schools, science museums, and state and local governments. These programs encourage the discovery of new knowledge and its application to real-world problems.

NSF support for basic research and science education has also had an important role in encouraging economic growth over the last fifty years. According to a recent study, each dollar that the federal government spends on basic research contributes 50 cents or more to the national output each year. In other words, investing in NSF pays for itself in two years. These benefits are spread throughout the economy, enhancing the productivity of the nation's workforce and improving the quality of life for all Americans.

At the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, for example, NSF funds have enabled scientists to explore the commercial applications of their research. Technology developed at MIT had a role in the launching of 13 companies in 1995. They manufacture products ranging from computer chips to communication networks. These enterprises have bolstered the state and local economies, and provided jobs and opportunities for many citizens. In fact, a 1997 report by BankBoston found that research and development at MIT has created 125,000 jobs in Massachusetts.

In our state, NSF is funding a wide range of other projects on the cutting edge of research. NSF grants have been instrumental in building the state's biotechnology industry, mapping the oceans at the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institute, developing new superconductors at the Material Research Science and Education Center at Harvard, and creating cooperative partnerships with schools, parents, businesses, and community organizations to strengthen math and science education.

Nationwide, NSF grants cover a broad range of projects from providing health care to fighting crime to protecting the environment. Specific grants are improving the treatment of arrhythmia, facilitating more accurate identification of crime suspects, developing new biotechnology techniques to cleanup hazardous waste sites, enhancing the speed of semiconductors in processing information, and even analyzing the Antarctic meteorite to determine whether life existed on Mars.

NSF funds benefit the humanities as well. The Next Generation Internet Project will give researchers access to information from the world's libraries and museums at rates that are 100 to 1,000 times faster than today's Internet.

This authorization Act will put research and development on a more secure footing over the next two years. It will increase NSF funding by 10 percent in FY1999 and 3 percent in FY2000, which are consistent with the levels recommended in President Clinton's FY1999 budget. The increased funding will provide larger award amounts, so that scientists can undertake longer-range projects.

The legislation also strengthens efforts to improve science, mathematics, engineering, and technology training for teachers and students. In addition, it authorizes the Office of Science and Technology Policy in the White House to prepare a report analyzing indirect costs, which play a vital but little understood role in federal R&D spending.

The National Science Foundation is doing an outstanding job in fulfilling its missions. Passage of this bill will strengthen America's leadership in science and technology, and I urge all of my colleagues to support this important legislation.

I congratulate our chairman for bringing us to this point in the legislative process.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I would like to engage Senator LOTT, Senate Majority Leader, and Senator JEFFORDS, Chairman of the Labor and Human Resources Committee, in a colloquy on certain programs within the National Science Foundation.

Mr. LOTT. I would be pleased to join Senator MCCAIN and Senator JEFFORDS in a colloquy on this subject.

Mr. MCCAIN. As Chairman of the Commerce Committee, I have noted with great pleasure the success and impact on the NSF's program to establish outstanding research and education centers at colleges and universities in partnership with industry. These centers are making great contributions to research, science, and technology education, and the economic development and global competitiveness of our nation.

Mr. JEFFORDS. As Chairman of the Labor Committee, I too have been a strong supporter of the NSF's efforts to strengthen research and education efforts at colleges and universities across the nation. NSF provides support to over 2000 colleges and universities and nearly 17,000 researchers nation-wide.

Mr. LOTT. A particular success is the Engineering Research Centers Program which has stimulated focused university-industry partnerships in research and education, and has served as a catalyst for economic development within the United States. Much success can be attributed to the Foundation's leadership in ensuring each center establishes a clear vision and conducts careful strategic planning involving their industry partners. Among the impacts of this program are: Next generation engineering systems developed from new knowledge discoveries and new technological developments; Technology transferred to hundreds of companies and governmental agencies; Technical assistance and training provided for industry and government; Thousands of undergraduate and graduate students involved in the research of the centers and exposed to next generation systems research and development; and Outreach to K–12 and to underrepresented groups.

