman from California [Ms. LOFGREN]; and amendment No. 5 offered by the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. LOFGREN

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California [Ms. LOFGREN], on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by a voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 197, noes 211, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 207]

AYES—197

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Berman
Bevill
Bishop
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Cardin
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Coyne
Cramer
Cummings
Davis
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Durbin
Edwards
English
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Filner
Flake
Ford
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gillmor

Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (TX)
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Heineman
Hilliard
Hinchev
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Klezcka
Klink
LaFalce
Lantos
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Millender-
McDonald
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Moran
Nadler
Neal

Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Richardson
Rivers
Roemer
Rose
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Salmon
Sanders
Sawyer
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Shays
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Spratt
Stark
Stokes
Stupak
Tanner
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torres
Torrice
Towns
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weller
Williams
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates
Zimmer

NOES—211

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Billbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla

Bono
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Caste
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Christy
Clinger
Coble
Coburn

Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Cooley
Costello
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cremins
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan

Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Flanagan
Foley
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Frisa
Funderburk
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Geren
Gilchrist
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Greene (UT)
Greenwood
Gunderson
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jacobs
Johnson, Sam
Kasich
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug

Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
Laughlin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
Longley
Lucas
Manzullo
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Montgomery
Moorhead
Morella
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce
Quillen
Ramstad
Regula
Riggs
Roberts
Rogers

Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Royce
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Trafiac
Upton
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff

NOT VOTING—26

Barton
Chabot
de la Garza
Engel
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Foglietta
Forbes
Gibbons

Gutknecht
Harman
Hayes
Houghton
Jefferson
Jones
Lincoln
Lowey
McDade

Molinari
Mollohan
Murtha
Payne (NJ)
Peterson (FL)
Quinn
Studds
Wilson

□ 1901

Messrs. GREENWOOD, FRISA, and GOODLING changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mrs. KELLY and Mr. WELLER changed their vote from "no" to "aye." So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 207, I was unavoidably detained—had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.
The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 192, noes 209, not voting 33, as follows:

[Roll No. 208]

AYES—192

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Berman
Bevill
Bishop
Blumenauer
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Cardin
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Coyne
Cramer
Cummings
Davis
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Durbin
Edwards
English
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Filner
Flake
Ford
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gilchrist

Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (TX)
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hastings (FL)
Heineman
Hilliard
Hinchev
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Johnson (SD)
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Klezcka
LaFalce
Lantos
LaHood
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Longley
Lowe
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Millender-
McDonald
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Montgomery
Moran

Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Porter
Poshard
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Richardson
Rivers
Roemer
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Saxton
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Skaggs
Skelton
Smith (NJ)
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Stupak
Tanner
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torres
Torrice
Towns
Trafiac
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weller
Williams
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates
Zimmer

NOES—209

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Billbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brewster
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn

Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Castle
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Christy
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Cooley
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cremins

Cubin
Cunningham
Davis
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Flanagan
Foley
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Frelinghuysen

Frisa	Lewis (CA)	Royce
Funderburk	Lewis (KY)	Salmon
Galleghy	Lightfoot	Sanford
Ganske	Linder	Schaefer
Gekas	Livingston	Schiff
Geran	Lucas	Seastrand
Goodlatte	Manzullo	Sensenbrenner
Goodling	McCullum	Shadegg
Goss	McCrery	Shaw
Graham	McHugh	Shays
Greene (UT)	McInnis	Shuster
Greenwood	McIntosh	Skeen
Gunderson	McKeon	Smith (MI)
Hancock	Metcalf	Smith (TX)
Hastert	Meyers	Smith (WA)
Hastings (WA)	Mica	Solomon
Hayworth	Miller (FL)	Souder
Hefley	Moorhead	Spence
Herger	Morella	Stearns
Hilleary	Myers	Stockman
Hobson	Myrick	Stump
Hoekstra	Nethercutt	Talent
Hostettler	Neumann	Tate
Hunter	Ney	Tauzin
Hutchinson	Norwood	Taylor (NC)
Hyde	Nussle	Thomas
Inglis	Oxley	Thornberry
Istook	Packard	Tiahrt
Johnson (CT)	Parker	Upton
Johnson, Sam	Paxon	Vucanovich
Jones	Peterson (MN)	Walker
Kasich	Petri	Walsh
Kelly	Pickett	Wamp
Kim	Pombo	Ward
King	Portman	Watts (OK)
Kingston	Pryce	Weldon (FL)
Klug	Radanovich	Weldon (PA)
Knollenberg	Regula	White
Kolbe	Riggs	Whitfield
Largent	Roberts	Wicker
Latham	Rogers	Wolf
LaTourette	Rohrabacher	Young (AK)
Laughlin	Ros-Lehtinen	Young (FL)
Lazio	Rose	Zeliff
Leach	Roth	

NOT VOTING—33

Barton	Harman	Payne (NJ)
Browder	Hayes	Peterson (FL)
Chabot	Hefner	Quillen
de la Garza	Houghton	Quinn
Engel	Jefferson	Scarborough
Fields (LA)	Klink	Schroeder
Fields (TX)	Lincoln	Sisisky
Foglietta	McDade	Slaughter
Gibbons	Molinari	Studds
Gutknecht	Mollohan	Taylor (MS)
Hansen	Murtha	Wilson

□ 1908

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Browder for, with Mr. Gutknecht against.

Mr. LONGLEY and Mr. STENHOLM changed their vote from "no" to "aye." So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title V?

If not, the Clerk will designate title VI.

The text of title VI is as follows:

TITLE VI—NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF STANDARDS AND TECHNOLOGY

SEC. 601. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated the following:

(I) For Scientific and Technical Research and Services of the National Institute of Standards and Technology, \$280,600,000 for fiscal year 1997, of which—

(A) \$38,407,000 shall be for Electronics and Electrical Engineering;

(B) \$18,747,000 shall be for Manufacturing Engineering;

(C) \$33,939,000 shall be for Chemical Science and Technology;

(D) \$28,048,000 shall be for Physics;

(E) \$54,589,000 shall be for Material Science and Engineering;

(F) \$13,085,000 shall be for Building and Fire Research;

(G) \$43,076,000 shall be for Computer Science and Applied Mathematics;

(H) \$18,950,000 shall be for Technical Assistance;

(I) \$28,772,000 shall be for Research Support; and

(J) \$2,987,000 shall be for the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Program under section 17 of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 3711a); and

(2) for Construction of Research Facilities of the National Institute of Standards and Technology, \$105,240,000 for fiscal year 1997.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 3322 takes an aggressive stance in title VI of the bill to ensure that the core science programs at the National Institute of Standards and Technology [NIST] are funded at levels which will permit the NIST Laboratories to perform their critical national mission.

I commend the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, for his support. Mr. WALKER has recognized the important work being done at the NIST Laboratories and has recommended a funding level which the laboratories deserve.

NIST is integral to U.S. competition in the global marketplace, through its interaction with industry, and by developing and applying technology measurements and standards. I am pleased that, despite our commitment to achieve a balanced budget, and with tight budget caps in place, the bill authorizes a funding level for the NIST Laboratories above the President's request of \$270.7 million.

By not only matching but exceeding the President's funding request for the scientific and technical research services account at \$280.6 million, the bill funds projects which we were unable to fully authorize in the previous fiscal year. These added increases will fund projects in semiconductor, metrology, biotechnology measurements, advanced materials processing, and new Government coordinating responsibilities to make NIST the lead agency for standards and conformity assessment activities as mandated by the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995.

In addition, the bill authorizes the NIST construction account to provide necessary renovation and modernization of facilities. Without these funds for the state-of-the-art Measurement and Calibration Laboratories to modernize their facilities, NIST cannot adequately fulfill its mission into the future.

Mr. Chairman, I am also pleased that title VII of H.R. 3322 authorizes fiscal year 1997 appropriations for FAA's research, engineering, and development [RE&D] activities; strengthens the role of the FAA RE&D Advisory Committee in setting priorities; and modifies requirements.

Title VII includes sections authored by the distinguished ranking member of the Technology Subcommittee, the

gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. JOHN TANNER. These sections require the FAA to consider recommendations of the FAA RE&D Advisory Committee in establishing R&D priorities; requires the FAA RE&D Advisory Committee to review FAA's R&D funding allocations and advise the Administrator as to whether they will support FAA objectives; and modifies requirements for the National Aviation Research Plan by changing the time horizon to 5 years and requires the FAA to respond to the recommendations of the RE&D Advisory Committee.

Mr. Chairman, I recommend passage of the titles VI and VII.

□ 1915

The CHAIRMAN. Are there amendments to title VI?

If not, the Clerk will designate title VII.

The text of title VII is as follows:

TITLE VII—FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION RESEARCH, ENGINEERING, AND DEVELOPMENT

SEC. 701. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the "FAA Research, Engineering, and Development Management Reform Act of 1996".

SEC. 702. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds that—

(1) considerable effort and expenditure has been devoted since 1981 to the modernization of the National Airspace System, with limited results;

(2) long-standing management, organizational, and cultural impediments at the Federal Aviation Administration have led to cost overruns, schedule delays, program terminations, and other wasteful inefficiencies;

(3) a lack of coordination between the technology developers and operational sections of the Federal Aviation Administration has led to research, engineering, and development programs that are unbalanced because they either are too technology driven or have operational requirements that are unrealistic or unwarranted;

(4) the research, engineering, and development functions of the Federal Aviation Administration have been carried out without the benefit of critical management education and competencies;

(5) the failure to employ contemporary management techniques and industry best practices has led to inadequate contractor oversight and poor risk management; and

(6) significant improvements in modernizing the National Airspace System will require fundamental changes in the Federal Aviation Administration's acquisition management system and in the orientation of the officials who implement the system.

