

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. LAHOOD). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

The motion to instruct was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees:

Conferees on S. 652, Telecommunications Act:

From the Committee on Commerce, for consideration of the Senate bill, and the House amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. BLILEY, FIELDS of Texas, OXLEY, WHITE, DINGELL, MARKEY, BOUCHER, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. RUSH.

Provided, Mr. PALLONE is appointed in lieu of Mr. BOUCHER solely for consideration of section 205 of the Senate bill.

As additional conferees, for consideration of sections 1-6, 101-04, 106-07, 201, 204-05, 221-25, 301-05, 307-311, 401-02, 405-06, 410, 601-06, 703, and 705 of the Senate bill, and title I of the House amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. SCHAEFER, BARTON of Texas, HASTERT, PAXON, KLUG, FRISA, STEARNS, BROWN of Ohio, GORDON, and Mrs. LINCOLN.

As additional conferees, for consideration of sections 102, 202-03, 403, 407-09 and 706 of the Senate bill, and title II of the House amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. SCHAEFER, HASTERT, and FRISA.

As additional conferees, for consideration of sections 105, 206, 302, 306, 312, 501-05, and 701-02 of the Senate bill, and title III of the House amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. STEARNS, PAXON, and KLUG.

As additional conferees, for consideration of sections 7-8, 226, 404, and 704 of the Senate bill, and titles IV-V of the House amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. SCHAEFER, HASTERT, and KLUG.

As additional conferees, for consideration of title VI of the House amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. SCHAEFER, BARTON of Texas, and KLUG.

As additional conferees from the Committee on the Judiciary, for consideration of the Senate bill (except sections 1-6, 101-04, 106-07, 201, 204-05, 221-25, 301-05, 307-311, 401-02, 405-06, 410, 601-06, 703, and 705), and of the House amendment (except title I), and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. HYDE, MOORHEAD, GOODLATTE, BUYER, FLANAGAN, CONYERS, SCHROEDER and BRYANT of Texas.

As additional conferees, for consideration of sections 1-6, 101-04, 106-07, 201,

204-05, 221-25, 301-05, 307-311, 401-02, 405-06, 410, 601-06, 703, and 705 of the Senate bill, and title I of the House amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. HYDE, MOORHEAD, GOODLATTE, BUYER, FLANAGAN, GALLEGLY, BARR, HOKE, CONYERS, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Messrs. BERMAN, BRYANT of Texas, SCOTT, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE.

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON S. 652 TELECOMMUNICATIONS BILL

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this motion to instruct the conferees.

As ranking member of the Judiciary Committee which has jurisdiction over the antitrust laws which lie at the heart of the M-F-J, I believe we in Congress should be doing everything we can to foster fair competition.

I am, therefore, encouraged by the fact that my good friend and Michigan colleague and distinguished ranking member of the Commerce Committee, Mr. DINGELL, agreed to specify in this motion that the conferees support those provisions which promote fair competition in telecommunications.

That means that we should open telecommunications markets only to the extent that we can be sure that monopolies will not abuse the principles of fair and open competition in the marketplace. Such abuse of monopolistic power would surely lead to higher consumer prices.

During the conference I will be doing everything within my power to ensure that the final bill provides for fair competition without the possibility of monopoly abuse. I fought for fair competition in the Judiciary Committee with Chairman HYDE, I fought for fair competition on the House floor, and I hope that as the House and Senate bills are reconciled we can achieve an accommodation providing fair competition for the American people.

If the final legislative product does not achieve such an accommodation, but instead allows monopolies to abuse their market power, this would be a dramatic step backward from the M-F-J. In such an event, I believe it would be preferable for the President to veto the legislation so we can begin work again next Congress.

Finally, I note that nothing in this motion preempts conferees from being very flexible. Nothing prevents the conferees from looking at a whole variety of alternatives that will promote fair competition.

Nothing in this motion should prevent the conferees from engaging in serious discussions with the administration so that a consensus package can be arrived at, and so that we can have meaningful telecommunications reform this year.

I urge a "yes" vote on this motion and a vote for fair competition.

OMNIBUS CIVILIAN SCIENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1995

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 234 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. 2405.

□ 1727

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. 2405) to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1996 and 1997 for civilian science activities of the Federal Government, and for other purposes, with Mr. KINGSTON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] had been disposed of and title V was open for amendment at any point.

Are there further amendments to title V?

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 133, line 5, strike subparagraph (A).

Page 133, lines 6 and 7, redesignate subparagraphs (B) and (C) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, this is the third of three amendments all in one paragraph on page 133, which seeks to strike language which disallows funding for three existing EPA programs which, in our opinion on this side, are vitally important to the improvement of our environment. The previous two have been offered by the gentlewoman from California [Ms. LOFGREN] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], dealing with indoor air pollution research and with the climate change action plan.

My amendment would eliminate the paragraph, the line, which deauthorizes funding for the environmental technology initiative. My amendment strikes this because we believe that the philosophy behind the deauthorization is incorrect, and as I indicated earlier, this debate is aimed at exploring philosophical differences rather than any hopes of getting a really good bill.

□ 1750

On the other side, this particular program in environmental technology, which is aimed at providing encouragement and assistance to private industry to develop environmentally safe and benign technologies and to create and exploit markets based upon this, is considered to be a form of corporate welfare.