NSF Science Technology Centers and other NSF university centers have likewise cultivated strong university-industry affiliations with centers focused on specific research areas related to industry needs. For example, the modern Internet browser was developed at the NSF National Center for Supercomputing Applications at the University of Illinois; a turbomachinery computational model developed at the Engineering Research Center for Computational Field Simulation at Mississippi State University is now used by all jet engine manufacturers; the Center for Molecular Biotechnology at the University of Washington is developing tools for industry use to analyze and interpret the information content of biological molecules such as DA and proteins, to analyze and interpret the information content to biological molecules; and the Center for High Pressure Research at the State University of New York at Stony Brook works with several companies to develop new ways that industry can use high-pressure technology to produce exotic materials, such as industrial-grade diamonds. Hundreds of similar contributions can be cited from these and other NSF-funded university centers.

I believe this program should be greatly expanded and that the NSF should become even more active in ensuring the development of long-term vision and strategic planning of each center. Further, NSF should build on successful centers and seek ways to sustain the investment with continual support when appropriate. Areas that show great potential for the future include: computation engineering, biotechnology and bioengineering, manufacturing, and industrial systems, electronics and communications systems, materials processing including polymers and composite materials, manufacturing systems, remote sensing systems and technologies, and optical systems as well as ship building, telecommunications and super-computing supercomputer technology for university research centers.

Mr. MCCAIN. I thank the distinguished Majority Leader and the Labor Committee Chairman, for their insights into these matters and how important research and education is to the overall National economy.

Mr. JEFFORDS. The distinguished Majority Leader should be commended for his strong support for basic scientific and engineering research and I look forward to working with him to strengthen the engineering research centers program.

Mr. LOTT. I also would like to thank Senator MCCAIN and Senator JEFFORDS for their leadership in these areas of science and technology.

SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATION RESEARCH PROGRAM

Mr. ENZI. I would like to raise an issue that has been brought to my attention since the Labor Committee reported this bill in October. It relates to the Small Business Innovative Research (SBIR) program and I want to

highlight the fact that recent NSF decisions may have a negative effect on this very successful program. I have worked closely on small business issues with my friend from Montana, Senator CONRAD BURNS, who also serves on the Small Business Committee with me. It is not my intention to hold up this legislation by offering an amendment at this time, but I want the Chairman, Senator JEFFORDS, to know that it is a very important issue for me. I would like to yield to Senator BURNS for a minute and ask him to describe the situation.

Mr. BURNS. On August 8, 1997, Ms. Linda G. Sundro, Inspector General for the National Science Foundation (NSF) recommended that NSF reduce their SBIR set-aside by approximately $2.5 million by excluding certain education and training costs, as well as program support overhead costs from their total extramural R&D budget. Although funded by the Congress as part of their overall R&D budget, the Inspector General concluded that these costs could be excluded because they do not fit the statutory definition of R&D as set forth in the Small Business Research and Development Enhancement Act of 1992, (Public Law No. 102.564, 15 U.S.C. Part 638(e)(5)).

The Inspector General's recommendation does not take into consideration the guidance provided by the Congress in determining the calculation. The legislation requires each agency ''which has an extramural budget for research or research and development'' (15 U.S.C. Part 638(f)(1)) to set-aside a percentage for the SBIR program. The legislation clearly defines extramural budget as ''the sum of the total obligations minus amounts obligated for such activities by employees of the agency in or through Government-owned, Government-operated facilities * * *'' (15 U.S.C. Part 638 (e)(1)). Under existing law, the only exclusion from the calculation is for funds dedicated to intramural R&D efforts.

In its April 17, 1998 report on the SBIR program, the General Accounting Office identified the calculation of the extramural budget as an issue for the SBIR program. Their analysis found that each participating agency was utilizing different methodologies in the calculation. The GAO recommended that the SBA issue guidance to the participating agencies to ensure consistency across the program. The SBA agreed with this recommendation.

Accordingly, I believe the NSF Inspector General's recommendation is inconsistent with the current law and would ask that the Director of the National Science Foundation hold the recommendation in abeyance until such time as the SBA issues guidance to the participating SBIR agencies.

Mr. ENZI. Would the Senator yield for a question? This is clearly a very important issue for members of the Small Business Committee. Would the Senator agree that NSF's coordination with SBA is critical to ensuring a strong SBIR program?

Mr. BURNS. I believe the NSF and all agencies participating in the SBIR program should coordinate with the SBA in determining their extramural research budgets. This is what the GAO recommend.

Mr. ENZI. I thank the Senator from Montana and I thank you, Senator JEFFORDS, for considering this important issue.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I rise today to encourage my colleagues to support passage of S. 1046, the National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 1998. University research continues to be a great American success story, and NSF can be proud of its role in helping to create and sustain this great research enterprise. We continue to ask much of NSF and our universities because we know what this system has contributed to the Nation in the past, and we know that greater contributions await us in the future.