SEC. 703. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this title—

(1) the term "affordable" means having life-cycle costs that are in consonance with the long-range funding and operational design plans for the National Airspace System;

(2) the term "evolutionary acquisition" means an acquisition strategy in which a core capability is fielded with a modular structure that allows for changes as requirements are refined;

(3) the term "life-cycle costs" means the total costs to the Federal Government of a system over its useful life, including the costs of research, development, acquisition, support, and disposal;

(4) the term "nondevelopmental" means not requiring significant further development to be made usefully operational; and

(5) the term "pre-planned product improvement" means an acquisition strategy that defers technically difficult or unknown system requirements to mitigate risks or to field a system that incorporates design considerations that facilitate future changes.

SEC. 704. MANAGEMENT PRINCIPLES.

The Federal Aviation Administration shall develop, implement, and maintain a disciplined acquisition management system that facilitates the transforming of broadly stated requirements into affordable, operationally effective and suitable products and services to meet the needs of users of the National Airspace System. Such acquisition management system shall be based on and incorporate the following principles:

- (1) The employment and integration of—
 - (A) a process to establish and validate requirements;
 - (B) full life-cycle acquisition management; and
 - (C) planning, programming, and budgeting.
- (2) Full involvement of both acquisition and operational Federal Aviation Administration personnel in the processes described in paragraph (1)(A), (B), and (C).
- (3) Early and continuous involvement of National Airspace System operators and users, advisory committees, and industry vendors and experts in establishing and stabilizing sound, realistic operational requirements.
- (4) Assignment of acquisition officials based on demonstrated leadership, professionalism, and proven acquisition management competencies, consistent with their positional responsibility and authority.

(5) Full life-cycle, event-driven acquisition strategies which explicitly link major interim program decisions and contractual commitments to demonstrated accomplishments in research, engineering, and development.

(6) The balancing of system design requirements and constraints based on cost-benefit sensitivity analysis.

(7) Consideration of maximum practicable use of nonmaterial, nondevelopmental, or commercial solutions before embarking on protracted research, engineering, and development activities by the Federal Aviation Administration.

(8) Consideration of evolutionary acquisition and pre-planned product improvement strategies to mitigate risks and expeditiously field products and services.

(9) Use of contemporary management techniques and industry best practices to—

- (A) compare the current status of a program to where it should be;
- (B) reassess the goals of a program and the plans for achieving those goals;
- (C) assess program risks and strategies for mitigating those risks; and
- (D) assess whether the program is affordable.

SEC. 705. DOCUMENT OF APRIL 1, 1996.

The Congress recognizes that the acquisition management system set forth in the document dated April 1, 1996, issued by the Federal Aviation Administration, is substantially compatible with the principles stated in section 704 of this title. The Federal Aviation Administration may implement that proposed system as a suitable compliance with the requirements of this title, and may modify elements of that system to the extent that those modifications conform with the principles stated in section 704 of this title.

SEC. 706. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 48102(a) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

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

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (2)(J) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and"; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(3) for fiscal year 1997—
 "(A) \$10,000,000 for system development and infrastructure projects and activities;

"(B) \$39,911,000 for capacity and air traffic management technology projects and activities;

"(C) \$20,371,000 for communications, navigation, and surveillance projects and activities;

"(D) \$6,411,000 for weather projects and activities;

"(E) \$6,000,000 for airport technology projects and activities;

"(F) \$37,978,000 for aircraft safety technology projects and activities;

"(G) \$36,045,000 for system security technology projects and activities;

"(H) \$23,682,000 for human factors and aviation medicine projects and activities;

"(I) \$3,800,000 for environment and energy projects and activities;

"(J) \$1,500,000 for innovative/cooperative research projects and activities; and

"(K) such sums as may be necessary for other research, engineering, and development activities described in the President's fiscal year 1997 budget request to the Congress under the category 'Engineering, development, test, and evaluation' of Facilities and Equipment."

SEC. 707. RESEARCH PRIORITIES.

Section 48102(b) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (3); and

(2) by striking "AVAILABILITY FOR RESEARCH.—(1)" and inserting in lieu thereof "RESEARCH PRIORITIES.—(1) The Administrator shall consider the advice and recommendations of the research advisory committee established by section 44508 of this title in establishing priorities among major categories of research and development activities carried out by the Federal Aviation Administration.

"(2)".

SEC. 708. BUDGET DESIGNATION FOR FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES.

Section 48102(c) of title 49, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(c) DESIGNATION OF ACTIVITIES.—(1) The amounts appropriated under subsection (a) are for the support of all research and development activities carried out by the Federal Aviation Administration that fall within the categories of basic research, applied research, and development, including the design and development of prototypes, in accordance with the classifications of the Office of Management and Budget Circular A-11 (Budget Formulation/Submission Process).

"(2) The President's annual budget request for the Federal Aviation Administration shall include all research and development activities within a single budget category. All of the activities carried out by the Administration within the categories of basic research, applied research, and development, as classified by the Office of Management and Budget Circular A-11, shall be placed in this single budget category."

SEC. 709. RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

Section 44508(a)(1) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

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

(2) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (C) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and"; and

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following new subparagraph:

"(D) annually review the allocation made by the Administrator of the amounts authorized by section 48102(a) of this title among the major categories of research and development activities carried out by the Administration and provide advice and recommendations to the Administrator on whether such allocation is appropriate to meet the needs and objectives identified under subparagraph (A)."

SEC. 710. NATIONAL AVIATION RESEARCH PLAN.

Section 44501(c) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)(A) by striking "15-year" and inserting in lieu thereof "5-year";

(2) by amending subparagraph (B) to read as follows:

"(B) The plan shall—

"(i) provide estimates by year of the schedule, cost, and work force levels for each active and planned major research and development project under sections 40119, 44504, 44505, 44507, 44509, 44511–44513, and 44912 of this title, including activities carried out under cooperative agreements with other Federal departments and agencies;

"(ii) specify the goals and the priorities for allocation of resources among the major categories of research and development activities, including the rationale for the priorities identified;

"(iii) identify the allocation of resources among long-term research, near-term research, and development activities; and

"(iv) highlight the research and development activities that address specific recommendations of the research advisory committee established under section 44508 of this title, and document the recommendations of the committee that are not accepted, specifying the reasons for nonacceptance.";

(3) in paragraph (3) by inserting ", including a description of the dissemination to the private sector of research results and a description of any new technologies developed" after "during the prior fiscal year".

Mrs. MORELLA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for this opportunity to briefly discuss title VII of H.R. 3322. This title authorizes fiscal year 1997 appropriations for FAA's research, engineering, and development [RE&D] activities; strengthens the role of the FAA RE&D advisory committee; and modifies the national aviation research plan.

FAA efforts to modernize the national airspace system have suffered significant cost, schedule, and performance problems and, according to extensive testimony, the issues do not appear to be the appropriated funding or how it's allocated—but to longstanding organizational, managerial, and cultural impediments within the FAA itself. With bold congressional help, the agency began an impressive first step by implementing a new acquisition management plan April 1.

When H.R. 3322 was introduced, it contained language to codify broadly-stated guiding principles—for managing FAA R&D activities long after the tenure of current FAA leadership. To expeditiously get the omnibus science bill to the House floor, we struck these important principles from this title. However, in the days ahead, we must maintain our focus on these critical principles to avoid the costly and protracted problems of the past. We look forward to working closely with Chairman BUD SHUSTER and our good friends and colleagues on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee and Aviation Subcommittee Chairman JON J. DUNCAN and the respected members of the Aviation Subcommittee—not on a partisan

nor jurisdictional mission, but rather to bring discipline and accountability to FAA programs that have drifted too long in the wilderness.

I would like to thank my good friend and distinguished gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. JOHN TANNER, the ranking minority member on the Technology Subcommittee, for his leadership in authoring sections of this title which strengthens the role of FAA's RE&D advisory committee in establishing R&D priorities and reviewing funding allocations, and increase the viability of the national aviation research plan. An additional section, also drafted by Mr. TANNER, would have greatly simplified the analysis of FAA R&D programs by requiring FAA to consolidate all its R&D activities into a single budget account—per OMB guidelines. This section was also withdrawn to expedite consideration of H.R. 3322 before the full House.

Regarding FAA RE&D funding, the President requested \$195.7 million for fiscal year 1997. Management reform, based upon sound guiding principles, offers the promise of increased efficiencies and less waste. Accordingly, fiscal year 1997 RE&D budget authority should not be increased above the fiscal year 1996 appropriation—\$185.698 million—until improvements in FAA's acquisition management are apparent and efficiencies can be more readily assessed.

In summary, FAA's chronic delays in fielding new systems have not been caused by a lack of funds or their allocation, but can be attributed to legendary organizational, managerial, and cultural impediments to changing its acquisition process. The FAA, with our assistance, has taken an enviable first step and we are cautiously optimistic. But the road ahead is long and formidable. Working together in the Congress, we can help continue the transformation of a bureaucratic agency—long overdue for change—into a world-class standard of excellence for the 21st century.

FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION RESEARCH, ENGINEERING, AND DEVELOPMENT [RE&D] FY 97 RECOMMENDED AUTHORIZATION

(In millions of dollars)

	Fiscal year—		
	1996 appropriated	1997 PB request	1997 authorized
System development/infrastructure	10.000	16.822	10.000
Capacity/ATM technology	37.200	40.570	39.911
Comm/Nav/Surveillance	23.000	20.371	20.371
Weather	6.493	6.411	6.411
Airport technology	6.000	6.000	6.000
Air safety technology	37.978	38.999	37.978
System security	36.045	36.045	36.045
Human factors/aviation medicine	23.682	23.682	23.682
Environment/Energy	3.800	3.800	3.800
Innovative/Cooperative research	1.500	3.000	1.500
Total	185.698	195.700	185.698

Note: Capacity/Air Traffic Management Technology was adjusted upward slightly from the fiscal year 1996 appropriation. For fiscal year 1997, the President requested \$2.629 million less for Communications/Navigation/Surveillance and \$0.082 million less for Weather than was appropriated for fiscal 1996. These two amounts, totaling \$2.711, were used to increase fiscal year 1997 budget authority for Capacity/Air Traffic Management activity from the fiscal year 1996 appropriated amount of \$37.200 million to \$39.912 million. This budget category, which funds research and development for the free flight concept, was cited as the top priority by the FAA's RE&D advisory committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to title VII?

If not, the Clerk will designate title VIII.

The text of title VIII is as follows:

TITLE VIII—NATIONAL EARTHQUAKE HAZARDS REDUCTION PROGRAM

SEC. 801. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

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

(1) in subsection (a)(7) by striking “and \$25,750,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996” and inserting in lieu thereof “\$25,750,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and \$18,825,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997”;

(2) in subsection (b) by striking “and \$50,676,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996” and inserting in lieu thereof “\$50,676,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and \$46,130,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997”;

(3) in subsection (c) by adding at the end the following new sentence: “There are authorized to be appropriated, out of funds otherwise authorized to be appropriated to the National Science Foundation, \$28,400,000 for fiscal year 1997, including \$17,500,000 for engineering research and \$10,900,000 for geosciences research.”; and

(4) in subsection (d) by adding at the end the following new sentence: “There are authorized to be appropriated, out of funds otherwise authorized to be appropriated to the National Institute of Standards and Technology, \$1,932,000 for fiscal year 1997.”.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to title VIII?

If not, the Clerk will designate title IX.

The text of title IX is as follows:

TITLE IX—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 901. PROHIBITION OF LOBBYING ACTIVITIES.

None of the funds authorized by this Act shall be available for any activity whose purpose is to influence legislation pending before the Congress, except that this shall not prevent officers or employees of the United States or of its departments or agencies from communicating to Members of Congress on the request of any Member or to Congress, through the proper channels, requests for legislation or appropriations which they deem necessary for the efficient conduct of the public business.

SEC. 902. LIMITATION ON APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) EXCLUSIVE AUTHORIZATION FOR FISCAL YEAR 1997.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no sums are authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1997 for the activities for which sums are authorized by this Act unless such sums are specifically authorized to be appropriated by this Act.

(b) SUBSEQUENT FISCAL YEARS.—No sums are authorized to be appropriated for any fiscal year after fiscal year 1997 for the activities for which sums are authorized by this Act unless such sums are specifically authorized to be appropriated by Act of Congress with respect to such fiscal year.

SEC. 903. ELIGIBILITY FOR AWARDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The head of each Federal agency for which funds are authorized under this Act shall exclude from consideration for awards of financial assistance made by that agency after fiscal year 1996 any person who received funds, other than those described in subsection (b), appropriated for a fiscal year after fiscal year 1996, from any Federal funding source for a project that was not subjected to a competitive, merit-based award process. Any exclusion from consideration pursuant to this section shall be effective for a period of 5 years after the person receives such Federal funds.

(b) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to awards to persons who are members of a class specified by law for which assist-

ance is awarded to members of the class according to a formula provided by law.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to title IX?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SOLOMON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SOLOMON: Page 137, after line 4, insert the following new sections:

SEC. 904. ROTC ACCESS TO CAMPUSES.

(a) DENIAL OF GRANTS AND CONTRACTS.—(1) No funds appropriated for civilian science activities of the Federal Government may be provided by contract or by grant (including a grant of funds to be available for student aid) to any institution of higher education that, as determined by the agency to which the funds were appropriated, in consultation with other appropriate Federal agencies, has an anti-ROTC policy.

(2) In the case of an institution of higher education that is ineligible for grants and contracts by reason of paragraph (1), the prohibition under that paragraph shall cease to apply to that institution upon a determination by the agency to which the funds were appropriated, in consultation with other appropriate Federal agencies, that the institution no longer has an anti-ROTC policy.

(b) NOTICE OF DETERMINATION.—Whenever an agency makes a determination under subsection (a) that an institution has an anti-ROTC policy, or that an institution previously determined to have an anti-ROTC policy no longer has such a policy, the agency—

(1) shall transmit notice of that determination to the Secretary of Education and the Congress; and

(2) shall publish in the Federal Register notice of that determination and of the effect of that determination under subsection (a) on the eligibility of that institution for grants and contracts.

(c) SEMIANNUAL NOTICE IN FEDERAL REGISTER.—Each agency shall publish in the Federal Register once every six months a list of each institution of higher education that is currently ineligible for grants and contracts by reason of a determination of the agency under subsection (a).

(d) ANTI-ROTC POLICY.—In this section, the term “anti-ROTC policy” means a policy or practice of an institution of higher education that—

(1) prohibits, or in effect prevents, the maintaining or establishing of a unit of the Senior Reserve Officer Training Corps at that institution; or

(2) prohibits, or in effect prevents, a student at that institution from enrolling in a unit of the Senior Reserve Officer Training Corps at another institution of higher education, but does not include a longstanding policy of pacifism based on historical religious affiliation.

SEC. 905. RECRUITING ON CAMPUS.

(a) DENIAL OF FUNDS.—(1) No funds appropriated for civilian science activities of the Federal Government may be provided by grant or contract (including a grant of funds to be available for student aid) to any institution of higher education that, as determined by the agency to which the funds were appropriated, in consultation with other appropriate Federal agencies, has a policy of denying, or which effectively prevents—

(A) entry to campuses or access to students on campuses; or

(B) access to directory information pertaining to students,

for purposes of military recruiting. This paragraph shall not apply to a longstanding

policy of pacifism based on historical religious affiliation.

(2) In the case of an institution of higher education that is ineligible for grants and contracts by reason of paragraph (1), the prohibition under that paragraph shall cease to apply to that institution upon a determination by the agency to which the funds were appropriated, in consultation with other appropriate Federal Agencies, that the institution no longer has a policy described in paragraph (1).

(3) Students referred to in paragraph (1) are individuals who are 17 years of age or older.

(b) NOTICE OF DETERMINATION.—Whenever an agency makes a determination under subsection (a) that an institution has a policy described in subsection (a), or that an institution previously determined to have such a policy no longer has such a policy, the agency—

(1) shall transmit notice of that determination to the Secretary of Education and the Congress; and

(2) shall publish in the Federal Register notice of that determination and of the effect of that determination under subsection (a) on the eligibility of that institution for grants and contracts.

(c) SEMI-ANNUAL NOTICE IN FEDERAL REGISTER.—Each agency shall publish in the Federal Register once every six months a list of each institution of higher education that is currently ineligible for grants and contracts by reason of a determination of the agency under subsection (a).

(d) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term “directory information” means, with respect to a student, the student’s name, address, telephone listing, date and place of birth, level of education, degrees received, and the most recent previous educational institution enrolled in by the student.

Amend the table of contents accordingly.

Mr. SOLOMON (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. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, let me be very brief, because this amendment in its two parts has previously passed this House and has become the law of the land. The amendment says that any institution of higher education that prohibits ROTC units on campus or prohibits the recruiters of our military to go on campus and offer honorable careers to the young men and women graduating from these colleges will not be eligible for any of the grants that appear in this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, these institutions just cannot expect to reject the people who defend our country and the public on one hand and dip into the public trough with the other hand. For the last 15 years or so, this country has had to depend on an all volunteer military. These young men and women come from all walks of life from all across this great country, and they are the best trained, the best educated, the best motivated young men and women of any military in the entire world today. But because it is an all-voluntary military, our military does need access to be able to offer these

honorable careers to these young men and women.

This amendment, the last time it was offered to the defense authorization bill, received 271 votes, and therefore I would ask the Members accept it here tonight so that we can continue the success of our all-voluntary military today.

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

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to accept the amendment if my understanding is correct of some language that the gentleman has added to the amendment.

As the gentleman knows, I had some concerns about schools that have a historic pattern of practicing pacifism, that are religiously oriented schools, and I wanted to assure that they were not kept from participating in research programs as a result of that historic pattern and those religious beliefs. My understanding is that the gentleman has put language into his amendment to assure that those kinds of institutions can be exempted. Is that correct?

Mr. SOLOMON. That is correct, I say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER]. If he reads on page 3, on line 1 and 2, it says that this does not include institutions who have a longstanding policy of pacifism based on historical religious affiliations.

I understand that with the kind of schools that the gentleman might have in his district, as well as the gentleman from Virginia, who I think is seeking to be recognized here as well.

Mr. WALKER. Just one more clarification, if I could. It is my understanding that that exemption then would be up to the agency that is going to grant the money and the respective Federal agencies to make the determination.

Mr. SOLOMON. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment. I think it is vitally important. Campus recruiting is a vitally important component of the military’s effort to attract our Nation’s best and brightest young people. It is simply sound fiscal policy to deny Federal dollars to schools that interfere with the Federal Government’s constitutionally mandated function of raising a military.

However, I have in my district, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania has, religious denominations, Mennonite, Amish and others that have hundreds of years of historical background of not participating in military activities based upon their deeply found religious beliefs, and I think if they are not sim-

ply antimilitary based upon a political position of the time but rather have that deep-seated opinion, then they should have that exemption and should still be able to apply for funds for legitimate scientific programs at their institutions. I thank the gentleman for including that language in the bill which will protect those schools.

Mr. SOLOMON. The gentleman is correct, and certainly because of his recommendation and that of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], we have included it.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the gentleman from California, who has been one of the major sponsors of legislation like this ever since he first came to the Congress.

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I rise in strong support of the amendment.

I think that it is an issue of fairness. It is an issue of fairness to our military, to our young people who have chosen a military career. I also believe it is extremely important that in our universities across this country that they make that an option for our students, for our young people, as an option for a career that they should go into if they do choose to accept Federal dollars and grants. I thank the gentleman for offering this amendment and am in strong support of it.

Mr. SOLOMON. It is the Solomon-Pombo amendment. I certainly thank the gentleman for speaking out for it.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, will this include student loans?

Mr. SOLOMON. It has nothing to do with student loans.

Ms. LOFGREN. I am seeking to understand the amendment. Would the prohibition of funds going to a university include Pell grants or student loans or students in universities where ROTC is not offered?

Mr. SOLOMON. No, it would not. These deal only with research grants.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I realize that I may be the only voice against the amendment here today, but I do so because there is a school in my district that for over a long period of time reached the conclusion not to have a ROTC program. I personally think ROTC is a good idea. I wish that ROTC did exist and I know individuals who have had a great experience and a measurable improvement in their future and life because of their participation in the program. However, I would hate to see San Jose State University cut off from all of the fine research that they are doing because of a decision made in another program area, supportive as I am of the ROTC program. I think it is a mistake to tie in our research funds with our ROTC program support, because so much of

what is done by way of scientific research is not done just to benefit the universities that might participate in those research programs but that research is to benefit the entire country, to benefit the future of the United States by forging advances on one or another of critical questions that face us and our future.

So I think although we must take strong efforts to support our men and women in the military, in the long run it will do them no good to cripple those universities that might be doing research in the very areas that could benefit them in the future.

So with a great deal of respect for those who have offered the amendment, I would urge that we not willy-nilly run down this path that may have consequences that are adverse and that we have not fully considered.

As a member of the Committee on Science, I know that this was not considered by the committee. We did not have any hearings on it, at least in our committee, and I think it would be ill-advised to approve the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title IX?

If not, are there further amendments to the bill?

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word to enter into a colloquy with the distinguished gentlewoman from Maryland.

Mr. Chairman, it was my intention to offer an amendment, a new title X which would add to the bill the provisions unanimously reported by the Technology Subcommittee chaired by the gentlewoman earlier this year.

Knowing of her interest in these programs, I would like to ask her what her intentions might be and if she would intend to offer such an amendment, I would allow her to do so.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of California. I yield to the gentlewoman from Maryland.

Mrs. MORELLA. In response, Mr. Chairman, to the ranking member of the Science Committee who is such a dedicated, distinguished gentleman who knows that I do care about the ATP Program, the amendment I am about to offer has to do with the Manufacturing Extension Program. It is an excellent amendment. I know that the gentleman would support it wholeheartedly. I would love to have the opportunity to offer it. We can then see whether the gentleman wants to do something else after that.

Mr. BROWN of California. I understand the gentlewoman's position. I infer that she is constrained from offering the version that was reported out of her subcommittee by unanimous vote; am I correct in that?

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I feel that it would be appropriate to ful-

fill what the full committee has decided to do, and it was not considered appropriate for the full committee to act on that.

Mr. BROWN of California. Did the full committee take some action that I am unaware of?

Mrs. MORELLA. No, the full committee did not act on that.

Mr. BROWN of California. In other words, the gentlewoman is doing what the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] says he is willing to accept?

Mrs. MORELLA. No, no, no, no, no. The ATP bill, which was authorized by our Technology Subcommittee, was approved, did not come to the full committee. And I am not offering it today, but I am offering an amendment that was offered at full committee and then was withdrawn with a significant sum attached to it.

Mr. BROWN of California. As much as I respect and admire the gentlewoman, I am constrained to say that her answer does not satisfy my requirements and I am going to offer, and I do offer at this point an amendment to the bill which had been approved unanimously by the subcommittee but was objected to by the chairman of the full committee.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROWN of California: Page 137, after line 4, insert the following new title:

TITLE X—INDUSTRIAL TECHNOLOGY SERVICES

SEC. 1001. INDUSTRIAL TECHNOLOGY SERVICES AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Commerce for the Industrial Technology Services activities of the National Institute of Standards and Technology for fiscal year 1997—

(1) for the Advanced Technology Program under section 28 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278n), such sums as may be appropriated; and

(2) for the Manufacturing Extension Partnerships program under sections 25 and 26 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278k and 278l), such sums as may be appropriated.

SEC. 1002. NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF STANDARDS AND TECHNOLOGY ACT AMENDMENTS.

Section 28 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278n) is amended—

(1) by striking "or contracts" in subsection (b)(1)(B), and inserting in lieu thereof "contracts, and, subject to the last sentence of this subsection, other transactions";

(2) by inserting "and if the non-Federal participants in the joint venture agree to pay at least 50 percent of the total costs of the joint venture during the Federal participation period, which shall not exceed 5 years," after "participation to be appropriate,";

(3) by striking "provision of a minority share of the cost of such joint ventures for up to 5 years, and (iii)" in subsection (b)(1)(B), and inserting in lieu thereof "and";

(4) by striking "and cooperative agreements" in subsection (b)(2), and inserting in

lieu thereof "cooperative agreements, and, subject to the last sentence of this subsection, other transactions";

(5) by adding after subsection (b)(4) the following:

"The authority under paragraph (1)(B) and paragraph (2) to enter into other transactions shall apply only if the Secretary, acting through the Director, determines that standard contracts, grants, or cooperative agreements are not feasible or appropriate, and only when other transaction instruments incorporate terms and conditions that reflect the use of generally accepted commercial accounting and auditing practices."; and

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

"(k) Notwithstanding subsection (b)(1)(B)(ii) and subsection (d)(3), the Director may grant extensions 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 and it is in the Federal Government's interest to do so."

Amend the table of contents accordingly.

Mr. BROWN of California (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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania reserves a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, as I indicated earlier, this amendment was considered in the Technology Subcommittee of the Committee on Science and adopted unanimously as an extremely innocuous indication of support for two of the vital programs of the National Institute of Science and Technology. These two programs were the Advanced Technology Program and the Manufacturing Extension Partnerships, as set forth in the amendment.

There is not a specific amount authorized for these programs but only such sums as may be appropriated. In other words, this leaves it up to the Committee on Appropriations to determine the level of funding. But, if adopted and signed into law by the President, it continues an authorization for these two excellent programs which are an integral part of the work of the National Institute of Science and Technology.

□ 1930

Now, it turns out, of course, that the bill, as reported out of the Subcommittee on Technology, was never taken up by the full committee. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] has many good reasons why he does not want to continue authorizing these two programs, and his method of doing this, of course, was merely not to take them up in full committee, not to have them debated and marked up in full

committee, and then not, therefore, to be included with the other matters within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Science and this so-called omnibus science authorization bill.

Now, I am offering something that I feel is the easiest, simplest, least controversial, and least expensive way to go. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] has frequently argued that we must never in our authorizations go beyond the levels which the appropriators are going to go. As a consequence, of course, we many times end up going far below what the appropriators are going to go.

Last year, for example, the appropriators continued these two programs at levels which did not satisfy me, but they were continued on the books. I am now, at this point, offering this amendment as a nominal way to maintain the authorization for these two existing programs, at the level that the appropriators in their wisdom fit within the budget, so that we cannot have the argument argued so often by the gentleman that we are busting the budget.

We cannot bust the budget in an authorizing committee, as all of those who have served in this body know. It is only the appropriators who can bust the budget, and by passing the ball to them we will allow them to decide what the budget allows and we will maintain the authorization for these two finally important programs, which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], the chairman of the committee, considers to be corporate welfare. So he is bitterly opposed to them.

Mr. Chairman, I very much hope that the Members will see the logic of my offering this minimal type of authorizing amendment and will support it.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my point of order.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. This is an interesting point in the debate. The gentleman from California has essentially decided to bring an amendment to the floor to authorize one of the favorite programs of the administration, and there is no doubt this administration loves corporate welfare. The gentleman has offered the ultimate corporate welfare amendment by reauthorizing the ATP program.

Now, as the gentlewoman from Maryland had said, we were prepared to try to reauthorize the manufacturing extension program but the gentleman from California was not satisfied with that. He wants to go further and go well beyond that and go into the ATP program. The ATP program is, in fact, industrial policy defined. It is all of the things that people are concerned about when they hear about their tax dollars being spent.

For middle class Americans who are concerned about where their tax dollars go, here is a program they should love because this particular chart talks about those largest awards and where they went last year. Now, when we think about \$25,000-a-year working

families in my district having taxes taken out of their pockets and brought to Washington and then given to people, who do we think they should have the money given to? Well, in this program where the money goes is to General Motors, Ford Motor, AT&T, GE, IBM, Hewlett-Packard, Motorola, United Technologies, Bell South, MCI, Allied Signal, Texas Instruments.

This is a list of the Fortune 500 that are getting money that is being taken out of the pocketbooks of working families and handed over to corporations.

Now, if Members think that results in good science, think a little bit about what we were told when the GAO took a look at these programs. What we will be told is, oh, well, we have to have these cooperative arrangements with these big companies in order to get development of new products. The fact is that we do not get development that is generic to all products, we get a few hand-picked corporations singled out that then get the money.

Now, I realize the administration loves that because these are hand-picked corporations that just happen to give big political contributions according to research done by one of the foundations in town. They looked at the ATP program and found that there was this surprising similarity between those who gave money to political campaigns and those who got money from the ATP program. So it fits a very, very nice pattern for those who think that corporate money into political campaigns is a great idea, but I am not so certain it serves the needs of science.