Mr. President, by themselves, universities cannot solve our national problems such as technological competitiveness, the environment, and social issues like crime, poverty, and education. However, the research and trained young people provided by our universities will continue to play a major role in addressing these pressing issues. S. 1046 authorizes the continuation of the vital programs of NSF that support these efforts, including EPSCoR which has helped strengthen science and technology in many of our smaller states.

I would like to take a moment and thank Senator MCCAIN, Senator KENNEDY, and Senator JEFFORDS for their efforts in getting this bill passed. The managers' amendment before the Senate today reflects agreement by the Commerce Committee and the Labor Committee on many issues relating to NSF's programs and funding. The two committees worked well together within the guidelines set forth in the standing order of March 3, 1988. Because of this bipartisan effort to address issues that are within the jurisdiction of the two committees, this is a good bill, and I encourage my colleagues to support its passage.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I am pleased to support the National Science Foundation (NSF) authorization bill, which is before us today. Prior to this Congress, when I became chairman of the Communications Subcommittee, I served as chairman of the Subcommittee on Science, Technology and Space, which has jurisdiction over the authorizations for the NSF. I conducted several hearings on NSF during that time. I am also a member of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on VA-HUD Independent Agencies, which funds the NSF. As a result, I have had the opportunity to get to know this agency and its program as well.

I will have to tell you that when I came to the U.S. Senate, I did not expect to become a champion for the National Science Foundation and for scientific research, education and technology. But, I quickly became a strong supporter.

I have seen what this agency can do, and its importance to the people in our states. NSF is about seeking new scientific knowledge and using that knowledge. It is about helping the researchers and teachers in our colleges and universities and helping them to make certain that their students receive a good education, with scientific, mathematical, engineering and technological opportunities. It is about offering better training and materials for our K-12 teachers. And, it is about developing infrastructure, such as advanced telecommunication and computing opportunities. Such infrastructure is particularly important for rural states, such as Montana.

NSF has funded research which led to Montana State University's Jack Horner's now famous work on dinosaurs. It has helped us start new program in computational biology. It has funded an Engineering Research Center, which has undertaken cutting edge research in networking connection and supported other networking and telecommunications programs. There is interest in new research opportunities on life in extreme environments, which could include the Yellowstone area, and in the plant genome initiative.

I also want to say a few words about a program that is of particular importance to my state—the Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research (EPSCoR). EPSCoR was created to assist states such as Montana become more competitive in the federal R&D arena. Unfortunately, federal R&D funds are highly concentrated in a few universities in a few states. That is not justifiable. Today's global economy requires that all parts of our nation share in scientific and technology development if we are to keep our entire nation and its industries and workforce competitive. Today, we know that scientific and technological problems and issues in one area of the country are likely to affect people in other areas. And, we know that we cannot have a healthy national science and technology system unless there is widespread support throughout our country for it.

The EPSCoR program is the base for much of our rural states' scientific and technological activities. It helps Montana and 17 other states develop infrastructure. It helps us develop new programs and take advantage of special opportunities. It has recently been assisting our states on participating more fully in other NSF programs. And, it was instrumental in ensuring that the EPSCoR states participate in the vBNS connections program and the Next Generation Internet initiative. I believe in the EPSCoR program, and would like to see the program expanded

in terms of financial assistance, especially when NSF funding overall is increasing and also since the co-founding, which is scheduled to increase in this budget year, should be matched by a similar increase in the base EPSCoR program.

I know that the report prepared last fall by the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee endorsed by EPSCoR program, and we on the Senate Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee are equally supportive.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, S. 1046 is deemed read a third time, the Labor Committee is discharged from further consideration of H.R. 1273 and the Senate will now proceed to its consideration. Under the previous order, all after the enacting clause is stricken, the text of S. 1046, as amended, is inserted in lieu thereof, and the bill is deemed read a third time.

The bill (H.R. 1273), as amended, was deemed read a third time.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass? On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the role.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 99, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 127 Leg.]