The fact is that what we have attempted to do is reprioritize spending by going away from some of these programs that give money to big corporations and put money into industrial subsidies and put the money into some of the places that we think are high priority research.

So the gentleman from California is offering an amendment which is, in fact, an amendment to continue the pattern of corporate welfare. Despite the fact suggested that the government ought to be backing out of corporate welfare, this administration, and now the minority, has decided that corporate welfare is the wave of the future. That is the way in which we have to go in order to assure a better climate for science in the country.

I just disagree. I think industrial policy science makes no sense. It in fact impedes our competitiveness. It does all the wrong things. It has us picking winners and losers in the marketplace. It does all the bad things in terms of how we want to proceed ahead with both research and development and the science of the country.

So if Members are for the gentleman's amendment as presented to us at the present time, they are for taking money out of the pockets of middle class Americans and giving it to General Motors, Ford Motor, AT&T, GE, IBM, Hewlett-Packard, Motorola, Unit-

ed Technologies, Bell South, MCI, Allied Signal, Texas Instruments, Apple Computers, Sun Microsystems, and a whole bunch of other people. That is what Members are for doing.

I think it is a bad deal and I suggest we should reject the amendment of the gentleman from California.

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

Mr. Chairman, in the 5 minutes I have I will try to give the facts on this amendment and what it was meant to do. It was unanimously, Democrat and Republican, passed out of our subcommittee last year. Because of the comments of the previous speaker, one knows where the bias of the chair on our committee is toward these programs, and I do not need, I do not think, to elaborate on that anymore.

Let me simply say this. Trying to separate fact from fiction, these are not corporate welfare grants, these companies put up 50 percent of the money as these ATP programs, Republican-administered, throughout the country. And let me further say this. In an independent Silber & Associates report, talking about the Advanced Technology Program, they said that it does indicate the program is achieving its objective; that there is no evidence that there is any linkage to any kind of political campaign, and that, furthermore, over half of the ATP cost-shared awards have gone to small businesses and more than 100 universities have participated in more than 157 projects.

Now, we went through this in the subcommittee at great length. I am sorry that the chairman of the subcommittee did not choose to try to bring our bill that we thought was so good in a unanimous vote to the floor. The full committee never took up the unanimously passed bill in the subcommittee for reasons that have heretofore been expressed, and I would just simply say this. All we are asking for is a vote on this.

Every person who has looked at these programs who is not an ideologue or has a bias of some kind has said the wave of the future, and I cited earlier when I was talking about the Council on Competitiveness, hardly a liberal claptrap organization, said that the wave of the future is to get away from this business of applied versus basic science. The wave of the future is to make government an ally of business in this country because the businesses in this country, because the vagaries of the marketplace are not going to be able to invest in blue sky research without some thought of a product that can be marketed to come back to them in the future for commercialization.

Therefore, it behooves us all, government, industry, universities and Federal labs, to work together. That is exactly what these two programs do. They allow for industry to participate in blue sky research with the help of the Federal Government, so that if

there is a technological breakthrough sometime down the line, American businesses will be able to take advantage of that in this worldwide marketplace. That it all it is.

Furthermore, this amendment does nothing more than authorize these programs at whatever sum the appropriators deem necessary, because we cannot get in our authorization committee a hearing on this bill in the full committee, notwithstanding the fact it was passed unanimously by the subcommittee.

Be that as it may, we do not run the committee, I understand that, but we have at this time an opportunity to let the Congress speak their will, not costing one dime, not one single cent, not a budget buster, only to say these programs ought to be authorized because unbiased experts have said they are working.

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

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

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I want to briefly comment, and I very much appreciate the gentleman's statement, and it illustrates exactly the reason I appear to be a little irked here on the floor.

This was the most arbitrary action I have ever seen a chairman take when he rejected a unanimous subcommittee report and refused to take up the bill. And then to categorize that as corporate welfare or industrial policy or as the grants going to, I gather, Democratic contributors is the most ridiculous, absolutely false statement, which he has never been able to substantiate, that I have ever heard.

A combination of arbitrariness, dictatorialness and a misuse of facts is what is ruining the activities of this committee and of the Congress as a whole to the degree it is infected by the gentleman from Pennsylvania's positions.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. MORELLA AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF CALIFORNIA

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as a substitute for the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. MORELLA as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. BROWN of California: Page 137, after line 4, insert the following new title:

TITLE X—FURTHER AUTHORIZATIONS

SEC. 1001. FURTHER AUTHORIZATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated \$90,000,000 for the Manufacturing Extension Partnerships program under sections 25 and 26 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278k and 278l) for fiscal year 1997. None of the funds authorized by this section may be used to establish a new Center.

Amend the table of contents accordingly:

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, the substitute that I propose will also add a new title X to the bill. It is for the purpose of authorizing the Commerce

Department manufacturing extension partnership program, managed by the National Institute of Standards and Technology.

□ 1945

This program is one which I, and many Members of this body on both sides of the aisle, consider to be not only valuable but essential to our national competitiveness. MEP's State and regional centers provide consultation and guidance to manufacturers, both large and small, in the development and implementation and advanced management techniques designed to enhance efficiency and manufacturing expertise.

Mr. Chairman, the substitute that I propose would provide an affirmative authorization only for the manufacturing extension partnership program, and it would allocate to it \$10 million more than was appropriated for fiscal year 1996. The amount would be \$90 million.

This money would provide the funding required for support of the centers that have now been established and also for those that are planned during the period of fiscal year 1997. So that would bring the total number of centers to 75 at the conclusion of fiscal year 1997.

Mr. Chairman, I understand from the information that we have been provided during the course of our committee's consideration of these spending authorizations that that figure would represent the full complement of centers, 75, that are planned by the present administration and that no new centers are planned for startup after the conclusion of the fiscal year 1997 period.

I am persuaded in any event that at the conclusion of this 1997 fiscal year, it will be appropriate to pause and evaluate the performance of these centers before considering the creation of any new ones.

Congress should consider, after gathering the requisite information, the record of the centers in achieving their goals and the implementation of criteria for continued Federal funding. Thus, the amendment also contains language that would preclude the opening of any new centers after fiscal year 1997. This is not intended to be a permanent prohibition but merely to ensure that there be a pause in expansion until Congress has an opportunity to review and affirmatively make a decision about the need for any additional centers.

I know, however, that we do have preliminary information on the impact of the MEP program in the form of two GAO studies which collected extensive assessments of customer opinion on the value of the work done by the centers. Those customer reports were positive, spoke well for the fine work that is being done by the dedicated participants and the work of the centers.

So, Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of my substitute to the Brown amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] insist on his point of order?

Mr. BROWN of California. Having read the amendment, I withdraw my point of order, and I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I must, to begin with, suggest my very great admiration for the gentlewoman from Maryland. She has been a stalwart of the committee for many years. I know of her dedication to all of the programs at the National Institutes of Standards and Technology and to the general policies of technology development, technology transfer and dissemination. She is one of the leaders in this House, and I have the very highest regard for her.

Mr. Chairman, I do not understand why she does certain things in this substitute. Of course, if she can explain it, I would be happy to listen to it. But what she has done here is to offer a substitute which takes a small part of the programs included in my amendment, the Manufacturing Extension Partnership, and eliminates the major program, the Advanced Technology Program.

She authorizes a specific sum, \$90 million, here. I see nothing in the amendment which accords with the Chairman's frequent admonition that there must be offsets whenever an amendment is offered that increases the amount of money. Perhaps he has in mind how she is going to offset this \$90 million. But until he does offer such an offset, then I am constrained to feel that his previous admonitions that we could not consider amendments that did not have offsets was slightly disingenuous, to coin a phrase that I have sometimes used.

Mr. Chairman, there is, also, despite the strong protestations by the gentlewoman as to the excellence of this program for manufacturing extension partnerships, and I thoroughly concur with her, that this is a prohibition against extending this program. None of the funds authorized shall be used to establish a new center. If these centers are, in fact, as good as they are purported to be, and which we agree they are, they are generally funded for a fixed term of years. When they have finished that, they are supposed to transition to, if possible, 100 percent private sector financing. The money that is released should be used to continue the work by establishing other centers.

In the gentlewoman's substitute, she prohibits this. Not that it requires more money; it could be done with existing stream of funds, but she prohibits it. This denies the earlier statements that she made that these centers are making a contribution to improving the quality of performance of our great small business community in this country, which is our goal.

Now, for these reasons, and others, having to do of course with the fact that it does not include the Advanced Technology Program, I am going to

ask that we reject the substitute offered by the gentlewoman and pass the original amendment which contains everything that her amendment, her substitute, offers, plus additional benefits which I have already described in my earlier remarks.

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

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] has gone on a couple of emotional tirades, and I think we ought to clear up the record.

The gentleman from California has suggested that, in talking about the ATP Program, that this is ideologically driven by the chairman of the committee. I would suggest that just the opposite is true of the ideology. Let us correct the record with regard to whether or not any responsible observers have suggested whether there may be a connection between the ATP grants and politics.

It was done by the Cato Institute. I quote,

Many of the top recipients of technology research grants awarded by the Clinton administration were also substantial contributors to the Clinton campaign or the Democratic National Committee.

Mr. Chairman, that is where I get the information. It was not made up. It is, in fact, very clear.

The next thing is, if this is a huge philosophical issue with the gentleman from Pennsylvania, then I do not know how I have gotten so far into the sack with Robert Shapiro, with director of economic policy at the Progressive Policy Institute, which is, in fact, not ideologically associated with me. But in looking at the ATP Program, he expressed some of the same concerns that I did.

Mr. Chairman, he says with regard to a grant that went to the Philips Corporation under ATP, he makes the statement:

However, the Federal Government should not be helping Philips, the largest lighting company in the world, develop new commercial applications for technology already used in street lights.

That is the kind of thing that is going on in the program, and even people at the Progressive Policy Institute in fact are finding some concerns with those kinds of questions.

So we have a lot of lobbyists and big corporations that support this program, but the fact is that there are real concerns.

What the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA] has done is she has said, okay, she has a strong faith in some of these programs such as the MEP Program. She says, let us single it out and make sure that it gets all the money that it needs to fund the 75 centers that the administration says are necessary; and the administration has requested no more than 75.

The \$90 million in the gentlewoman's amendment totally funds all 75 centers plus some administrative expenses. She

is making the case that that is the right direction to go, but let us not continue down this road of funding industrial policy through ATP that gives money to big corporations out of the pockets of poor and middle-class wage earners.

Mr. Chairman, that is what the whole issue will be about here as we consider this: whether or not Members are for extending the MEP programs and probably getting an overwhelming vote in favor of the MEP, or whether or not what they are wanting to do is go the route of corporate welfare by ensuring that the ATP Program is that which is funded, and it is funded at a huge level at a cost to the taxpayers and going to big corporations.

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

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I thought the gentleman would give me the courtesy of allowing me to complete my statement, but I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I just would like to ask the gentleman, he likes to quote the Cato Institute report a lot and says that these are contributors to Democratic causes. Only five of the corporations, AT&T, Boeing, Chevron, Shell and Texaco, received ATP awards, and each of those companies gave more heavily to Republicans than they gave to Democrats.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman too about corporate welfare that he supports like the National Weather Service, NIST in-house R&D, energy supply R&D, FAA, S&T. The Cato Institute defines all of this as corporate welfare.

If the gentleman is agreeing with Cato's definition that corporate welfare is any program that involves government cooperation with industry, then why is the gentleman supporting hydrogen R&D, which he supports? Is that not corporate welfare?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, does the gentleman want a response or is he just interested in pejoratives?

Mr. Chairman, the hydrogen R&D Program that I supported was a basic research program. If the gentleman wants to go back and look at the bill, we supported a basic research program from hydrogen. We did not support any industrial policy to research to that. And the gentleman from Pennsylvania does not accept the Cato Institute's definition of corporate welfare. There are many different definitions around here that the gentleman can come up with.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, that is the report the gentleman cited.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I did not yield to the gentleman. Is he going to let me answer?

Mr. Chairman, the fact is that the way I define corporate welfare is when we are taking money from hard-earning, middle-class Americans and putting it in the hands of corporations through subsidies.

Now, that is exactly what we do here. And so, in fact, this is one of the biggest programs we have in the entire Federal Government that takes money out of the pocketbooks of Americans and hands it to big corporations.

So, Mr. Chairman, in my view, this is a definitional corporate welfare program. It is certainly a corporate subsidy program. It is certainly an industrial policy program, all the things that I think are bad.

The fact is we have had a recent report on U.S. competitiveness in USA Today. In USA Today they in fact say that the best things that we do in this country are when we have entrepreneurship and when we do the job of having better investment, not with huge corporate subsidies.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Morella substitute, and I yield to the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA].

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to respond to the wording in this particular amendment. There are 75 centers that will, we understand, be fully funded, including administrative costs. Of the 75 centers, 15 are new. Fifteen are new, already contracted for, and we are providing the money for them for fiscal year 1997.

We are asking that it is appropriate at the end of that period of time to simply look and review the 75 centers to see how effectively they are operating. I think this is good accountability, good responsibility, good oversight on the part of this Congress.

The MEP program is one that our committee has demonstrated a desire to continue. We are budgeting it. We are offering in the authorization \$10 million more than what was in the budget authorization for the last fiscal year that had been appropriated, and we feel it is a good amendment. I do not think it has any criticism. That is adverse. And I say to this Congress, pass it.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I would just add, in support of this, that this House addressed the ATP program last year, zeroed it out. The gentlewoman from Maryland's strategy is to come back and try to get something for the MEP program. I think it is a realistic way that we can get the appropriate money for it, and I am happy to support it.

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

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to comment briefly on this because I have heard some of the same things that I have heard now for 18 months in the Committee on Science. I think there is a philosophical difference, and I think it is fair that we discuss it. It is not about money to corporations. I was here and voted against the agriculture bill. We shovel money at farmers, and they are corporations; that does not seem to bother anybody. It bothered

me. So the problem is not about taking tax money and giving it to others apparently. It is about industrial policy. And I have heard the Chairman use that word over and over again.

I think there is a difference.

□ 2000

I know that we are in a vicious economic global competition. If we look at what others around the world are doing and compare them to what we will do it this bill passes with the Morella amendment to the Brown amendment, I think we will agree, at least I believe, we are in trouble.

Mr. Chairman, Europe is accelerating its investment in commercial technologies through just the same kind of programs that the ATP program represents for America through the European Union joint R&D initiative. Japan is doubling their government science and technology budget in the next 4 years. China is tripling its investment in joint projects. Korea is also boosting its R&D efforts in key areas.

They realize, as we should, that precompetitive, precommercial research is part of getting ahead in the really rather strident and tough competition that we face internationally.

I would like to note that some people who I do not think the very political, like the American Chemical Society, has said, and I quote: ATP is a vital component of our Nation's technology and competitiveness portfolio.

I would like to give just a couple of quick examples of how this actually works. One example from San Jose is Spectra Diode Laboratories, which joined with Xerox in 1991 in a project to develop integrated arrays of high-powered multi-wavelength laser diodes. Now the ATP funds that were provided, and I would add in partnership; industry puts at least 50 percent of the money up and oftentimes more; enabled this firm, SDL, to move ahead of where they otherwise would have been.

It is true one of the three technologies they developed might have been developed anyhow, but would not have happened in the time frame in which it did. In Silicon Valley and high tech, time is very important. We are talking about products that have a life cycle of 12 months, 13 months, 14 months. If you miss a step, pretty soon you have got your competitors abroad just killing you in the business.

Mr. Chairman, I would note that SDL's early applications have tripled their business in 2 years, and note that in some measure their success has added to the 46,000 jobs that were added in 1 year in Silicon Valley, CA.

None of us want to squander tax money, but there are things such as squandering and then there are investments for the future. My voters tell me for the most part that, if we can do something to invest in science and technology that boosts our economy, that provides high-tech, good-paying jobs, that is a good investment.

Mr. Chairman, I would add just one other example, and that has to do with

something that I think is going to be a critical matter for our country and whether we prosper or fail in the next generation of computers. That is flat panel display. There are several competing technologies being pursued at this point. It is not yet clear which of them will emerge as the winner. We have one ATP program located in Silicon Valley pursuing very sophisticated approaches using photons as a base for the technology.

We have very little going on other than the ATP program in the United States. Our major competitors are in Japan, in Singapore, in Korea.

If we were to pull out of this technological research, we would be doing great damage. For those who have laptops, you cannot build a laptop unless you can get a flat panel. When all the flat panels are owned, when all the flat panel technology is owned by our economic competitors, our folks will not have a guaranteed supply of the key components for something that is going to be a growth industry.

Mr. Chairman, let us not shoot ourselves in the foot. I strongly urge that we vote against the Morella amendment. It kills the ATP program, and it does damage to our country's future.

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

Mr. Chairman, I know it is getting late, and I am not going to take a lot of time. I just think it is interesting to note that, while the chairman of the Committee on Science likes to talk about Boeing receiving \$2 million on the ATP program and labels that corporate welfare, he conveniently overlooks the \$6 billion contract Boeing gets on the Space Station, which he supports. So I think there is just a little bit of a double standard going on here.

There is some corporate welfare apparently that is good, and then there is other corporate welfare that is not so good.

I would say to the gentlewoman from Maryland that we support MEP. All of us over here support that program, and we have tried to work in a bipartisan way to make sure what is clearly a success story continues. I would like to see the MEP program funded at \$105 million, at full funding.

I would like to see other areas have MEP centers, like I enjoy in western Pennsylvania. The Southwestern Pennsylvania Industrial Resource Center, I believe, has saved the manufacturing base in Pittsburgh and is a program that not only needs to continue but should be expanded because it is doing good things, too.

Similar good things have been happening in the ATP program, and I think it is interesting to note that, when we held hearings on ATP, most of these so-called expert witnesses that were presented were not from members from the private sector or from industry. They were these so-called experts from these inside-the-Beltway think tanks that talked negatively about this program.

Every private sector, every company representative, even those that did not receive ATP awards, spoke favorably about this program. So I think, if we were serious about addressing this issue of so-called corporate welfare, that we would have done it in a much more substantial way rather than the very narrow focus that the chairman has taken in this program.

In closing, I think the Brown amendment is a far superior amendment because it takes care of two programs that are a success story. We do support the MEP program and certainly are going to support funding for that.

Certain elements within the Science Committee have tried to bury NIST's technology and manufacturing support programs without ever having to endure the political inconvenience of debating their merits or voting on the record to kill them.

Our amendment is designed to correct this situation and allow flexibility for the Appropriations Committee to find funding for these supposedly controversial programs.

What are the functions of these disputed programs?

First, let's look at NIST's Manufacturing Extension Program. The MEP, which originated during the Reagan administration, has been a salvation to many American small manufacturing businesses. Faced with increasing direct global competition in the mid-1980's, small American manufacturers needed to become more efficient, but objective sources of modernization advice were costly or nonexistent. Abroad, countries like Japan, Germany, Singapore, and Italy all launched manufacturing extension programs to help their small manufacturers innovate, renovate, and compete. The Manufacturing Extension Partnership program [MEP] was NIST's response to the efforts of our global competitors to seize control of the international market for technology.