YEAS—99

Abraham	Faircloth	Lott
Akaka	Feingold	Lugar
Allard	Feinstein	Mack
Ashcroft	Ford	McCain
Baucus	Frist	McConnell
Bennett	Glenn	Mikulski
Biden	Gorton	Moseley-Braun
Bingaman	Graham	Moynihan
Bond	Gramm	Murkowski
Boxer	Grams	Murray
Breaux	Grassley	Nickles
Brownback	Gregg	Reed
Bryan	Hagel	Reid
Bumpers	Harkin	Robb
Burns	Hatch	Roberts
Byrd	Helms	Rockefeller
Campbell	Hollings	Roth
Chafee	Hutchinson	Santorum
Cleland	Hutchison	Sarbanes
Coats	Inouye	Sessions
Cochran	Jeffords	Shelby
Collins	Johnson	Smith (NH)
Conrad	Kempthorne	Smith (OR)
Coverdell	Kennedy	Snowe
Craig	Kerrey	Specter
D'Amato	Kerry	Stevens
Daschle	Kohl	Thomas
DeWine	Kyl	Thompson
Dodd	Landrieu	Thurmond
Domenici	Lautenberg	Torricelli
Dorgan	Leahy	Warner
Durbin	Levin	Wellstone
Enzi	Lieberman	Wyden

NOT VOTING—1

Inhofe

The bill (H.R. 1273), as amended, was passed.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed, and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mrs. BOXER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak as in morning business for 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PATIENTS' BILL OF RIGHTS

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, earlier this morning, some of us were on the floor urging the Senate to bring up the Patients' Bill of Rights, a very important bill that would essentially protect patients from decisions made by accountants and bureaucrats in insurance companies and have their health care decisions made by physicians.

I was talking with the Senator from North Dakota who has been presenting a number of cases that proves our point as to why this legislation is needed, and he shared with me a most extraordinary case coming out of California. I am going to tell the Senate about this case, because we cannot close our eyes to what is happening.

I share with you the case of Joyce Ching from Agoura, CA. Joyce Ching lived with her husband David and 5-year-old son Justin. In 1992, when David switched jobs, he was offered an array of plans, but Joyce convinced him to join an HMO because she wanted the entire family to go to the same place to get their care.

In the summer of 1994, Joyce got sick. She began to suffer from severe abdominal pain and from rectal bleeding. The pain was so excruciating that some days she couldn't even get out of bed to be with her son. She visited her HMO doctor and was refused referral to a specialist.

I am not a physician, but I know enough people who have had problems, and when you have rectal bleeding, that is a sign that something is amiss. Yet, this HMO did not refer her to a specialist. Do you know what her doctor in the HMO told her? That her symptoms would be alleviated by a change in diet.

She changed her diet, and the symptoms were not alleviated. Fearing that her illness could hamper her chances of having a second child, she continued to complain to the physician that her pain was getting worse, and the doctor said, ''Give your diet time,'' and still would not refer her to a specialist.

Finally, after nearly 3 months and countless visits, she was referred to a gastroenterologist, but it was too late. Joyce, 34 years old, was diagnosed in the final stages of colon cancer.

What is so shocking about this case is that her doctor never really listened to her concerns and never sent her to a specialist. When you find out why, it will send chills up and down your spine. There was a deal in that HMO. They looked at Joyce's profile and they decided: A healthy woman in her thirties, we can't spend more than $28 a month on Joyce.

I will conclude with this, Mr. President. The HMO's accountants decided that Joyce should cost the HMO $28 a month, and they told the doctor, ''If she costs you any more than that, your clinic will have to pay out of its own pocket.'' So there was a deal made to give incentives to that clinic not to treat this woman, and she is gone. She is gone forever from the lives of her husband and her beautiful son, and she died at 34.

I have to say, when we stand up here day after day with these cases, it is not to hear the sound of our own voices, because there are thousands and thousands of stories like this, and people want action. They want decisions made by physicians. They want patients and physicians to be honest with each other. They don't want incentive payments to doctors so that they will not be treated. This is a tragedy that you cannot even measure, Mr. President. I call on the leadership to allow us to bring up the Patients' Bill of Rights. I yield the floor.

RECESS UNTIL 2:15 P.M.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will stand in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, at 12:47 p.m., the Senate recessed until 2:15 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. COATS).

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH, EXTENSION, AND EDUCATION REFORM ACT OF 1998—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 2:15 having arrived, the Senator from Texas is recognized to move to recommit the conference report accompanying S. 1150.

Mr. ROBERTS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mikki Holmes, an intern, be allowed on the floor for the duration of this debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.