The MEP demonstrates that the Federal Government, in partnership with local business groups, educational institutions, and State governments, could provide small manufacturers with modernization services worth several times the Federal investment. Today, the MEP program serves 32 States through a network of 44 nonprofit centers. Federal funds are awarded on a competitive basis with States and local partners matching Federal funds. Each MEP center is tailored to meet the needs of regional industries by assisting small and medium size firms employing fewer than 500 workers—381,000 manufacturers employing 12 million workers—to modernize in order to compete in the demanding marketplace of the 1990's and beyond. To date, MEP centers have reached 25,000 customer firms. Each MEP project on average adds or saves 5 jobs, increases sales by \$360,000 and saves \$430,000 in labor and investments. Total benefits to manufacturers amount to \$8 for every Federal dollar invested.

The MEP in my region, SPIRC, the Southwestern Pennsylvania Industrial Resource Center, has made meaningful improvements in numerous manufacturing plants throughout Allegheny County. It's safe to say SPIRC is directly responsible for maintaining our manufacturing base in western Pennsylvania.

The MEP program's benefits have been widely recognized. The House and Senate have agreed on language that was included in

the debt ceiling extension bill reaffirming the importance of MEP centers in helping businesses comply with Federal and State-level environmental regulations. The language reads,

Nothing in this Act in any way affects or limits the ability of other technical assistance or extension programs to perform or continue to perform services related to compliance assistance.

This clearly covers current MEP activities, which provide significant environmental assistance to small and medium-sized manufacturers. This has been a recent point of emphasis within the MEP program. For example, the Tennessee MEP Center was awarded \$900,000 to develop a prototype program for environmental compliance that can be emulated by other MEP centers.

Let's also look at another Reagan administration effort, the Advanced Technology Program, which addressed another market failure. Technology partnership programs, such as ATP, were crafted in direct response to the concern that too much of the scientific knowledge resulting from research projects was not finding its way into our companies, where technology could be turned into the products and services, the profits and jobs that drive our economy. Many factors, including the globalization of markets, the rapid pace of technology cycles, and the focus on short term investment, have led to the short term and narrow R&D focus in most companies.

As a result, U.S. industry tends to avoid investments in enabling technologies with broad economic benefits, and focuses almost exclusively on narrow mission-specific research with short horizons. Technology partnerships were conceived as a means to create some bridges to better connect basic research with the companies who can move ideas into the marketplace.

The ATP, based on previous Government experience in fostering technology transfer, is a cost-shared partnership between Government, industry, and universities. With funding of \$341 million in fiscal year 1995, it represented less than 1 percent of total Federal civilian R&D investment. It is too early to determine the full economic benefits from a program like ATP, which began in 1990, but has at least a 10-year horizon for payoff. Already, there is substantial evidence that the ATP is catalyzing unique, new enabling technologies and thereby creating new economic opportunities that would not have existed otherwise.

Also, I want to mention that in spirit of bipartisan cooperation, Congressman BOEHLERT and I circulated a letter of support for MEP. Well over 90 Members signed onto this letter, including such notable Members as Congressman HASTERT, the majority's chief deputy whip, Chairman SPENCE of the Armed Services Committee, Chairman MEYERS of the Small Business Committee, and many others. I have a copy of the letter here, which I hope Members will look at before voting.

Thanks to more thoughtful consideration of these programs than that of the Science Committee, Congress provided adequate funding for the NIST laboratories and provided subsistence funding for the Manufacturing Extension Partnership. Unfortunately, funding for the Advanced Technology Program was eliminated for fiscal year 1996.

Authorization levels for the MEP and the ATP were not the result of any objective analysis of the merits of these programs, but were

based solely on political considerations. From the beginning days of the 104th Congress, both the MEP and ATP programs were targeted as corporate welfare by certain Members.

What is the basis for my assertion that the attacks made on the ATP and MEP are political rather than any rational evaluation of the program? In a hearing before the Technology Subcommittee this past year, the only witness who spoke against the ATP and MEP were expert witnesses with no technical business background—their only experience was working for inside the beltway think tanks. Every other private sector witness supported these programs and programs like them, regardless of whether their company received an ATP award.

According to a July 1995 Congressional Budget Office [CBO] report, Federal Financial Support of Business, the ATP and MEP represent less than 4 percent of the \$12 billion the Federal Government will spend on programs that support industrial technology commercialization. If the cities of these programs were truly interested in rooting out this so-called corporate welfare, why are they silent regarding the majority of programs, such as the almost \$1 billion Small Business Innovation Research Program [SBIR], or \$3.7 billion at the National Institutes of Health [NIH] for applied biomedical research? If they were serious, we would be debating the entire range of technology commercialization programs which the Government funds. The Science Committee has not done this and the House has not done this.

The elimination of the ATP and attempts to eliminate the MEP are using the corporate welfare label to further another agenda. To be frank, the ATP and MEP were targeted, despite their initiation by a Republican administration, because they were enthusiastically endorsed by Bill Clinton—both as a candidate and as President. Eliminating ATP and MEP does not mean that Congress is making hard choices, it says Congress is making political ones. Rather than listening to the experts and building a Federal investment S&T that is based in economic reality and looks to the future, opponents of these programs have only used rhetorical arguments as justification for attacking the ATP and MEP for purely political reasons.

I want to emphasize that until this Congress the question of support for MEP and ATP has not been partisan. It is the effort to make this a partisan debate that many of us on both sides of the aisle are working to counter. Even in the mark-up of this bill, Members of both parties supported this amendment, which failed on a tie vote. I have the utmost respect for my colleagues in the majority who have not succumbed to the misguided effort to handicap our competitiveness.

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

Mr. Chairman, I will not take all of my 5 minutes. I just feel compelled to answer some of the charges, I guess we would call them, that have been made on the floor here today, all without any foundation, from the benefit of the standpoint of a hearing in our committee on these matters.

Let me tell Members what industry says about the Advanced Technology

Program, just a few things. The Institute of Electrical and Electronic Engineers continues its strong support for the ATP program. A significant amount of progress in technology transfer is the direct result of the ATP programs. These programs illustrate that government participation in the R&D arena can be both efficient and productive.

The American Chemical Society: As the gentlewoman from California [Ms. LOFGREN] alluded to, ATP support of market incentives encourages companies to invest for the long term in high-risk, high-payoff technologies.

The American Electronics Association: ATP is based on government and industry cooperation and the development of technologies critical to America's long-term ability to compete in the global marketplace.

The South Carolina Research Authority in Columbia, SC: By supporting research in high-risk, leading-edge technology, the ATP is advancing the state of the art, contributing to the growth of our economy.

Finally, from a company in Valley Forge, PA: ATP is one vital approach to maintaining our science and technology leadership. These projects will never be undertaken without government support to challenge industry to take the higher technology risk. This could double or triple our R&D efforts on projects that are beyond our current core business and which we would otherwise never undertake.

That says it better than any politician, Mr. Chairman. That says exactly what this amendment that the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] has offered is all about. And that is why this almost, well, I do not know the word to use, amendment, to mask what is happening here that has been offered by the chairwoman of our subcommittee to just limit it to MEP and then to cut that off saying no new centers, that is why it should be rejected. We ought to really and truly support American business in this country.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, the ATP program was established in 1990 by President Bush. It seems to have worked very well. I do not know what has caused the chairman of this committee to just turn against it and seem like to have closed his mind on it. When the amendment was offered in committee, the majority of the committee members bipartisanship supported it. But he literally went over in committee and intimidated a Member to change his vote. It failed because it was a tie vote.

It really says that most of us on this committee really do think about what the future is all about. We really do understand that we have to be a partner in creating these jobs and getting technology that saves money. You know, there are a lot of success stories of the ATP program. They are many, they are varied. But in the health care industry,

for example, the ATP program for information infrastructure is assisting the industry in laying the foundation for the efficient use of technology in doctors' offices, hospitals, and clinics by cost-sharing with industry in the development of technologies, to reduce paperwork and bring better health care to rural areas. Many of our rural hospitals are at risk for closing.

Mr. Chairman, this is the kind of technology we need. Health care costs about \$1 trillion a year in the United States, and the process of information accounts for about 20 percent of that total cost, or about \$200 billion annually. If we can get technology to reduce that cost, thereby reducing the cost to individual patients, it is worth that small investment.

There are other examples of the ATP process. In Plano, TX, just outside my district but in the district of the gentleman from Texas, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, there is Microfab Technologies that hired 18 people. But they have come up, a very small company. I do not think you consider 18 people a large company, a big corporation. They have come up with product development from major, other companies. This new technology will significantly reduce hazardous waste. That is significant because soon we will be talking about Superfund reform and reauthorization.

I should think we want to save dollars when we have that technology. I think it is not penny-wise but it is pound-foolish for us to just decide arbitrarily, almost single-handedly that we must not partnership for developing technology, bringing about more jobs and reducing costs on things that are done in a way that could be improved with technology. I really regret that we have forgotten that we hold the trust of the people in this country, and we ought to try to bring about these changes because other countries will pass us by and we will pay more for it.

Rather than reducing ourselves to personality battles to show who is bigger than the other, that is irresponsible. I think that it is time for us to stop that and decide that we are here with the trust of people. We ought to stand and be responsible for what we are here about, and we cannot do it without these partnerships.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am extremely disappointed that a procedural maneuver may prevent a clean vote on the Tanner amendment, now called the Brown amendment, which I have enthusiastically cosponsored. Instead we will vote on a watered-down compromise, much less than we need.

NIST technology programs never used to be political hot potatoes. Both the MEP and ATP were established, as we just heard, during the Reagan and Bush administrations. Both programs are embraced by Members on both sides of the aisle because they make our Nation's businesses more competitive

worldwide. Both programs are visionary and prove that government can be an effective partner with industry on technology development.

Mr. Chairman, let me just spend a few moments discussing the MEP and, in particular, California's Manufacturing Technology Center in Southern California's South Bay. Last year, 51 small manufacturers hired 442 additional employees after implementing improvements recommended by the CMTC. These same manufacturers saw their sales increase by a total of \$5.8 million. Those are private-sector dollars, not taxpayer dollars.

It is all the more intriguing to me why the Committee on Science majority has decided to turn the Federal Government's back on small manufacturers, which have accounted for the majority of manufacturing-sector job growth in the Nation during the last 25 years.

Equally important to our Nation's high-tech development is the ATP, the Advanced Technology Program, a unique partnership between government and industry to accelerate the development of high-risk technologies. That promises significant commercial payoffs and widespread benefits for our economy. Industry drives the ATP by setting the program's research priorities. Industry must keep its part of the partnership by adhering to strict cost-sharing rules. We must keep up our end of the bargain by maintaining investment in high-technology industries.

Mr. Chairman, we must drive technology forward into the 21st century. Government must be a partner with industry in this effort. This amendment is too little and very late.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, there has been a long-standing debate on this House floor that one party over another is good for small businesses. I rise to support the Brown substitute that really does support small businesses and creates jobs.

We realize that the MEP program, in fact, has kept thousands of smaller companies in business by giving them the technology and the understanding to maintain their business and to keep their doors open. But we have heard a very striking and unfortunate debate revolving around the ATP program.

□ 2015

Might I, Mr. Chairman, simply call the roll?

Plano, TX, an ATP program; Harris County, TX, an ATP program; Farmington Hills, MI, an ATP program; Danbury, CT, an ATP program; Yorktown Heights, NY, an ATP program; Valley Forge, PA, I might add in the great State of Pennsylvania, ATP program; Hopewell Junction, NY, ATP program; Wilmington, DE; San Diego, CA; Potomac, MD; Columbia, SC; Washington, DC; Santa Clara, CA, among many.

This is not a corporate welfare program. What it is is an effective partnership between business and government. It says to business, "Where there is a great risk and we realize that you will not be taking the opportunity to explore these technologies, we will come in in competition with Japan and Germany and France and England and stand alongside of you so that you might be successful."

I am somewhat disappointed that the distinguished chairman of this committee would continue to call this corporate welfare. Is he aware that when he sees the names of AT&T and IBM and Xerox, that they are, in fact, a partner with some 12 to 15 smaller companies that wind up on the grant from the Advanced Technology Program? Again a helping hand.

The chairman likes to always cite Cato as the expert on what is corporate welfare, and of course the Cato Institute suggests that the Advanced Technology Program is corporate welfare. Well, if they are so wise, let me offer to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] that Cato also says that his favorite projects are welfare, corporate welfare; the National Weather Service, the NIST in-house research and development, general science at DOE, energy supply R&D, U.S. Geological Survey, the FAA, the Office of S&T Policy, cooperative R&D agreements, technology transfer, high-performance computing, R&D university researchers, and the Space Station.

Might I say that we as a body have a bipartisan responsibility to insure that the science of America becomes the jobs of the 21st century? I have said it yesterday, I say it today, and I say it tomorrow. The MEP program, along with the Advanced Technology Program, are effective partners, want to emphasize small businesses, but as well to emphasize partnerships between the government large corporations and smaller businesses to insure that risky scientific investigation and research is carried on so that we can be competitive worldwide.

This is a bad amendment that excludes the ATP program. I would ask my colleagues to join me in supporting the substitute offered by the ranking member, the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN], for the committee offered in committee a bipartisan support short of that one vote. I will simply ask, Mr. Chairman, that we do that today and be victorious on behalf of research and businesses of America, particularly our small businesses.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA] as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN].

The amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN], as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to the bill?

If not, under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GOODLATTE) having assumed the chair, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3322) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1997 for civilian science activities of the Federal Government, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 427, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

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

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN EN-GROSSMENT OF H.R. 3322, OMNIBUS CIVILIAN SCIENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1996

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of the bill, H.R. 3322, the Clerk may be authorized to correct section numbers, punctuation, and cross references, and to make such other technical and conforming changes as may be necessary to reflect the action of the House in amending the bill.

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

There was no objection.

EXCHANGE OF LETTERS BETWEEN COMMITTEES REGARDING JURISDICTION

Mr. WALKER. Mr. speaker, further, I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD include the exchange of letters between the Committee on Science and the Committees on Natural Resources, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Natural Security regarding the respective jurisdictions of the committees.

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

There was no objection.

The letters referred to are as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE,
Washington, DC, May 2, 1996.

Hon. BUD SHUSTER,
Chairman, House Committee on Transportation
and Infrastructure, House of Representa-
tives, Washington, DC.

DEAR BUD: On April 24, 1996, the House Committee on Science marked up and reported out H.R. 3322, the Omnibus Civilian Science Authorization Act of 1996. Title VII of the bill contains provisions relating to the authorization and administration of the Federal Aviation Administration's Research, Engineering and Development Program.

Several sections of title VII fall within the jurisdiction of your committee and as such your committee received a sequential referral of the omnibus bill upon introduction.

Given the short time frame before the omnibus bill will be considered on the Floor of the House, I realize that the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee will not have sufficient time to consider those provisions within your committee's jurisdiction. In order to expedite Floor consideration of H.R. 3322, I will drop Sections 702, 703, 704, 705 and 708 of H.R. 3322 which mainly pertain to the management of the Federal Aviation Administration. I also understand that you also object to Section 706(k) of the omnibus bill, and I will therefore not include that provision when the omnibus bill is considered on the House Floor.

I appreciate your willingness to work with us to expedite the consideration of H.R. 3322. I look forward to continuing to work with you on these issues.

Cordially,

ROBERT S. WALKER,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE,
Washington, DC, April 30, 1996.

Hon. FLOYD SPENCE,
Chairman, Committee on National Security,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Committee on Science has marked up and introduced H.R. 3322, the Omnibus Civilian Science Authorization Act of 1996. The following provisions may be within the jurisdiction of the Committee on National Security: Section 128, Science Studies Institute and Section 453, National Oceanographic Partnership Program.

The Committee on Science acknowledges the Committee on National Security's jurisdictional interest in these provisions. It is my understanding that similar language to Section 453 will be included in the FY 1997 Department of Defense Authorization bill. Nevertheless, I ask that your committee waive any request for sequential referral with respect to the provisions described above so that the House can consider H.R. 3322 without undue delay. I would of course support the inclusion of your Committee as conferees should H.R. 3322 go to a House-Senate conference.

Thank you for your cooperation and I look forward to hearing from you.

Cordially,

ROBERT S. WALKER,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE,
Washington, DC, May 1, 1996.

Hon. DON YOUNG,
Chairman, Committee on Resources, House of
Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR DON: I am writing to follow up on our conversation of May 1, 1996 about the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) title of H.R. 3322, the Omnibus Civilian Science Authorization Act of 1996.

With one exception, the title's programmatic scope is identical to the NOAA title passed by the House last year as part of H.R. 2405, the Omnibus Civilian Science Authorization Act of 1995.

The one exception is a new section dealing with ocean research partnerships. It is my understanding that your staff has taken part in every step of the drafting process of the ocean research partnership language. In deference to your concerns, however, I will be pleased to drop the provision from the bill. Likewise, I am willing to drop language worked out between our two Committees last year, and passed by the House, on the NOAA Fleet and NOAA Corps as well as related program support accounts. I also am willing to drop language authorizing the National Sea Grant College Program as well as all National Ocean Service (NOS) programs and the Ocean and Great Lakes Programs of the office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research (OAR).

As with last year, I am pleased to work out any differences our two Committees may have over the substance of authorization language covering the NOAA programs we share. If we cannot agree, however, I will oblige your desire to strike the authorization for the programs I have outlined above.

I look forward to continuing our close working relationship on legislative matters our two Committees share.

Cordially,

ROBERT S. WALKER,
Chairman.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION
AND INFRASTRUCTURE,
Washington, DC, May 2, 1996.

Hon. ROBERT S. WALKER,
Chairman, House Committee on Science,
Washington, DC.

DEAR BOB: Thank you for your letter of May 2, 1996, concerning H.R. 3322, the Omnibus Civilian Science Authorization Act of 1996. I appreciate the work your committee is doing in this bill on matters of civil aviation research and development within the jurisdiction of the Science Committee. I look forward to working with you on these matters as we proceed to reauthorize the Airport Improvement Program and as we continue to pursue FAA reform.

Because you have agreed to drop provisions within the Transportation Committee's jurisdiction from H.R. 3322, I have no objection to its consideration in the House.

With warm personal regards, I remain

Sincerely,

BUD SHUSTER,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COM-
MITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY,
Washington, DC, May 1, 1996.

Hon. ROBERT S. WALKER,
Chairman, Committee on Science,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I understand the Committee on Science has recently marked up H.R. 3322, the Omnibus Civilian Science Authorization Act of 1996. This legislation includes two provisions within the legislative jurisdiction of the Committee on National Security—section 128, Science Studies Institute, and Section 453, National Oceanographic Partnership Program.

In recognition of your committee's desire to bring this legislation expeditiously before the House of Representatives, the Committee on National Security will waive referral of H.R. 3322, without, of course, waiving this committee's jurisdiction over the provisions in question. This committee also will seek to have conferees appointed for these provisions during any House-Senate conference.